



LUND UNIVERSITY
School of Economics and Management

Department of Business Administration
FEKN90, Business Administration
Examensarbete på Civilekonomprogrammet
Spring 2014

Stakeholder Collaboration in a Sustainable City *- A Case Study of San Francisco*

Authors

Sofia Leeb

Cecilia Rudeberg

Supervisor

Thomas Kalling

Abstract

Title: Stakeholder Collaboration in a Sustainable City: A Case Study of San Francisco

Seminar date: May 26 2014

Course: FEKN90

Authors: Sofia Leeb and Cecilia Rudeberg

Supervisor: Thomas Kalling

Key words: Collaboration, Driving forces, Stakeholder theory, Success factors, Sustainable city, Sustainable development

Purpose: The purpose of this thesis is to increase the understanding of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. This includes identification of prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements.

Method: Qualitative case study conducted in San Francisco, with a combination of inductive and deductive reasoning. Firstly, a theoretical framework was developed. Secondly, qualitative semi-structured interviews were conducted with individuals in San Francisco. The theoretical framework was supplemented with the empirical findings, and an extended framework was thus developed.

Theoretical perspectives: Stakeholder collaboration, Stakeholder theory, Sustainable city, Sustainable development.

Empirical foundation: Qualitative semi-structured interviews with 23 individuals from the local government of San Francisco, and businesses and NGOs operating in San Francisco.

Conclusions: The result of this study is an extended framework based on theory and empirical findings that presents prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city.

Acknowledgements

We would like to begin by thanking everyone who made our study possible, and especially the individuals in San Francisco who took time to participate in the interviews. We would also like to thank those involved in the research program Sustainable Society (SuS), in which this thesis is written, for inspiration and feedback.

Finally, we would like to thank our supervisor Thomas Kalling for great engagement and guidance during our study. We truly appreciate your support.

May 16 2014, Lund

Sofia Leeb
901229-2786

Cecilia Rudeberg
900725-5525

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background and problematization	1
1.1.1 Theoretical problematization	3
1.2 Purpose	5
1.3 Contribution	6
1.4 Delimitations	6
1.5 Research program: Sustainable Society	6
1.6 Outline	7
2. Theory	8
2.1 Sustainable development	8
2.1.1 Background to sustainable development	8
2.1.2 Pillars of sustainable development	8
2.1.3 Defining sustainable development	9
2.2 Sustainable cities	10
2.2.1 Importance of cities	10
2.2.2 Benefits of cities	10
2.2.3 Cities as systems	11
2.2.4 Cities meeting present needs without compromising future needs	11
2.2.5 Cities and the pillars of sustainable development	12
2.2.6 Sustainable city development	12
2.2.7 Arriving at a definition of a sustainable city	14
2.3 Stakeholder theory	15
2.3.1 Background	15
2.3.2 Rethinking the traditional view of the firm	15
2.3.3 Fundamentals of stakeholder theory	16
2.3.4 Definitions of a stakeholder	16
2.3.5 Stakeholder legitimacy and identification	16
2.3.6 Extending stakeholder theory	17
2.3.7 Stakeholder networks	17
2.3.8 Stakeholder groups in a sustainable city	18
2.3.9 Roles of stakeholder groups in a sustainable city	19
2.4 Stakeholder collaboration	21
2.4.1 Stakeholder collaboration and sustainable development	21
2.4.2 Elements of stakeholder collaboration	21
2.4.3 Stakeholders collaborating for sustainable development	22
2.4.4 Defining stakeholder collaboration	23
2.4.5 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	23
2.4.6 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	26
2.5 Theoretical framework	29
2.5.1 Explanation of theoretical framework	29
2.5.2 Summary of theoretical framework	31
2.5.3 Contribution of theoretical framework	36
3. Method	38
3.1 Research approach	38
3.2 Qualitative case study	38
3.2.1 Ontological position of constructivism	39
3.2.2 Inductive and deductive reasoning	39
3.2.3 Selection of case	39
3.3 Data collection	40
3.3.1 Secondary data	40
3.3.2 Qualitative interviews in San Francisco	40
3.4 Method for presentation of empirical findings	44

3.5 Method for analysis	45
3.6 Reliability and validity	45
4. Empirical findings	47
4.1 San Francisco	47
4.1.1 Stakeholder groups in San Francisco.....	48
4.2 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco	50
4.2.1 Macro level.....	50
4.2.2 Micro level.....	55
4.3 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco	64
4.3.1 Plan	64
4.3.2 Manage	71
4.4 Overall view of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco	78
5. Analysis	80
5.1 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	80
5.1.1 Macro level.....	80
5.1.2 Micro level.....	82
5.2 Added driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	85
5.2.1 Micro level.....	86
5.3 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	88
5.4 Added success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city	97
5.5 Extended framework	100
5.5.1 Explanation of extended framework.....	101
5.5.2 Contribution of extended framework.....	102
6. Conclusion	103
6.1 Result relative to the purpose	103
6.2 Validity	103
6.2.1 Integration.....	103
6.2.2 Relative ability to explain.....	104
6.2.3 Relevance.....	104
6.3 Implications for future research	105
7. References	106
Appendix 1: List of respondents	113
Appendix 2: Interview guide	115
Appendix 3: Article in Harvard Business Review	117

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and problematization

The world population is growing and is by 2050 expected to reach nearly 9.2 billion. Not only are more people projected to occupy the world, there is also an ongoing demographic shift. Urban areas are by 2050 projected to contain almost 70 % of the world population, while the rural population is expected to decrease (OECD, 2012). This urbanization, where “more and more people leave the countryside to live in cities” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2013), has both positive and negative effects (OECD, 2012). Seen from the positive side, urbanization can lead to increased economic growth and productivity (McKinsey&Company, 2013). Moreover, it is generally easier to supply a more concentrated population with basic utilities such as water and energy (OECD, 2012). However, cities are also centers of waste generation and energy consumption, as well as sources of social problems and inequalities (Marceau, 2008). A higher concentration of people can further have environmental effects that put citizens’ health at risk, and can also cause serious transportation complications. Other problems include insufficient resource supply and poor infrastructure support, as well as a possible increase of urban slums (OECD, 2012).

How cities decide to deal with these unsustainable effects have implications for the well-being of the entire world population (McKinsey&Company, 2013). The world economy is by 2050 projected to use about 80 % more energy than today, and in order for emissions and urban air pollution not to reach unprecedented levels, it is clear that change is needed (OECD, 2012). The question for cities is not whether to address sustainable development, but rather in what way (The World Bank Group, 2014). Inaction to the various problems of urbanization will have enormous consequences, as passivity will jeopardize the future of coming generations. Hence, there is a need for a new way of thinking (OECD, 2012). We need to change the way cities operate and the way they are structured, as it is not necessarily cities themselves that are bad, but rather the way they are constructed and used (Haughton & Hunter, 1994).

The central threat to sustainable development is humans trying to live beyond the capacity of the planet (Haughton, 1999). Main challenges include making production and consumption patterns more sustainable, reducing poverty, and preserving natural resources (UN, 2012). Sustainable development efforts include prevention of pollution, environmentally sound

production, and green designs (Glavič & Lukman, 2007). Other initiatives take in improved opportunities for education, involvement of stakeholders in political decision-making, and transformation of brownfields into environmentally friendly housing projects (OECD, 2008). Various organizations and individuals have attempted to respond to the challenges of sustainable development. According to UN (2010), sustainable development has today become a recognized guiding principle among governments, companies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as citizens. Many international organizations, such as the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, have incorporated sustainable development into their operations, and private businesses are addressing sustainability in terms of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) agendas (UN, 2010).

However, achieving sustainable development is difficult, and action does not support the changes required for a shift towards sustainable development (UN, 2010). It is the common opinion among supporters of sustainable development that society needs to change, but the changes required and means for achieving change remain debatable (Hopwood, Mellor & O'Brien, 2005). The wide scope of the concept of sustainable development can help explain why necessary changes have not yet been successfully implemented (OECD, 2008). Various actors have their own interpretations of the meaning of sustainable development, in part shaped by their different worldviews. These differences will in turn affect what issues are prioritized, and what actions are taken (Giddings, Hopwood & O'Brien, 2002). Although an obvious need for change, the question is if whether progress made in the area is sufficient, and if we treat the warnings we receive adequately (OECD, 2008).

In today's world, we are seeking to address global sustainability problems, but fail to achieve advancement towards a sustainable society at the local level. We are not able to achieve correspondence between structures that are thought to manage the environment successfully, with activities that drive unsustainable practices (Redclift, 1996). Further, many urban areas do respond to the ongoing climate change, but fail to execute long-term strategies for this purpose. For sustainable development to be present at the local level, there is a need for a new way of thinking, and for different ways of creating more successful and sustainable cities. There is further not only one way of addressing sustainable city development. Therefore, each individual city has to be aware of how it wants to address sustainable development, and identify and work with a broad spectrum of partners from both the public and private sector (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). In order to address sustainable development, governments

have developed plans for their cities to become more sustainable (Lee, Hancock & Hu, in press). Indeed, cities are increasingly recognizing the value of understanding in what way it is possible to successfully manage their local environment and improve the community, while still maintaining an effective economy (Boyle, Head, Hood, Lawton, Lowe, O'Connor, Peet, Schreier & Vanegas, 2013). However, even though sustainable development is encouraged, only a small number of governments have implemented adequate frameworks that support sustainable development for urban areas. Also, lack of consensus regarding what sustainable development in cities incorporates has resulted in great ambiguity of who truly is pursuing such efforts. It is also difficult to determine which cities that address environmental issues in the best way, as many cities are only transferring issues to other locations (Satterthwaite, 1997).

Sustainable development requires collaboration among government, business, and NGOs (UN, 2010). It is not possible for governmental actors, financial institutions, planners, builders, or citizens alone to overcome the challenges of sustainable development. Therefore, it is essential to involve all stakeholders in sustainable development efforts, and allow for coordination, integration, and resource sharing that benefits all (Boyle et al., 2013). The same holds true for sustainable development in cities, where collective will and alignment of governmental, economic, and social power is required (PWC, 2012). During the last two decades, stakeholder involvement has increased and both business' and NGOs' roles have enhanced in the sustainable development process (UN, 2010). Today, we are witnessing a broad range of various organizational structures (Andriof & Waddock, 2002), and numerous forms of collaboration are used to address multifaceted issues involving social, political, and economic problems. Such forms of collaboration take place within different parts of society, involving both business and NGOs, among others (Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

1.1.1 Theoretical problematization

It exists a great amount of literature on sustainable development. A wide range of definitions of the concept has been developed, as well as descriptions that attempt to explain sustainable development. Even though the concept has been thoroughly reviewed by multiple researchers, how to practice sustainability is not sufficiently understood (Boyle et al., 2013). Therefore, there is a need for research that addresses how sustainable development can be practiced. The

discussion about sustainable development has advanced over the years, and has come to include the way cities are structured and operated. However, there is still a need for more research within the area of sustainable cities (Alusi, Eccles, Edmondson & Zuzul, 2011). The need for recognizing and addressing an organization's stakeholders is widely known, and this theoretical area has been well explored. There are many definitions of what constitutes a stakeholder, and also a great amount of literature that explains how stakeholders can be identified and managed. However, in terms of stakeholders in a sustainable city, the literature is limited. It does not exist much literature about stakeholders such as the local government, businesses, and NGOs, specific to a sustainable city. Because of this, research that develops theory about such stakeholders in a sustainable city is needed. Further, it exists a great amount of literature that explains that cross-sector collaboration is needed to advance sustainable development. However, there is little research about the nature of such collaboration in a sustainable city, and the literature gives few answers to how local government, business, and NGOs collaborate in a sustainable city. In summary, it exist a vast amount of literature in each of the theoretical areas mentioned above, but there is less literature where the theoretical areas are combined. An attempt to merge the areas is made by Boyle et al. (2013), who examine the engagement and involvement of stakeholders in cities that attempt to advance sustainable development. Khare, Beckman and Crouse (2011) similarly review how cities that address climate change can develop sustainable programs and initiatives through stakeholder collaboration. However, none of these thoroughly present what drives collaboration and what comprises successful collaborative arrangements. As previously mentioned, collaboration among government, business, and NGOs is necessary for sustainable development. Therefore, in order for sustainable development to advance, there is a need for research that increases the knowledge of collaboration among these stakeholder groups. Identification of driving forces, as well as success factors of collaboration, would be helpful in making collaborative efforts among the stakeholder groups more successful. Included in efforts that address sustainable urban development is seeking answers through research, and it is important to link practice with academia (Boyle et al., 2013). There is lack of descriptions of successful collaborative arrangements addressing sustainable development. Moreover, there is a need of using empirical data to examine collaboration between organizations, and its connection to sustainable development (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007).

In the light of this, we will study collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. To be able to perform the study, we will use well selected theories and

concepts. To provide the reader with a background to the concept of sustainable cities, we will use the concept of sustainable development and explain what is embedded in this concept. This is done in an attempt to facilitate the understanding of what constitutes a sustainable city, as well as the importance of such cities. The literature on sustainable development is somewhat exhausting, which makes a consistent view of what constitutes sustainable development in this thesis necessary. Further, it exists a wide range of terms that attempt to depict sustainable city development, which contributes to difficulties in developing a theoretical framework. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion of what constitutes a sustainable city, this concept will be reviewed. We will also use stakeholder theory, as it is a fundamental theory that explains why organizations need to consider the external environment. A prerequisite for sustainable development is to consider the external environment, and organizations and individuals in it, which makes this theory relevant to our study. Even though stakeholder theory is not specifically developed to understand stakeholders in a sustainable city, it is possible to apply the theory in a sustainable city as local government, business, and NGOs represent stakeholders in the city. As this study involves studying collaboration, theories addressing this theme will be reviewed. It exist a vast amount of literature in each of the theoretical areas mentioned above, but less literature that combine the three. As a result of lack of integration among the areas, sustainable development and stakeholder theory will be explained somewhat separately. However, it is our intention to combine sustainable development, stakeholder theory, as well as theories addressing collaboration in a theoretical framework. In the theoretical framework, we will merge the theoretical areas into one framework that presents prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. The literature used in the study has been thoroughly reviewed and consciously selected. We attempted to proceed from the work of prominent authors within each theoretical area, and make use of commonly cited concepts and ideas. Also, both older and more recently published research has been used in order to provide a more inclusive literature review.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to increase the understanding of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. This includes identification of prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements.

1.3 Contribution

We believe our study will contribute to the understanding of sustainable cities and especially collaboration in a sustainable city. Further, we hope that those interested in the research field will find the study relevant, and that the results of the study can be helpful to stakeholders in sustainable cities who want to improve collaboration. We will use the city San Francisco as our case, and perform interviews with the local government, businesses, and NGOs in the city. We will complement the theoretical framework with findings from our empirical data.

1.4 Delimitations

This study is limited to only studying one case, namely the city San Francisco. Thus, we are only able to address the purpose of this thesis in a specific city context. The study is further limited to studying a smaller number of stakeholders in San Francisco. Also, we attempt to provide a broad and overall view of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs. Therefore, we will not provide in depth descriptions of such collaborative arrangements. The study is further limited to only identify prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration between local government, business, and NGOs. This means that less prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements may be present. Furthermore, this study has a limited time frame, and the purpose will only be addressed in San Francisco at a specific point in time. As a result of this, the study does not cover how collaboration among the three stakeholder groups evolves over time.

1.5 Research program: Sustainable Society

This thesis has been written as a part of the research program Sustainable Society (SuS), at the school of Economics and Management, Lund University. The purpose of the program is to increase the understanding of the formation of a sustainable society, and how various actors involved benefit as they aim to become more sustainable. The development of such sustainable societies includes challenges within various areas such as energy, transportation, and architecture. Within SuS, the assumption is that sustainable societies will not emerge unless collaboration between organizations and across sectors is present. The development of a sustainable society further requires efforts from various stakeholders.

1.6 Outline

The thesis is structured as follows. The following chapter reviews the selected theoretical areas and thus gives a theoretical answer to the purpose, through the development of a theoretical framework. Thereafter, the method used for the study is presented. Following the method, the empirical findings are presented. Subsequently, an analysis follows in order to put the empirical findings in relation to the theoretical framework. Through this, the theoretical framework is supplemented based on the empirical findings and thus an extended framework is presented. Conclusions and implications for future research conclude the thesis.

2. Theory

We begin the chapter by explaining the concepts of sustainable development and sustainable cities. Thereafter, we briefly review stakeholder theory, and relate it to sustainable cities. After this, theory that addresses stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city is presented. The chapter is concluded with a presentation of a theoretical framework. In this, the theoretical areas are merged into one framework that presents prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. The reason for initially presenting the theoretical areas somewhat separately is due to the limited literature that combines them.

2.1 Sustainable development

To understand the concept of sustainable cities, it is useful to gain an understanding of the term sustainable development. Therefore, the concept of sustainable development is presented, and its meanings briefly reviewed. The section is concluded with a working definition of sustainable development.

2.1.1 Background to sustainable development

The concept of sustainable development is broad, and associated with many different meanings (e.g. Egger, 2006; Giddings, Hopwood & O'Brien, 2002; Hopwood, Mellor, & O'Brien, 2005). However, the definition of sustainable development formulated by the WCED in the report 'Our Common Future', "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987, p. 43), has come to be the common definition of the concept (UN, 2010). Although many definitions and explanations of sustainable development have appeared subsequently, the majority resembles the definition formulated by the WCED (Glavič & Lukman, 2007).

2.1.2 Pillars of sustainable development

The main principle of sustainable development is that our actions today should not jeopardize the future of coming generations. We must therefore consider the effects of our actions on the economy, society, and the environment (OECD, 2008). This brings us to the three pillars of sustainable development, namely economic development, social equity, and environmental protection (UN, 2010). The economic dimension concerns the negative consequences that result from increased economic growth and production (Crane & Matten, 2010). Economic

growth is related to income inequalities and heavy resource use (Sustainable Development Commission, 2009), and can ultimately lead to impaired quality of life. Within the social dimension, the aspiration is to achieve a more equitable and just situation for the world population. Although living standards have improved around the world, social inequalities still represent a great issue. The environmental dimension mainly regards the handling of natural resources. Scarce resources must be responsibly managed and protected to ensure sufficient future supply (Crane & Matten, 2010).

2.1.2.1 Interrelation among the pillars

Sustainable development has historically been closely related to the environmental dimension (Crane & Matten, 2010), and is still by many perceived to be mainly an environmental issue (OECD, 2008). However, it is often difficult as well as impractical to address environmental sustainable development without also considering the economic and social dimensions (Crane & Matten, 2010). The three pillars that comprise sustainable development must therefore be considered together, as they are interrelated. We are dependent on the environment and its ecosystems for our existence, since it provides us with necessities such as oxygen, water, and soil. Without an environment to exist in, we would be unable to develop societies and improve economic growth. In the same way, economic resources are required to deliver needed services to people, and to responsibly look after the environment (OECD, 2008). Convergence between the pillars, and recognition of their interdependence is needed in order to successfully manage sustainable development (UN, 2010). If the pillars are considered in isolation, unsustainable outcomes can emerge. For example, pure focus on profit generation can cause environmental and social harm, which in turn creates future costs for society (OECD, 2008). The goal is to balance the three pillars and resolve possible conflicts among them (Giddings, Hopwood & O'Brien, 2002).

2.1.3 Defining sustainable development

As a working definition, we define sustainable development as *the processes that improve economic, social, and environmental sustainability, without compromising the needs of future generations.*

2.2 Sustainable cities

In this section, the concept of sustainable development is related to cities. The section is concluded with a working definition of a sustainable city.

2.2.1 Importance of cities

In order to responsibly manage the environment globally, it is necessary to achieve sustainable development at a local level (Redclift, 1996). Despite the fact that climate change indeed is a global problem, it certainly is a local level issue (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Even though international agreements are needed, it is clear that the main effort has to be articulated and executed locally (Satterthwaite, 1997). If we are to understand global sustainable development, we need to understand cities as they today dominate the global society (Egger, 2006).

2.2.2 Benefits of cities

Cities are frequently blamed for being one of the main problems when attempting to advance sustainable development (Thornbush, Golubchikov & Bouzarovski, 2013; UN Centre for Human Settlements (HABITAT), 1996). However, cities possess great advantages for addressing sustainable development, as they for example concentrate production and population (UN Centre for Human Settlements (HABITAT), 1996). By concentrating the population, cities are able to lower the unit cost of infrastructure, as well as cost of health care and emergency services (Satterthwaite, 1997). If a city is managed accurately, it can also reduce travel distance and as a result energy usage (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). Cities further have the ability to combine existing knowledge and experience from previous implementations of strategies towards sustainable development. Cities can also make use of efficient supply management strategies and waste programs, in order to decrease their role as centers of energy consumption and waste creation (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). It is also possible for cities to create an environment in which citizens are culturally stimulated through for example great buildings and parks (Haughton and Hunter, 1994). Other relevant areas where cities play a significant role in sustainable development include housing and employment (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998).

2.2.3 Cities as systems

Egger (2006) describes cities as systems, and contends that cities are expressions of society. A city without inhabitants is according to the author irrelevant, as it is not possible to separate the city from the environment in which it exists. In order for cities to provide an environment where humans can live and interact, management, governance, business, culture, and education is necessary. Egger (2006) as well as Haughton and Hunter (1994) further state that cities can be considered as ecosystems. Cities are however different from other ecosystems that exist in the global environment, as they to a larger extent affect the natural environment. A great part of the waste creation emerging from cities does not break down naturally, and cities are not enough sophisticated to deal with the waste. Haughton and Hunter (1994) further elaborate on this theme and exemplify with various authors work that depict the city as unsustainable. The vulnerability of a city is like that of other systems, and a city can therefore not be considered as sustainable, even though a balance between input and output in the system is achieved. Ensuring sustainable development is much more about being able to address the entire system of components in the city simultaneously, and adapt and respond to external effects. The city needs to be able to continuously reinvent itself, and has to realize that it is not possible to achieve static sustainability. The city itself is a part of other systems, which makes frequent change inevitable (Egger, 2006).

2.2.4 Cities meeting present needs without compromising future needs

In order to address sustainable development in cities, it is possible to further build on the earlier presented definition formulated by the WCED. The first part of the definition explains that sustainable development concerns the meeting of needs. These needs can in terms of cities be divided into economic needs, social, cultural, environmental and health needs, as well as political needs. Economic needs include the right to an adequate way of living, and economic security. Included in social, cultural, environmental, and health needs is a safe and affordable home, and a living environment that is secure from environmental hazards. Also included is the need for people to live in areas where their social and cultural requirements are met. A just and fair income distribution is also implied as a need of those responsible for child rearing. Finally, political needs include the option for individuals to take part in politics regarding control of their neighborhood. In this, civil and political rights should be ensured and also the implementation of environmental regulation. The second part of the definition presented by the WCED concerns the ability to meet those articulated needs, without

comprising the ability of future generations. Applying this to cities, it is possible to identify certain goals of sustainable development. The first goal includes minimizing the usage of non-renewable resources and waste creation resulting from such usage. These non-renewable resources can apart from fossils fuels and limited mineral resources, also encompass natural landscapes and historic locations as they can be considered irreplaceable and therefore non-renewable. The second goal includes a sustainable use of limited renewable resources, and a secure handling of waste that do not damage sinks (UN Centre for Human Settlements (HABITAT), 1996).

2.2.5 Cities and the pillars of sustainable development

According to Camagni, Capello, and Nijkamp (1998), it is possible to view a city as a setting where three environments coexist. These environments are similar to the attributes of the urban environment which Haughton and Hunter (1994) describe. All authors include the economic, social and physical environment (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998; Haughton & Hunter, 1994), and argue that the three should be considered together. It is necessary to consider the three environments as interrelated, and note that each of the environments creates both advantages and disadvantages for the city (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998). Therefore, a sustainable city is one in which the three environments “interact in such a way that the sum of all positive externalities stemming from the interaction of the three environments is larger than the sum of the negative external effects caused by the interaction” (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998, p. 108).

2.2.6 Sustainable city development

Haughton and Hunter (1994) state that a city is continuously changing, and is thus never fixed. Therefore, a city’s development should not be considered as an end point, but rather as a process that contributes to sustainable development on a global level (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). It does not exist a simple formula for creating sustainable cities (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998; Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011), as different geographic locations clearly have specific cultural, economic, environmental, and political characteristics (Camagni, Capello & Nijkamp, 1998). Indeed, such unique characteristics of a specific city need to be considered when addressing sustainable development in the city. The strategies for embracing sustainable development initiatives may differ in their strategic nature, ranging from

educational efforts to investment decisions and principles and guidelines (Haughton & Hunter, 1994).

2.2.6.1 Elements of a sustainable city

In the literature on sustainable urban development, various areas that are important in the field are discussed. Infrastructure is likely to play a major role in sustainable cities (Alusi, Eccles, Edmondson & Zuzul, 2011). As an example, the way railways and highways are constructed within a city can have an important effect on its sustainable development (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). Cities are required to manage their infrastructure to ensure that the citizens' needs and wants are met. However, it is costly for cities to respond to the increasing demands on their infrastructure. For example, to maintain adequate water and energy supply, new technologies often have to be integrated with old, which is generally a costly procedure. Public transportation will also be important when working towards sustainable urban development (Boyle et al., 2013). A sustainable city is associated with the use of green buildings that has the aim to reduce its environmental impact (Alusi, Eccles, Edmondson & Zuzul, 2011). It is also likely that technology will play a central part of sustainable urban development (Boyle et al, 2013). Indeed, to manage the city in a more sustainable way, technology is often used (Alusi, Eccles, Edmondson & Zuzul, 2011). Cities are major contributors to environmental change, in part because of their increased populations. Environmental issues in cities, such as air and water pollution and poor sanitation, are not new phenomenon, but are however being added to as it becomes clear that they are linked to global environmental sustainability (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). Satterthwaite (1997) argues that there are five categories, mainly focusing on environmental issues, which cities need to assess in order to commit to sustainable development. The first category involves providing water as well as ensuring sanitation, drainage, and garbage collection with the purpose of controlling various diseases. The second category is concerned with providing homes, workplaces, and a living environment that minimizes chemical and physical threats. Embedded in the third category is for example that citizens should have access to open spaces such as parks, and be able to practice sports. Further, the protection and preservation of natural and cultural heritage is considered important. The fourth category states that it is not only about minimizing unsustainable development within the city's boundaries, but also about minimizing the transfer of environmental costs to other locations or people. This is in line with Haughton and Hunter (1994), who state that "its responsibilities stretch beyond the city

boundaries” (p. 311). The final category concerns sustainable consumption, which involves making sure that consumption needs are met without unsustainable damage to nations or future generations (Satterthwaite, 1997).

2.2.7 Arriving at a definition of a sustainable city

We have not been able to find a unanimous definition of a sustainable city. Descriptions of urban areas working with sustainable development vary from broad to more narrow, depending on what aspects are included. Also, the frequently mentioned categories greenfield, brownfield, and retrofit imply that the term city in the concept sustainable city is not necessarily associated with what would generally be considered as a city. Also, as earlier discussed, the concept of sustainable development is vague, which contributes to the difficulties of defining a sustainable city.

2.2.7.1 Defining a sustainable city

As a working definition we build on the definition of sustainable development, and define a sustainable city as: *a city, or a part of a city, that carries out processes that improves economic, social, and environmental sustainability, without compromising the needs of future generations.*

2.3 Stakeholder theory

In this section, we present the background and basics of stakeholder theory. The traditional view of stakeholder theory is after this extended to encompass the interdependence of stakeholders, which is explained in the context of stakeholder networks. We then present the main stakeholder groups in a sustainable city, and review their roles within the city.

2.3.1 Background

When the notion of stakeholders first emerged, it was supposed to challenge the view that the firm and its management only had responsibilities to the shareholders (Parmar, Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Purnell & De Colle, 2010). This view was brought forward in 1970 by Milton Friedman in the today classic article ‘The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits’. An opposing view was developed and brought forward by Edward Freeman in the book ‘Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach’, published in 1984. The book is often referred to as the landmark in the development of stakeholder theory (e.g. Calton & Kurland, 1996; Clarkson, 1995; Crane & Matten, 2010; Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997), and is together with other publications by Freeman frequently cited in the literature. Stakeholder theory is based on the view that the company not only has responsibilities to shareholders, but to a wide range of stakeholders (Freeman, 1984).

2.3.2 Rethinking the traditional view of the firm

Traditionally, the firm has been seen as connected to four groups, namely shareholders, employees, suppliers, and customers (Crane & Matten, 2010). Shareholders, employees, and suppliers contribute with inputs to the company, which after transformation into outputs are sold to customers, depicted in the ‘Input-Output Model’ (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). The four groups represent the groups to whom the company is responsible, and thus needs to satisfy. However, the traditional view of the firm does not sufficiently consider the surrounding environment and external groups of the firm. The business environment is dynamic and turbulent, as businesses are affected by local as well as global matters. Thus, a different approach to deal with external matters was needed, and stakeholder theory was developed (Freeman, 1984).

2.3.3 Fundamentals of stakeholder theory

The basic idea of the stakeholder approach is that there are a number of groups, so called stakeholders, who possess a legitimate interest in the firm (Crane & Matten, 2010). The stakeholder approach attempts to widen the responsibilities of management beyond profit maximization, to regard non-shareholders' interests and claims (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). Businesses are thus not solely run in the interests of the shareholders, but rather take several groups into concern that they have a responsibility towards (Crane & Matten, 2010). Stakeholder theory is concerned with the relationships between the firm and its stakeholders, and seeks to explain who represents a stakeholder and who does not (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997).

2.3.4 Definitions of a stakeholder

The question of who represents a stakeholder has no clear answer, as there exists a range of different definitions of the term (Crane & Matten, 2010). Definitions presented in the literature vary from broad to narrow. Broad definitions seek to explain that nearly anyone can constitute a stakeholder to a company, while more narrow definitions attempt to justify that it is unrealistic for a company to pay attention to all potential stakeholders (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). Freeman (1984) defines a stakeholder as "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (p. 46). This definition has become commonly accepted, and is described as the classic definition of a stakeholder (Fassin, 2008). The definition by Freeman is broad, and implies that practically anyone can constitute a stakeholder (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997).

2.3.5 Stakeholder legitimacy and identification

The vagueness resulting from various stakeholder definitions presented in the literature has led to ambiguity regarding the question on stakeholder legitimacy and identification (Phillips, 2003). Phillips (2003) explains legitimacy in terms of normative and derivative stakeholders. Normative stakeholders are groups that the organization has a moral responsibility towards. Derivative stakeholders must also be considered as they can affect the organization and its normative stakeholders. Clarkson (1995) along with other authors (e.g. Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997) distinguishes between primary and secondary stakeholder groups, when discussing stakeholder legitimacy. A company depends on its primary stakeholder groups for its continuing success or survival, and must therefore be aware of, and satisfy each of these

groups. Secondary stakeholder groups represent those who have the ability to influence, or is affected by the company. These stakeholders are not vital for the survival of the company, and are not involved in exchanges with it (Clarkson, 1995). Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) propose a framework to facilitate stakeholder identification. The framework suggests that stakeholders can be identified by their possession of one or more of three attributes: power, legitimacy, and urgency. A company is assumed to give greater attention to a stakeholder who is perceived to possess a higher degree of the attributes. A stakeholder can be nearly any type of entity, and does not necessarily need to be a person or a group. Organizations, communities, societies, and the natural environment all represent potential stakeholders (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). All types of organizations, such as governments, universities, and NGOs have stakeholders that they need to take into concern. The range of stakeholders varies between organizations, and may differ within the same organization under different circumstances (Crane & Matten, 2010). Organizations are supposed to handle a range of stakeholder expectations and in order to do so, they collaborate with various stakeholder groups (Andriof & Waddock, 2002).

2.3.6 Extending stakeholder theory

The literature on stakeholder theory has become increasingly comprehensive and diverse, and various attempts have been made in trying to widen the traditional stakeholder theory (e.g. Fassin, 2008; Lopez-De-Pedro & Rimbau-Gilabert, 2012; Post, Preston & Sachs, 2002; Rowley, 1999). Attention has moved “from an entirely corporate-centric focus in which stakeholders are viewed as subjects to be managed towards more of a network-based, relational and process-oriented view of company-stakeholders engagement” (Andriof & Waddock, 2002, p. 19). The economy can be seen as a network of organizations, where various organizations represent the nodes in the network, and interactions between these represent the links (Thorelli, 1986). Increased collaboration between organizations and between sectors requires a better understanding of such complex relationships and stakeholder networks (Andriof & Waddock, 2002).

2.3.7 Stakeholder networks

Rowley (1999) argues that in order to explain how an organization interacts with its stakeholders, stakeholder theory needs to be extended to encompass the interdependent relationships in the stakeholder environment. The author proposes a network theory of

stakeholder influences, suggesting that the firm does not interact separately with each stakeholder, but rather responds to the accumulated claims of a number of stakeholders. In summary, Rowley (1999) attempts to explain the simultaneous influences of various stakeholders, and the responses made by the organization. Similarly, Post, Preston and Sachs (2002) recognize that stakeholder linkages are relational and thus not purely transactional. Rather than viewing the relationships between the firm and its stakeholders as dyadic, the authors explain the stakeholder model as a complex network of relationships (Post, Preston & Sachs, 2002). Similar arguments are presented by Lopez-De-Pedro and Rimbau-Gilabert (2012), who argue that the traditional stakeholder model cannot explain complex interactional processes. Multiple actors, including government, business, and NGOs are nowadays interacting when addressing shared issues such as degradation of the environment. In processes where multiple actors participate, the actions of one actor affect other actors and cause a series of effects. Such effects should be included in stakeholder theory (Lopez-De-Pedro & Rimbau-Gilabert, 2012). Calton and Kurland (1996) propose a postmodern theory of stakeholder enabling. The authors accentuate the interdependence between the firm and its stakeholders, and seek to shift the focus from stakeholder management to stakeholder enabling. The authors argue that while managing implies that managers exercise control within a hierarchy over stakeholders, enabling means that stakeholders and managers together exercise control over shared matters. Multiple stakeholders possess power, and there is no apparent center of this power. Stakeholders interact to reach consensus and achieve shared goals (Calton & Kurland, 1996). In this context, organizations are part of larger stakeholder networks characterized by interdependent relationships.

2.3.8 Stakeholder groups in a sustainable city

According to UN (1992), the key actors involved in sustainable city development are the public and the private sector and the community. In a similar manner, UN (2010) states that government, business, and NGOs must be involved in the sustainable development work at the local level. According to Khare, Beckman and Crouse (2011), a city that is committed to sustainable development has three key stakeholder groups: the local government, business, and citizens. The three stakeholder groups are interrelated and seen as equally important by the authors. PWC (2012) adds a fourth stakeholder group to the discussion and distinguishes between government, business, community, and academia, and refer to these as the stakeholder groups in a sustainable city. While somewhat different categories and labels of

stakeholder groups are presented in the literature, it seems to be an agreement that the sectors in society presented above are all important actors in the sustainable development work in a city. For the purpose of this thesis, we accept the statement by UN (2010), and agree that the central stakeholder groups in a sustainable city are government, business, and NGOs. We add the word 'local' to government as this study is conducted on a city-level.

2.3.9 Roles of stakeholder groups in a sustainable city

2.3.9.1 Local government

The local government is elected by the city's residents to govern the city, impose taxes, approve commercial proposals and progress, as well as plan and implement social programs in the city (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Local governments are involved in sustainable development efforts initiated by national governments, but such action has not resulted in the changes necessary. A reason for this is that action often is directed towards the effects of for example degradation of the environment, instead of the actual sources creating the problem (UN, 2010). However, the local government has great opportunities to advance sustainable development in the city, and attempts to address sustainable development are conducted by many local governments. The local government can receive funding from higher-level governments, and is in a position to initiate projects in the city that address climate change. Further, the local government has experience from areas such as energy supply management, transportation, and waste management, and extensive knowledge within these fields. A challenge for the local government regarding sustainable development is the constraints resulting from time-limited election periods. Because of this, the local government often undertakes a more short-term perspective in their actions, instead of the long-term time perspective that is required for sustainable development (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011).

2.3.9.2 Business

Business includes companies and industries in the city, and plays a central role in the city's sustainable development work. The stakeholder group provides the city with products and services, as well as creates employment opportunities (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Business also has the financing, management, and technical expertise needed to improve sustainable development (UN, 2010). On the other hand, the stakeholder group accounts for great resource use, and significant generation of pollution and waste resulting from its operations (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Despite the fact that interest in sustainable

development has increased, and that business has become more responsible, sustainable development efforts within business are voluntary and there is still a relatively small number of businesses that are truly committed to sustainable development (UN, 2010). The main concern for business is the economic system where focus is on financial gains (Bendell, 2000). Businesses must make profit in order to survive, which implies that creating revenue is a main priority that overrides other responsibilities (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011).

2.3.9.3 NGOs

There exist various ways of defining an NGO. In this thesis, we adopt the definition formulated by Bendell (2000), which explains NGOs as “groups whose stated purpose is the promotion of environmental and/or social goals rather than the achievement or protection of economic power in the marketplace or political power through the electoral process” (p. 16). The definition includes nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations, but leaves out nonprofit organizations without a precise social or environmental purpose, and those working for economic interest. NGOs are interested in the social system and its related values and beliefs (Bendell, 2000). The stakeholder group engages in social areas and functions that are often associated with governmental responsibilities, such as protecting the environment and helping underprivileged members of society. NGOs serve as an alternative source to improve such functions, and a source for providing social services. The stakeholder group is generally larger and plays a more important role in cities where the population is heterogeneous, as the local government has a hard time meeting the needs of a diverse population. Increased diversity in cities thus implies growing reliance on NGOs. A common concern for NGOs is limited resources. In search for funding, collaboration as well as competition has arisen and tensions are created among NGOs, local government, and business as a result. Some NGOs are also engaging in commercial activity as a way to generate revenue, which places them in the field of business (Weisbrod, 1997).

2.4 Stakeholder collaboration

In this section, stakeholder collaboration is reviewed and related to sustainable cities. We propose a working definition of stakeholder collaboration to provide clarity of the concept as it is used in this thesis. Driving forces of collaboration on a macro and micro level, as well as success factor of collaboration are presented to increase the understanding of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city.

2.4.1 Stakeholder collaboration and sustainable development

The literature agrees on the notion that stakeholder collaboration is a requirement for sustainable development (e.g. Andersson, Angelstam, Axelsson, Elbakidze & Törnblom, 2013; Bendell 2000; Boyle et al., 2013; Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011; McKinsey&Company, 2013; UN, 1992). A participatory approach and interaction between stakeholders in the community is needed to successfully manage sustainable development. No individual or organization alone can achieve sustainable development. Rather, all stakeholders need to coordinate their efforts and link their activities, as well as combine, leverage, and share resources through collaborative arrangements. While the government has the primary responsibility of ensuring sustainable development (UN, 1992), most governments realize the potential contribution from both business and NGOs in achieving sustainable development. Local governments include businesses and citizens in discussions that address the future of their cities, and various initiatives are implemented in order to increase stakeholder engagement (Boyle et al., 2013). Moreover, many businesses are committing to collaboration and partnerships with stakeholders in response to increased concerns regarding matters such as human rights, anti-corruption (Andriof & Waddock, 2002), and the human impact on the environment (Crane & Matten, 2010). Other examples of collaborative initiatives that address sustainability matters include government and business engaging in partnerships to address social problems and transportation issues, and NGOs collaborating with businesses to improve working conditions (Crane & Matten, 2010).

2.4.2 Elements of stakeholder collaboration

Roberts and Bradley (1991) have identified five elements that characterize a collaborative arrangement. The first element is a transmutational purpose, referring to the shared and goal oriented activities by the participants. The second element of collaboration is voluntary and clear membership, implying that the parties freely participate in the collaboration, and that

their roles are openly articulated. The third element explains that collaboration involves organization. Planning and coordination of activities is a requirement of collaboration, as well as shared norms and rules, and joint decision-making. The fourth element is the interactive process, which should be continuously reevaluated and reexamined. The fifth and last element is the temporary duration of the collaboration. When the objective of the collaboration is achieved, the collaboration is ended (Roberts & Bradley, 1991). Woodland and Hutton (2012) similarly suggest five attributes of collaboration. The first attribute is that the collaborating parties are guided by a shared purpose, which is the reason for the collaboration. The second attribute explains that collaboration is “a nested phenomenon that takes place in a complex, open systems environment” (Woodland & Hutton, 2012, p. 370). Collaboration is thus a network phenomenon that simultaneously exists on different levels, namely at the interorganizational, intraorganizational, and interprofessional level. The third attribute states that collaborative arrangements undergo different development stages. Moreover, collaboration involves integration, linkages, and relationships as explained by the fourth attribute. Lastly, the fifth attribute suggests that collaboration between individuals involves ongoing review (Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

2.4.3 Stakeholders collaborating for sustainable development

Waddock (1991) discusses the concept of social partnerships, in which organizations from different sectors collaborate to achieve shared goals. Such partnerships are defined as “Voluntary collaborative efforts of actors from organizations in two or more economic sectors in a forum in which they cooperatively attempt to solve a problem or issue or mutual concern that is in some way identified with a public policy agenda item” (Waddock, 1991, p. 481). These partnerships are created to handle complex problems that require collective action. They involve two or more organizations, which can be part of government, business, NGOs, universities, and other institutions. The participants voluntarily interact to contribute to the social good, while at the same time serving their own interests. Short-term objectives tend to benefit the organizations involved in the partnership, while more long-term goals will have an impact on the public policy arena (Waddock, 1991). Selsky and Parker (2005) similarly address partnerships among government, business, and NGOs that focus on social issues, which the authors refer to as cross-sector social-oriented partnerships (CSSPs). Organizations participating in a CSSP attempt to jointly solve social concerns such as sustainable economic development, poverty, and environmental sustainability. The CSSP is by the authors defined

as “cross-sector projects formed explicitly to address social issues and causes that actively engage the partners on an ongoing basis” (Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 850). In a similar manner, Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007) discuss collaborative arrangements for sustainable development and define these as “collaborative arrangements in which actors from two or more spheres of society (state, market and civil society) are involved in a non-hierarchical process, and through which these actors strive for a sustainability goal” (p. 77). This definition suggests that the collaborative arrangement must include actors from at least two different sectors in society.

2.4.4 Defining stakeholder collaboration

For the purpose of this thesis, we build upon, and somewhat modify, the definition formulated by Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007) and propose the following working definition of collaboration: *Collaborative arrangements in which actors within the same sector, or from two or more sectors of society (local government, business, and NGOs), strive for sustainable development.*

2.4.5 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

2.4.5.1 Macro level

There exist multiple reasons that explain the increase in collaboration between sectors (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). On a macro level, collaboration between sectors is seen as necessary in response to the rapid changes that take place in the larger society. These changes are according to Austin (2000) generated by political, economic, and social forces. Political forces originate from the fact that the role of government is changing, and it can no longer be seen as the main problem solver. Limitations of government have been acknowledged, which has initiated a shift of social functions from the public to the private sector. This shift of roles and responsibilities has pushed businesses and nonprofit organizations towards collaborative initiatives. Economic forces relate to the increase in the number of nonprofit organizations, resulting in more nonprofit organizations seeking their share of limited governmental resources. Social forces derive from complex social problems, which individual organizations cannot handle alone (Austin, 2000). In order to address such problems successfully, collaboration between organizations (Trist, 1983) and sectors is required. Sustainable development issues are highly complex in their nature, and because of this require resources and skills from different organizations to be solved (Van Huijstee,

Francken & Leroy, 2007). This creates interdependence among multiple actors (Waddock, 1991). Woodland and Hutton (2012) likewise argue that the desire to address complex social issues is a strong driving force of stakeholder collaboration.

In the book 'Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development' edited by Bendell (2000), three macro level forces are presented by various authors that contribute to the increase in stakeholder collaboration to achieve sustainable development. The first driving force is related to globalization (Newell, 2000). Political power previously held by government is because of globalization today distributed among government, business, and NGOs (Crane & Matten, 2010). Governments' ability to regulate and control is decreased, which implies an argument for collaborating with private actors. A common concern related to globalization is that governments are forced to prioritize economic goals over environmental protection. The importance of private initiatives regarding environmental action is therefore increased, and there is a shift in government practices towards collaborating with private actors on this matter (Newell, 2000). The second driving force of stakeholder collaboration in sustainable development matters presented in the book is the changed role of business in society. Society has increasingly high expectations and demands on business to be held responsible for their actions. This has resulted in businesses engaging with stakeholders to a larger extent (Rodgers, 2000). The third driving force is the development in ICT (Bendell, 2000). As information today is easy accessible to nearly anyone, the balance of power between governments, business, and NGOs has changed (Bray, 2000). NGOs gain greater knowledge and power because of worldwide access to ICT (Bendell, 2000), while governments and business have a hard time conducting confidential negotiations and face greater demands on explaining their actions (Bray, 2000). This represents a driving force for businesses to work together with NGOs (Bendell, 2000), and eases the process of NGOs collaborating with each other (Bray, 2000).

2.4.5.2 Micro level

On a micro level, there are numerous driving forces of collaboration to achieve the goal of sustainable development. Different stakeholders are driven by different motives, and the literature often separates driving forces into those that are essential to government, business, and NGOs, respectively. However, some driving forces are applicable to all sectors (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). A main driving force of stakeholder collaboration in

sustainable development efforts is the ability to combine resources and strengths, in order to compensate for weaknesses of the individual organization (Bendell, 2000). Collaboration is usually driven by the ability of one participant to perform something that the other participant cannot, and vice versa. This holds true for collaboration between government, business, and NGOs, who hold diverse roles and responsibilities in society. This implies that the different stakeholder groups also take on different roles in collaborative arrangements, which depict their individual abilities and strengths (Waddell, 2000). Closely related to this is the improved access to resources resulting from collaboration (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). The notion of sustainable development addresses the need for economic development, social equity, and environmental protection (UN, 2010). Resources to handle such development are allocated to various stakeholders in society (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). Obtaining additional resources is a particularly strong driving force for NGOs, which can collaborate with other stakeholders to for example achieve funding (Crane & Matten, 2010; Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Weisbrod, 1997). Improved access to knowledge and expertise of the stakeholders involved in a collaborative arrangement represents another driving force (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). For example, business can gain access to new expertise and skills by collaborating with NGOs, as they possess knowledge about societies and their needs, as well as about issues related to the environment and social inequalities. By obtaining such knowledge, business can improve new product and market development (Waddell, 2000). In a similar manner, NGOs can obtain technical expertise by collaborating with business (Elkington & Fennell, 2000). Another driving force of stakeholder collaboration is the potential access to new markets that collaboration can provide (Crane & Matten, 2010; Waddell, 2000). NGOs can help business to link their economic and production-oriented activities with the values and beliefs of society, and offer linkages to groups in society that business find hard to relate to (Waddell, 2000). Also, NGOs can collaborate with business to create new markets for sustainable products and services (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). Another common driving force of collaboration is to foster innovation and creative solutions (Crane & Matten, 2010; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Waddel, 2000; Woodland & Hutton, 2012). An external actor to an organization can question traditional ways of operating, leading to opportunities for change and innovation (Waddel, 2000). Gaining legitimacy and credibility is another driving force for collaborating with other stakeholders. As business face increasing difficulties of legitimizing their operations, they must seek new means to defend their role in society. NGOs play an important role in the pursuit of legitimacy for business, as they have the ability to significantly influence the

perceived corporate legitimacy (Rodgers, 2000). From a government perspective, collaboration with business and NGOs can result in improved acceptance and implementation of decisions (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). Likewise, NGOs can by collaborating with a business gain greater credibility with government (Elkington & Fennell, 2000). Lastly, a driving force especially important to business is to gain a competitive advantage through improving the image of the company (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). By collaborating with NGOs, corporate reputation can be improved (Bendell, 2000). Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007) describe this driver as eco-marketing reasons, meaning that the image of the company can be improved among employees, NGOs, and consumers.

2.4.6 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

While the literature agrees on the idea that collaborative arrangements can make significant contributions to sustainable development, this is only true under certain conditions (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). For successful collaboration between sectors, it is essential that the collaboration is well integrated into each organization's strategy. In order to maximize the benefits of collaboration, the participants must ask and respond to various strategic questions. These questions elaborate on why the organizations should collaborate, what type of collaboration that is most suitable, possible partners for collaboration, when collaboration is appropriate, and finally how this collaboration should take form (Austin, 2000). Tholke (2003) states that choosing the right partner to collaborate with is a critical success factor. When choosing a partner, one should consider the particular qualities and abilities one seek in a partner. An appealing partner organization is credible and has the ability to fulfill commitments. A common way to find a partner is to leverage past interactions, and approach familiar individuals. The ideal partner might however be an organization that the approaching organization lacks relational history with (Tholke, 2003). Austin (2000) stresses the importance of that the parties of a collaborative arrangement have alignment between their mission and strategy, and pursue strategic fit. Related to this is the success factor presented by Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007), formulated as a careful choice of subject. The scope and issue addressed by the actors involved in the collaborative arrangement must be suitable to the core mission of the respective actors (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). The reason for collaborating is to achieve a vision that cannot be accomplished individually, and thus the actors involved in collaboration must be guided by this shared purpose (Woodland & Hutton, 2012). Concrete and measurable objectives from

which the involved stakeholders can derive some benefit is another success factor of collaboration (McKinsey&Company, 2013). Collaborative parties must agree on specific goals, which guide action and facilitate evaluation of progress. Defining shared goals is an important task, requiring a sufficient investment in time (Tholke, 2003). Moreover, the parties need to understand the nature and expectations of the collaborative arrangement, in order to successfully handle it (Andriof & Waddock, 2002). The unique needs and requirements of each stakeholder must be well understood by everyone involved, as well as be addressed and integrated in a sustainable development initiative (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011).

Furthermore, Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007) stress the need of “a respectful, open way of working” (p. 84) within collaborative arrangements. Included in this is openness, effective communication, and shared understandings. Actors involved in the collaborative arrangement must practice good communication and have access to relevant transparent knowledge in order to support decisions. Also, it is important that information is well understood by all actors involved (Andersson et al., 2013). According to Tholke (2003), the frequency and format of meetings decides the drive of the collaboration. If meetings are held frequently, the atmosphere will be perceived as safe by the participants, as well as characterized by open communication. While conference calls serve as an easy way to track progress and clarify queries, face-to-face meetings help to boost creativity and create agreement (Tholke, 2003). A significant element of successful collaboration is trust (Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Trust can be explained as “the ability to form expectations about aims and partners’ future behaviors in relation to those aims” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p. 10). Closely related to the concept of trust, is risk and vulnerability. By collaborating with another party, risk and vulnerability follows, as the party becomes more or less dependent on the other party to contribute. Trust is strengthened when the outcome of a collaborative initiative meets expectations, and the sense of risk and vulnerability is thus reduced (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Trust can also be seen as related to power. It may be articulated as a reliance on another party that it will act in best interest of both parties, and fulfill agreed upon duties. The concept is often based on reputation and actions deriving from the past, but is however referring to the future (Thorelli, 1986). According to Thorelli (1986), routine relationships and social bonds build trust.

Mutual interest (Austin, 2000), commitment (Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000) and action (Wood & Gray, 1991) are prerequisites for successful collaboration. Mutual commitment concerns a partner's intention to continue collaborating, and willingness to make efforts that contribute to the success of the collaboration (Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000). Mutual action is a requirement for achieving the benefits of a collaborative arrangement (Wood & Gray, 1991). Further, interaction and involvement in the planning and implementation process by all participants is required for successful collaboration (Waddock, 1991). Khare, Beckman and Crouse (2011) stress the importance of "creating a balanced, win-win situation for all stakeholders" (p. 228) involved in the collaboration. No group should be seen as contributing more, or receiving a greater return than the others, hence a fair distribution of the costs and returns to all stakeholders is a requirement for success. Sustainable development efforts need to be financially beneficial to all stakeholders, in order to create incentives for their involvement. Thus, a quantifiable benefit for everyone must be present as the stakeholders more or less are driven by self-interest (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011; Waddock, 1991; Wood & Gray, 1991). The stakeholders involved must therefore perceive that the collaboration will serve their individual interest (Wood & Gray, 1991).

2.5 Theoretical framework

In this section, a theoretical framework is presented to provide a theoretical answer to the purpose of this thesis. The framework builds upon the theoretical areas previously reviewed.

2.5.1 Explanation of theoretical framework

With background in the concepts of sustainable development and sustainable cities, stakeholder theory, and theory that addresses stakeholder collaboration, we gained a theoretical foundation regarding collaboration among stakeholder groups in a sustainable city. We proceeded in the statement formulated by UN (2010), namely that the stakeholder groups that must be involved in sustainable development at the local level are government, business, and NGOs. As this study is conducted on a city-level, we added the word ‘local’ to government, and thus the stakeholder groups included in this study are local government, business, and NGOs. The reason for not including citizens as a separate stakeholder group as for example Khare, Beckman and Crouse (2011) do is because our focus is on organized activity. Also, we see citizens’ interests as being represented by both local government and NGOs. Focus of the study is on driving forces and success factors of collaboration, among these stakeholder groups. To provide a theoretical answer to the purpose, we developed a theoretical framework in the form of a table that addresses prominent driving forces and success factors in existing theory, related to stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city. The driving forces are divided on a macro and micro level. The sequence of the factors does not depict any sort of ranking among them. After the theoretical framework is presented, the driving forces and success factors are summarized in a shorter description.

Table 1 Theoretical framework: Driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city

Driving forces	
<i>Macro level</i>	
Complex social problems	Austin, 2000; Trist, 1983; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Waddock, 1991; Woodland & Hutton, 2012
Changed role of government	Austin, 2000; Crane & Matten, 2010; Newell, 2000
Changed role of business	Rodgers, 2000; Selsky & Parker, 2005
Development in ICT	Bray, 2000

Micro level	
Combine resources and strengths	Bendell, 2000; Boyle et al., 2013
Access to financial resources	Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Weisbrod, 1997
Access to knowledge and expertise	Bendell, 2000; Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Waddell, 2000
Access to new markets	Crane & Matten, 2010; Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Waddell, 2000
Innovation	Crane & Matten, 2010; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Waddell, 2000; Woodland & Hutton, 2012
Gain legitimacy and credibility	Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Rodgers, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Improve image	Bendell, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Success factors	
People	Austin, 2000; Tholke, 2003; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Choice of subject	Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Shared purpose	Austin, 2000; Woodland & Hutton, 2012
Goals	McKinsey&Company, 2013; Tholke, 2003; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Shared expectations	Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011
Respect	Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Communication	Andersson et al., 2013; Austin, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007
Trust	Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000; Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007; Vangen & Huxham, 2003
Mutual interest, commitment, and action	Austin 2000; Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000; Waddock, 1991; Wood & Gray, 1991
Win-win situation	Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011; Wood & Gray, 1991

2.5.2 Summary of theoretical framework

2.5.2.1 Driving forces

2.5.2.1.1 Macro level

Complex social problems

Social problems facing cities today are highly complex. Such problems can include matters like poverty, inadequate education, homelessness, and unemployment. As social equity and quality of life are primary components of sustainable development, cities must find ways to deal with these social problems effectively. Collaborative efforts are required to manage such problems successfully, as resources and abilities from various stakeholders in the city are needed. Collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs thus occurs in an attempt to handle such complex social problems.

Changed role of government

The role of government has changed. The local government is no longer seen as the primary problem solver of the complex issues that cities face today, or as the primary creator of sustainable initiatives and practices. Functions that traditionally have been associated with local government are today shared with businesses and NGOs operating in the city. Business and NGOs take on increased responsibilities regarding economic, social, and environmental issues, which has led to increased collaboration both within and between sectors. Also, the local government's ability to regulate is reduced, which suggests that collaboration with private actors is necessary.

Changed role of business

The role of business has changed. Society's expectations on businesses, that either operate in the city or have an impact on the city, have increased. Society is expecting businesses to take responsibility for their operations, and to consider their wider impacts of their activities on the city and the environment. As businesses face these greater demands for accountability, many do take on more responsibility and engage in stakeholder collaboration to increase their positive contribution to the city. For example, a business can collaborate with the local government to make their operations become more environmentally friendly. The local government can help the business by providing it with knowledge and resources, while at the same time benefit from having advance environmentally friendly business activity in the city.

Development in ICT

The development in ICT has made information easy accessible to almost everyone, which has changed the balance of power among local government, business, and NGOs. The availability of information places greater demands on transparency, and it becomes increasingly difficult for organizations to cover up irresponsible practices and actions. High availability of information facilitates NGOs' jobs as advocates, and ICT further facilitates effective collaboration between NGOs. This is also a driving force for the local government and business to work together with NGOs in the city, as the stakeholder group has become increasingly powerful.

2.5.2.1.2 Micro level

Combine resources and strengths

As individual stakeholder groups cannot handle the complex challenges and problems that cities face today, such as waste generation and air pollution, they must combine their resources and strengths through collaboration. Local government, business, and NGOs all have different resources and strengths, which represent their role in the city. To improve sustainable development in the city, the stakeholder groups must combine their individual abilities.

Access to financial resources

Financial resources are needed to carry out many of those initiatives and activities that contribute to a city's sustainable development. Gaining access to funding therefore represents a driving force of collaborating with other stakeholders. This holds especially true for NGOs, which often face limited financial resources. By collaborating with the local government or business, NGOs can gain funding and thus improve their opportunity to achieve their individual objectives, as well as the shared goals within the collaborative arrangement.

Access to knowledge and expertise

Different stakeholders have diverse knowledge and expertise depending on which area their main focus is on. While the local government has knowledge and expertise about regulation and political processes in the city, business has economic and technical knowledge and expertise, and NGOs have their own area of expertise that reflects their cause. Such diverse

and diffused knowledge and expertise is needed to develop sustainable initiatives and processes in the city, which drives stakeholder collaboration.

Access to new markets

A collaborative arrangement can provide one or more of the stakeholders involved with access to new markets. In order for a city to become sustainable, it needs to exist a sufficiently large market for sustainable products and services. If various stakeholders collaborate, they have a greater likelihood to create and expand such a market. For example, a business that provides ready cooked meals that is interested in selling more green products can collaborate with an NGO that promotes green eating. The NGO can by educating consumers about the benefits of green eating, create an interest and market for buying green ready cooked meals. Through the collaborative arrangement, the business benefits by expanding its market, the NGO by promoting its cause, and the city by increasing its green food consumption. The NGO can also help the business to find new markets through its local knowledge about consumers' needs.

Innovation

Innovation is often needed for a city to develop new processes and solutions that advance sustainable development. Even though many sustainable processes and solutions do exist in cities, there is a constant need of creating more effective and economically viable solutions, for which innovation generally is a requirement. Through stakeholder collaboration, different views and perspectives are combined, which can generate new and creative ideas that can lead to valuable improvements in the city's sustainable development work.

Gain legitimacy and credibility

For a city striving for sustainable development, it is vital that the city as a whole and the stakeholders involved in the development work have high legitimacy and credibility. Sustainable and green initiatives can be used as mere means to promote cities and organizations, and thus it becomes crucial that the initiator of the initiative is legitimate and credible. For an individual stakeholder, collaboration with legitimate and credible stakeholders can improve one's own legitimacy and credibility. Further, a sustainable effort initiated by multiple stakeholders in the city is more likely to be considered as credible. In this context, we see legitimacy and credibility to be interrelated, and therefore the factors are presented as one driving force.

Improve image

Improved image as a result of collaboration is a driving force most valid for businesses. By joining forces with a trusted local government to improve sustainable development, the image of the business can be improved among the city's residents. In the same way, by collaborating with a credible NGO, the business can strengthen its reputation. Implementing sustainable and green practices often improves the image of a business, and doing this together with another recognized stakeholder in the city could strengthen the image further.

2.5.2.2 Success factors*People*

It is critical to choose the right people to enter a collaborative arrangement with. When seeking to collaborate with stakeholders in the city, one should carefully consider the qualities and abilities that are preferred to be possessed by the collaborating stakeholder. For example, if the collaboration regards making the city's public bus service more environmentally friendly, it may be crucial that all involved possess some experience in bus technology.

Choice of subject

The stakeholders involved in a collaborative arrangement must carefully choose what subject to address in the collaboration. While collaboration is a requirement for sustainable development in a city, the city will not experience success in the area if the stakeholders do not choose a suitable subject to address when collaborating. The subject should be appropriate given the involved stakeholders' individual missions, and reflect their combined abilities. For example, an NGO solely working with planting trees within the city is more likely to experience successful collaboration if the subject regards green city areas, than if it would address the city's energy use.

Shared purpose

By establishing a shared purpose in a collaborative arrangement, it is more likely that the collaboration is successful. Without such a shared purpose, the stakeholders may be driven by divergent purposes that may end up in conflict. A shared purpose that the involved stakeholders are guided by when they make decisions and act will significantly ease the collaboration. In a city striving for sustainable development, the shared purpose integral in all collaborative arrangements should preferably address some area of the city's sustainable development. More specific aims should be formulated in clear goals.

Goals

Clear goals are an important element of successful collaboration. By formulating goals that all stakeholders involved in the collaboration understand and agree upon, the work and the evaluation of the work is more likely to be efficient. The goals should preferably be measurable, as it provides clear measurement of progress. Sustainable development is in large part a soft aim, which makes the establishment of clear goals at a smaller scale even more important. In a collaborative arrangement between local government and a business providing the city's public buses, the goal could be to reduce the emission of the buses with 25 % by year X. If the goal is not reached by year X, it becomes apparent that the collaboration has been less successful in this area.

Respect

It is essential that stakeholders collaborating in a city respect each other, both in the current collaborative arrangement and for future successful collaboration. Respect is about recognizing and valuing the other stakeholders' abilities and knowledge, and act accordingly. All involved in collaboration should listen and take everyone's thoughts and ideas into consideration. Respect can be earned as well as lost over time, why it is important that stakeholders act in a way that improves the respect others have for them.

Communication

Good communication is vital for successful collaboration. As sustainable development is a debated concept that individuals associate with different meanings, good communication among the city's stakeholders is essential. Through good communication, unnecessary misunderstandings and conflicts can be avoided. The work will be more effective and the relationship among the stakeholders will most likely be improved. Relevant information should be transparent and available for all stakeholders involved, as well as be well understood by all.

Shared expectations

For successful collaboration, shared expectations among the stakeholders are essential. By having shared expectations, the work becomes easier as the stakeholders know not only what others expect from them, but also what they can expect from others involved in the collaboration.

Trust

Trust is an essential element for successful collaboration in a sustainable city. The city's stakeholders have different interests related to their individual missions. This puts high demand on trust, as the collaborating stakeholders must believe that all involved will contribute to the collaboration and not solely act in self-interest. In a sustainable city, the stakeholders need to engage in collaboration multiple times. If there is lack of trust in the beginning of a collaborative arrangement, the likelihood that the same stakeholders will experience future successful collaboration is significantly reduced, and collaboration will eventually decline. Thus, trust among the city's stakeholders is vital for the future sustainable development of the city.

Mutual interest, commitment, and action

It is important that there exist mutual interest, commitment, and action among the collaborating stakeholders from the start of a collaborative arrangement. Sustainable development is not an easy aim, and the city will not experience success in the area without sufficient commitment from everyone involved. Sustainable development requires long-term thinking and consideration of future generations, which requires that the city's stakeholders are truly committed and act accordingly in collaborative arrangements.

Win-win situation

A win-win situation that involves benefits to all stakeholders involved in a collaborative arrangement is an important element of successful collaboration. In a sustainable city, the benefits are what create incentives for the stakeholders to collaborate, and these should be equally distributed among them. It is important that all stakeholders feel that the collaboration is fair, in order for them to be willing to keep collaborate in the future.

2.5.3 Contribution of theoretical framework

Given the assumption that stakeholder collaboration is a requirement for a city to advance sustainable development, it is important to understand the driving forces of collaboration as these motivate stakeholders to engage in collaborative arrangements. An understanding of the driving forces can also be helpful to a city that attempts to become more sustainable, and is in need of increased stakeholder collaboration. It is also important to know and understand the success factors that lead to successful collaboration. Although all collaborative arrangements

are different and face various contextual conditions, some important elements can be identified that apply to most collaborations. By knowing which these are, stakeholders involved in collaborative arrangements may experience a higher level of success.

3. Method

In this chapter, the research design and approach of the study will be presented. The basis for selection of case and respondents will be explained, as well as the method for data collection. The choice of analysis method is also included. A reliability and validity discussion concludes the chapter.

3.1 Research approach

The purpose of this thesis is to increase the understanding of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. This includes identification of prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements. In order to achieve the purpose, the following research approach has been used:

1. The first step was to provide a theoretical answer to the purpose. Therefore, a theoretical framework based on theories relevant to the study was developed.
2. The second step was to supplement the theoretical framework with the empirical findings. An extended framework was developed through analysis, in an attempt to provide a more informed answer to the purpose, and to advance existing theory.

3.2 Qualitative case study

Two broad research methods are presented in the literature, namely the qualitative and the quantitative method (e.g. Backman, 2008; Bryman & Bell, 2013). As our purpose involves great complexity, we chose to conduct a qualitative case study. We found it difficult, as well as impractical to formulate clear-cut hypotheses given our purpose, and thus a quantitative method was found unsuitable. We possessed limited initial knowledge about the subject, which further complicated a possible hypotheses formulation. The qualitative method often involves the terms meaning, context, and process, which all relate to our study. Meaning concerns a focus on the interpretations and perceptions of individuals, context regards the study within a natural environment, and process relates to the process oriented method of a qualitative study (Backman, 2008). We proceeded from the views of the study objects and attempted to depict their perspectives. We also wanted to include contextual conditions in the study, as we believed it to influence the views of the study objects. Moreover, we studied a real environment and participants within it, which contributed to the complexity and diversity of the study (Yin, 2011).

3.2.1 Ontological position of constructivism

The qualitative method involves an ontological position of constructivism. It is based on the view that the social reality is constructed by interacting social actors, and that it is under constant change (Bryman & Bell, 2013). The researcher seeks to learn more about how the participants observe and interpret their surroundings, and a subjective perspective is thus adopted (Backman, 2008). This is in contrast to the ontological position based on objectivism, adopted by quantitative methods, which assumes that the social reality is objective and independent of social actors (Bryman & Bell, 2013). The research is then focused on measuring and explaining a fixed reality (Backman, 2008). We found a position of constructivism to be suitable to achieve our purpose, as focus was on the study objects and their interpretations. The results of the observations depended upon how the study objects understood their reality.

3.2.2 Inductive and deductive reasoning

The qualitative method is often conducted inductively, but can also follow a deductive approach (Yin, 2011). The focus of the qualitative method is on generation of theory, which is assumed to be the result of empirical data. On the contrary, the quantitative method is usually related to deductive reasoning, where focus is on testing theory. The two approaches are not straightforward, and should be considered as general orientations rather than distinct strategies (Bryman & Bell, 2013). In our study, we used a combination of deductive and inductive reasoning. The study proceeded from expectations derived from existing theory, and thereafter empirical data was collected. As we examined the extent to which the theoretical expectations corresponded with reality, deductive reasoning was used. The inductive reasoning was comprised of the supplementation of the theoretical framework through the use of empirical data. Thus, we attempted to advance and fill gaps in existing theory. Although we proceeded from expectations derived from theory, we were cautious about making assumptions in advance, as we did not want to let such assumptions significantly affect the results of the study. We attempted to start our research rather open minded, because we wanted our purpose as well as the empirical findings to guide us.

3.2.3 Selection of case

The challenge when making a case selection is to know which case or cases to study, and the appropriate number of these (Yin, 2011). When conducting a case study, it is common to

make a thorough and detailed study of one case (Bryman & Bell, 2013). The reason for only studying one case could for example be that the selected case demonstrates characteristics that are typical with respect to the purpose of the study (Yin, 2011). Our selected case is the city San Francisco. San Francisco is prominent in its sustainable development efforts and is a frequently mentioned example in research and studies addressing sustainable urban development (e.g. Joss, Tomozeiu & Cowley, 2011; Lee, Phaal & Lee, 2013; Lee, Hancock & Hu, in press; McKinsey&Company, 2013; PWC, 2012; Roseland, 2000). In a global study conducted by PWC (2012) on cities' social and economic performance, San Francisco is ranked as number two of the 27 cities included within the category that concerns sustainability and the natural environment. In the Green City Index by Siemens, that ranks environmental sustainability of cities worldwide, San Francisco is ranked as the number one city in North America. One additional argument for selecting San Francisco is that problems originating from urbanization are highly present in the US. Moreover, business and NGOs are strong initiators of sustainable efforts in the US, and the city of San Francisco is prominent in partnering with the private sector on environmental initiatives (Siemens AG, 2012). The reason for not including an additional case was that the marginal utility was considered too low, compared to the effort and resources required. The case selected was further considered sufficient for achieving the purpose.

3.3 Data collection

3.3.1 Secondary data

We started the study by collecting secondary data about San Francisco. This was done in an attempt to get an initial understanding of the city and its sustainable development work. Statistical data was derived from American census bureaus, and information regarding the city's sustainable development work from departments of the local government. The secondary data was used in the thesis in order to give the reader an initial understanding of the case, which we believe will ease the further reading and understanding of empirical findings and analysis.

3.3.2 Qualitative interviews in San Francisco

After we had conducted secondary research about San Francisco and developed a theoretical framework, we wanted to examine whether the secondary data depicted reality, and collect empirical data on site. Therefore, we visited San Francisco between the 14th and 29th of March

2014. By visiting the city, we were able to get a better understanding of the case and its contextual conditions. Also, we developed an understanding of how well sustainable development efforts and initiatives were implemented in the city. While there, we conducted personal interviews with selected individuals.

Conducting interviews is the most common method for data collection in a qualitative study, in large part due to the flexibility the method offers. Given the complexity of our subject, we chose to conduct qualitative interviews. The two main forms of qualitative interviews are unstructured and semi-structured interviews. While the interviewer during an unstructured interview might only use relaxed notes and the respondent can associate freely, a semi-structured interview involves a list of specific themes that should be addressed during the interview (Bryman & Bell, 2013). We chose to perform semi-structured interviews, as we found the interview type to be most appropriate given our purpose. We intended to cover some specific topics, as well as leave room for the respondents' own opinions and perspectives during the interviews. A further motive to use semi-structured interviews is to ensure a certain degree of comparability. Although our aim with the study was not to compare the interviews with each other, we needed to make sure that some degree of comparability between the interviews was possible in order to facilitate analysis. Due to the fact that we were two researchers conducting the interviews, and that the study involved multiple respondents, semi-structured interviews was the preferred method considering the need of comparability (Bryman & Bell, 2013).

3.3.2.1 Selection of respondents

A complex subject, as that of this thesis, can be studied through a smaller number of respondents, which validates our number of 23 respondents. The composition of the group should be considered, as a great number of participants is not what makes a study more credible. It is therefore important to involve participants who can provide divergent and inconsistent views on a subject (Yin, 2011). The sustainable development of a city is of interest to multiple stakeholders who live in, operate in, or are in some way connected to the city. Therefore, we attempted to include a wide range of perspectives in the study. By including individuals working within different sectors, we argue that the study became more comprehensive and multifaceted. Our group of participants includes individuals from the local government of San Francisco, as well as businesses and NGOs operating in the city. The organizations that these individuals represent all address sustainable development in some

way, and we believed that they were engaged in collaborations with other stakeholders in the city to address sustainable development. We argue that individuals working within these sectors can provide us with insights and different perspectives on stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco.

3.3.2.2 Sampling

We began by reaching out to individuals from the local government, and businesses and NGOs present in San Francisco. This resulted in interviews with 23 individuals, which ultimately represented those individuals who were available to us, also referred to as convenience sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2013). Despite some clear limitations of convenience sampling, such as an unknown level of incompleteness and possible distortion (Yin, 2011), we believed the benefits of using this sampling technique to outweigh the drawbacks. As we considered it useful to include a variety of perspectives in the study, we did not want to exclude any individual willing to take part in it. Further, the difficulties arising from geographical distance between Lund and San Francisco, alongside limited resources and issues of accessibility to relevant respondents, strengthened the arguments for using convenience sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2013). Even though the results of the study become difficult to generalize when using convenience sampling, we agree upon the argument presented by Bryman and Bell (2013) for using the sampling technique, namely that a deeper study do not require a sample representative of a larger population. We further believe that our results can serve as a foundation for future research, which is an additional argument for the usefulness of convenience sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2013).

Our first contact with potential study objects resulted in a small use of snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is a method to get in contact with additional study objects through the use of existing participants (Bryman & Bell, 2013). During e-mail conversations with two of the respondents, we were referred to three other individuals that were believed to be of interest to us. Although snowball sampling should not be used out of convenience reasons, a motivated reason for its use is when the recommended individuals may possess valuable knowledge for the study (Yin, 2011). As we found the new contacts useful for our study, they were included in our final group of respondents. The final group of respondents is presented in Appendix 1.

3.3.2.3 Interview procedure

In this study, semi-structured personal interviews with 23 individuals in San Francisco were conducted. The majority of the interviews took place at the respondent's office, and a few took place in public area locations. The majority of the interviews took approximately 50 minutes, while a few were conducted under less time, due to limited time of the respondent.

The topics and questions covered during the interviews proceeded from the theoretical framework. We attempted to formulate relatively open questions, in order to let the respondents put emphasis on what they considered to be important. We wanted to facilitate more deep discussions on topics being emphasized by the respondents, and allow for follow-up questions. A flexible interview guide was designed (Appendix 2), that served as a basis for the interviews. We wanted our interview guide to serve as a mean for remembering the themes that we wanted to address in the interviews. It was not supposed to limit us, and we were free to depart from the formulated questions. As the interview guide proceeded from the theoretical framework, the questions and topics were somewhat affected by the theoretical expectations. Furthermore, the interview guide covered some areas that were not of specific interest to us, but that were of interest to the research program SuS. However, even though not directly included in the thesis, it allowed for us to gain a deeper understanding of sustainable cities and San Francisco in particular. Not all questions were directly addressed in every interview. The respondents possessed knowledge and expertise within different areas, and had experience from different fields. Therefore, we found it important to let the interviews pursue in the directions that were most relevant given the individual respondent. Depending on the position and background of the respondent, the interviews had different preconditions, which we attempted to reflect in the questions asked. The interviews were recorded, in order to facilitate analysis and capture expressions made by the respondents. A common concern regarding recording of interviews is the reaction of the respondent, as there exists a risk for creating cautiousness and discomfort (Bryman & Bell, 2013). We did not consider this risk to be a major issue, as we believed that the topics that were addressed in the interviews were relatively insensitive, and the questions allowed the respondent to answer fairly freely. The information obtained from the interviews may be somewhat distorted, as organizations generally want to emphasize the positive aspects of their work, while avoiding negative aspects and potential problems. However, as we conducted interviews with individuals from different sectors, as well as with multiple individuals within the same sector, the risk of the compiled empirical data being distorted was reduced. Moreover, as we

attempted to adopt a subjective perspective and were interested in the interpretations of the participants, we did not consider this to be a major issue.

3.4 Method for presentation of empirical findings

In order to compile and present the empirical findings, we listened to the recordings and reviewed our written notes from the interviews. We also transcribed sporadically to allow for quotations. Through this, we were able to capture key points made by the respondents, and provide the reader with exact vocabulary. We chose not to transcribe the interviews in their entirety, as it was considered too extensive given the rich amount of empirical data. Furthermore, we did not consider transcription to necessarily improve the presentation of the empirical findings or the analysis.

The presentation of the empirical findings is based on the theoretical framework and prominent themes that were addressed during the interviews. Although focus is on prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration, less prominent are also mentioned. The empirical findings are presented using a combination of quotes and rendering of responses. We formulated categories based on the prominent themes, and connected the responses to these categories. Further, we attempted to analyze underlying explanations of driving forces and success factors of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco. This means that the presentation of the empirical findings includes analytical elements. This method facilitated the presentation of the views of the respondents, and enhanced our ability to depict their reasoning. Moreover, it facilitated our ability to identify the characteristic features of the study. Also, the method allowed us to conduct an analysis where it was possible to detect similarities, as well as dissimilarities between theory and empirical data. A risk to be considered is that the information obtained from the interviews might be interpreted according to the theoretical expectations, rather than the actual results. As we were interested in studying the level of congruence between theory and the empirical data, and not in obtaining support for existing theory, we did not find the risk to be a major issue. The information obtained from the interviews was not presented in its entirety, as we considered such a presentation to be too exhaustive for the reader. Neither did we consider such a presentation to add any significant advantages to the study. Further, it would reduce the ability to relate different responses to each other. For the same reason, we chose not to separate the empirical findings according to the individual respondents and their responses.

3.5 Method for analysis

In the analysis, the empirical findings were related to the theoretical framework in an attempt to link the theoretical expectations to the empirical data. We were interested in studying the level of agreement between theory and empirical data, and to extend the theoretical framework using the empirical findings. By relating the empirical findings with theory, we were able to analyze the level of agreement, and to discover potential similarities and dissimilarities between theory and the empirical findings. Aspects that are not emphasized by theory, but that are prominent in the empirical findings, were highlighted in order to develop theory. These aspects were added to the theoretical framework, and included in the extended framework where the theoretical expectations were supplemented using the empirical data. Likewise, aspects that are addressed as important by theory, but that were not emphasized in the empirical findings, were highlighted and discussed further to examine the reason for this.

3.6 Reliability and validity

Reliability regards if the results of a study will be the same if the study would be conducted again, or if the results are affected by random conditions. When conducting a qualitative study, the term should be adjusted to put less emphasis on matters that regards measurements (Bryman & Bell, 2013). The reliability of this study is increased through the use of triangulation. In the study, we used secondary data, observations, and interviews as data sources. This enabled us to compare data from different sources, which strengthens the reliability of the study. When we encountered opposing views during the interviews, we attempted to investigate this further through follow-up questions that allowed for cross-checking. Further, respondent validation was used during the interviews, as we attempted to ensure that our interpretations agreed with the views of the respondents. This was made through asking if our interpretations were correct. Being a part of the research program SuS, we were engaged in seminars during the spring semester of 2014 with other students also involved in SuS. The intention of the seminars was for the groups involved to discuss ideas, as well as exchange information that could be of relevance for other groups' research. The seminars were rewarding, as they enabled us to compare our theoretical and empirical findings to those of other groups, and facilitated ongoing feedback from the students. As we were two researchers conducting the study, we have been two individuals involved in the comprehension and interpretation of theory and, more importantly, the interpretation of empirical data, accounts and statements. This increased the inter-reliability of the study. Also,

as two persons conducted the interviews, and because the interviews were recorded, the reliability of this study is increased. Further, by recording the interviews we have been able to verify the responses.

Glaser (1978) argues that there are three aspects of validity. The first aspect concerns the final framework's logic and integration. We attempted to develop our framework in a way that made it logical. This was done by presenting the driving forces before the success factors, as the driving forces depict the emergence of collaboration, while the success factors explain how such collaboration is planned and executed. Also, we attempted to make the sequence of the driving forces and success factors logical to the reader. The second aspect concerns our framework's ability, in comparison to others, to explain driving forces and success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city. As it exists a limited amount of theory regarding stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city, it is difficult to compare our framework to others, with the purpose to improve our framework's relative ability to explain. When developing our framework, we have used both theory and empirical data, and conducted extensive analysis. The analysis identifies underlying reasons and explanations to the prominence of the elements, which strengthens its ability to explain stakeholder collaboration. Through the analysis between theory and the empirical findings, we identified additional driving forces and success factors that are not emphasized by existing theory. The third aspect of validity involves the relevance of the framework. We conducted an extensive literature review, and through this gained a deeper understanding within the theoretical areas used in the study. The depth of the empirical data was increased, as we interviewed a number of individuals from different sectors with different knowledge and experience. Also, we used both deductive and inductive reasoning. We compared the theoretical expectations with the empirical findings, and through this were able to gain support of existing theory and develop theory.

4. Empirical findings

In this chapter, the empirical findings of the study are presented. The empirical data consists of interviews conducted in San Francisco with 23 individuals. For more information about the respondents, see Appendix 1. The chapter begins with a brief presentation of San Francisco and stakeholder groups in the city. The chapter continues by presenting driving forces and success factors of collaboration between local government, business, and NGOs in San Francisco. We have formulated categories for presentation of the empirical findings, and related the responses to these categories. Also, we have attempted to analyze underlying explanations of the driving forces and success factors of collaboration in San Francisco. Because of this, the chapter includes analytical elements.

4.1 San Francisco

San Francisco is located on the west coast of the US, in California. The city is part of the Bay Area, which is the region surrounding San Francisco. The Bay Area consists of nine counties, and is home to over seven million residents (Bay Area Census, n.d.). San Francisco has approximately 825 000 residents and encompasses a land area of nearly 47 square miles. This gives the city a density of just over 17 000 residents per square mile. The population is ethnically diverse, and the residents are mainly of European, Asian, and Hispanic or Latino origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). San Francisco is one of the leading financial hubs in the US. Tourism, as well as the high tech industry in the Bay Area also drives the local economy (Siemens AG, 2011).

Some of the challenges resulting from climate change that San Francisco and the Bay Area face are sea level rise and extreme heat events. This in turn threatens the water and energy supply, the transportation infrastructure, and the regional ecosystems. San Francisco has established a number of goals and policies to address these challenges, and to advance sustainable development in the city. The city attempts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve quality of life through the implementation of policies and programs in the following five areas: energy use in buildings, transportation, zero waste, urban forest, and municipal operations. To mention some examples of the main policies and goals, one is to source 100 % of residential buildings and 80 % of commercial electricity consumption from renewable energy sources. Also, the local government launched the San Francisco's Green Building Ordinance to ensure that all buildings are designed and built to make efficient use of

energy, water, and material resources, provide safe indoor environments, and minimize the negative impacts on the local environment. The city also tries to reduce the travel by automobiles, by improving its public transportation system and bike lanes, and has set the goal to make 50 % of all trips to non-automobile trips by 2017. Furthermore, San Francisco has the goal of zero waste to landfills by 2020 through increased recycling and composting. In 2009, San Francisco, as the first city in the US, initiated mandatory recycling and composting for all residents and everyone who operate in the city to support the goal of zero waste. Also, the city has banned single use plastic bags in all retail stores. The net result of these initiatives among others was by 2010 a total reduction in GHG emissions of 14.5 % below 1990 levels. This occurred during a time period when the city experienced growth in its economy as well as population (San Francisco Department of the Environment, 2013). San Francisco is considered a pioneer in collaborating with the private sector on sustainable development initiatives, which improves the potential of the city to meet its environmental goals (Siemens AG, 2011).

4.1.1 Stakeholder groups in San Francisco

The local government, business, and NGOs are stakeholder groups that are highly involved in the sustainable development work of San Francisco. Many respondents also mention that the residents are an important and active stakeholder group in the city. As an example, residents attend local community meetings, which tend to be highly vocal. As explained below, we consider the residents of San Francisco to be represented by the three stakeholder groups: local government, business, and NGOs, combined. The residents are represented by the local government as they elect representatives of the local government. It is explained to us that the residents elect representatives whose decisions they believe they can influence. San Francisco is according to some respondents subject to social unrest, which has resulted in the residents pushing the local government to advance social matters, such as solving the problem of the city's expensive housing. Also, the city's workforce is an important stakeholder group that has the ability to influence and shape their employers in sustainable development areas. A big part of the workforce in San Francisco wants their offices to be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-certified, and to provide bike parking. To satisfy their employees, and to attract a skilled workforce, the employers tend to listen to these requests. This makes business partly representative of the interests of the people. It is further pointed out that the NGOs speak for the people, who gain a stronger voice through NGOs.

4.1.1.1 Roles of stakeholder groups in San Francisco

The local government plays a vital role in the sustainable development work of San Francisco, as it has power to intervene and make decisions that can make significant impacts. Many political careers have begun in San Francisco. A part of launching these careers regards the implementation of aggressive policies, as a way to make one's mark. This has led to a number of policies originating from San Francisco, which subsequently have spread nationally. For example, a great part of the regulation that concerns no smoking in restaurants and bars can be traced back to the University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine. Another example is the carbon tax on business, which was initiated in San Francisco as the first city in the US. Further, regulations made by the local government have had major effects on the city. To mention a few of these, the San Francisco's Green Buildings Ordinance requires that all buildings meet certain LEED certifications. This has led to the highest per capita density of LEED-certified square footage in the US. The ban of single-use plastic bags in retail stores is another example of regulation initiated by the local government, which has resulted in a decrease of 5 million plastic bags used by consumers per month in the city (San Francisco Department of the Environment, 2013). Some respondents believe that unless the people are regulated to do certain things, for example compost, they will not do it. This means that the regulating role of the local government is crucial to advance sustainable development in the city. Furthermore, the local government also has the ability to open up market space for business. Businesses in San Francisco possess a lot of power and have great resources to practice sustainable development. Because a lot of unsustainable practices originate from the business sector, it is vital that businesses are committed to and engaged in the city's sustainable development work. According to some respondents, the business sector is a very active and engaged stakeholder group. Many businesses that operate in San Francisco have some sort of sustainability director, which implies that these businesses are committed to sustainable development. Also, the business sector in San Francisco is very aware of the political environment. It is pointed out that business interests control politics, which makes business and the local government of San Francisco strongly interrelated. However, a few respondents point out that business will only lead the way if profit is present. This statement implies that profit has a higher priority than sustainable development, which is understandable, as business must make profit to continue to operate. Nevertheless, this becomes a problem if sustainable development initiatives do not also imply an opportunity for businesses to gain profit. It is therefore vital that such initiatives are seen as business opportunities. It exists many NGOs in San Francisco that advocate for various causes. The

NGOs represent an active stakeholder group that plays an important role in spreading their message. They also have a consulting role as they can provide a better picture of an issue through education. The NGOs are often in a leadership position as advocates and visionaries and the stakeholder group is generally considered as important to include in discussions as they can contribute with good ideas. It was brought to our attention that even though these three stakeholder groups ideally should be equally important, power can make some stakeholder group more important in certain issues. If one stakeholder group is politically or economically stronger than another, it can make itself more visible and powerful in a particular issue.

4.2 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco

4.2.1 Macro level

Complex economic, social, and environmental problems

Complex social problems, alongside economic and environmental issues, are present in San Francisco. For example, a number of respondents point out that housing and homelessness are great social issues in the city. Regarding housing, not only are there not enough residences in San Francisco, but also, people cannot afford the present housing opportunities. Paula Luu, who is the founder of Coming Home Goods, a business that up cycles post-consumer textiles into home furnishings and provide employment for formerly incarcerated, elaborates on the housing problem. Paula Luu states that people who have been living in San Francisco for decades are now talking about selling their homes. This is because they cannot afford the 80 000 dollars for mandatory retro fitting of their homes that is a part of San Francisco becoming a sustainable city.

“I think housing is one of the biggest class dividers here... it’s just kind of an insane market...” (Paula Luu)

Wells Lawson who is the Senior Project Manager at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure also talks about the housing problem and states that,

“We do not have the centralized control of housing... the market is allowed to do whatever...” (Wells Lawson)

Wells Lawson further elaborates on the reasons behind the housing problems in San Francisco.

“In San Francisco... have to spend more than 30 % [of income] just to live in the city because we are constrained... there is not a lot of land, and we

are not building enough housing... as a result, there's scarcity, and the scarcity drives high land values, and as result it makes it [San Francisco] too expensive to live in. (Wells Lawson)

From an economic perspective, several respondents mention unsustainable areas. As an example, Paula Luu explains that San Francisco is not very economically sustainable by stating that,

"The higher income people are getting more wealthy, and there is less and less opportunities and funding plats for lower income families to even just kind of make ends meet..." (Paula Luu)

This is consistent with the view of the President and CEO of the Presidio Graduate School, William Shutkin. Presidio Graduate School is a sustainability graduate school with the mission to educate students on how to create a more sustainable world.

"It's a ridiculously expensive city, and as green and sustainable as San Francisco likes to think it is, it's not very affordable and therefore not particular equitable." (William Shutkin)

Seen from the environmental side, some respondents believe that the city is doing well, while some respondents mention that there needs to be improvement.

"Environmentally, I think San Francisco is doing really well, in terms of sustainability, I think better than anyone else probably." (Ethan Warsh)

Michelle Myers, who is San Francisco Bay Chapter Director at the Sierra Club, an organization that promotes clean and renewable energy and plans for more sustainable communities throughout the Bay Area, states that there is not enough usage of renewable energy. Some respondents also mention that the residents are too automobile reliant. One reason for being over dependent on the automobile is the insufficient public transportation system that is frequently mentioned as one of the city's greatest problems in terms of sustainable development.

An example of a project that is intended to address economic, social, and environmental problems in San Francisco is the redevelopment project Hunters Point Shipyard. The project area is an old navy base with 1940s buildings, and the surrounding area is characterized by low income, high criminality, and high unemployment. A third of the project's planned

residences is supposed to be affordable housing. The project is made possible through a public private partnership which Wells Lawson explains as,

“...the developer goes out and builds it, we recoup a lot of that value and we reimburse the developer for a portion of their cost and that is the public private partnership that makes up this whole thing that makes it all work.”

(Wells Lawson)

There seems to be an agreement among the respondents that for sustainable development in San Francisco, collaboration between organizations and across sectors must be present. Collaboration is needed in order to solve the complex social, economic, and environmental problems in the city.

“For a truly sustainable city, you have to have complete collaboration.”

(Scott Mandeville)

“With soft problems you have to have the stakeholder collaboration to make it work, because it’s not going to be sustainable otherwise.” (Chris Geiger)

“With regards to sustainability, that collaboration is key because if it’s just one group of people that’s figuring out the future for the whole world and leaving out a whole other group, then it’s actually not sustainable because they’ve left a whole other group of people out.” (Beth Schechter)

“You can’t do it by yourself, I mean it’s impossible to be a sustainable city, to be a sustainable organization, to be a sustainable individual, if you don’t partner with something or someone... You have to collaborate in order to be a sustainable society...” (Maggie Ostdahl)

Changed role of government

Anna Frankel works as Green Business Specialist for the San Francisco Green Business Program at San Francisco Department of the Environment (SF Environment). Anna Frankel explains that the role of government has changed. She notes that it has changed in the sense that people and businesses want more, and expect more from the local government. She explains this as,

“...making sure that people aren’t dumping hazards waste into the water... I think they want government to be strong there honestly... businesses I think wants supportive legislation for things that will help them...” (Anna Frankel)

The people of San Francisco are highly informed in the sustainability field, and are greatly engaged in the city's sustainable development. Therefore, the people place high demands on the local government. Anna Frankel points out that although the local government wants to meet the increased expectations, it is hard to move at the pace that is needed, as work within government takes time. Wells Lawson further explains that government used to be considered as looking out for the public good. However, this role has been undermined, because of increased privatization of various functions. Paula Luu states that the role of government within the area of sustainability has changed and points out the following,

“Government is only going to do what you ask them to do, and sometimes they won't even do it if you ask.” (Paula Luu)

This statement implicates that the people of San Francisco have the ability to affect governmental decisions. However, governmental work takes time as Anna Frankel explains, and the government cannot fully meet all the requests made by the people. Ann Blake works as a consultant within environmental and public health, and has years of experience from working with the local government. For example she was highly involved in developing the Precautionary Principle that was adopted by the City and County of San Francisco. She emphasizes that today, the local government of San Francisco is aware of that business and NGOs have different pieces for sustainable development that all are needed. Trust between these stakeholder groups has increased, and they are now working together.

“Government can never actually do all the thing they're needed to do, but now they are understanding that they can't, so they are bringing other people in.” (Ann Blake)

Chris Geiger, who is Municipal Toxics Reduction Coordinator for the City and County of San Francisco, also talks about trust between different stakeholder groups. He explains that over the years, the government has gained more of the citizens' trust, but points out that this is not necessarily only positive. As citizens' trust for the local government is improved, it is increasingly difficult to get citizens to attend various stakeholder meetings. On the contrary, many other respondents highlight the active community of San Francisco, and emphasize that citizens of San Francisco do take great part in the sustainable development work of the city, by for example going to stakeholder meetings that concern sustainable development projects in the city. As trust in the local government has increased, it is possible that more stakeholders see the local government as a possible partner for collaboration.

The changed role of government seems to have evolved gradually. Therefore, the changed role of government does not serve as a direct driving force of collaboration in San Francisco, but more as an explanation to why the three stakeholder groups share the responsibility of sustainable development in the city. The shared responsibility is likely to be particularly prominent in San Francisco where the community is active and constantly tries to advocate for sustainable development.

Changed role of business

Several respondents believe that the role of business in San Francisco has somewhat changed, because of consumers', employees', and society's increased expectations and awareness. As an example, Paula Luu notes that NGOs, media, and universities publish a lot of information about what businesses do, which makes consumers more informed. Further, Ann Blake argues that people expect more from business, and explains that consumers today are more aware and informed.

“Public expectations have shifted hugely, for many different reasons.” (Ann Blake)

Anna Frankel takes it one step further, and explains the changed role of business by stating that people today expect that being green is a part of doing business. The people of San Francisco assume that businesses incorporate green practices into their operations, why expectations on businesses in the city are huge.

The changed role of business can also be viewed from an employee perspective. Beth Schechter who is employed as an Education and Outreach Manager at the design and technology studio Stamen, states that employees nowadays rely on their employer to for example provide health insurance. A reason for the great reliance on employers is because of the limited social safety nets in San Francisco. Paula Luu tells us about Healthy San Francisco, which is a program designed to make health care available to uninsured employees.

“...as a restaurant goer in San Francisco, regardless of whether you're a resident or not, sometimes you will be charged like a Healthy SF tax, so there might be like a dollar or two added to your bill and what that does is it supplements health care for people [employees of the restaurant] who can't afford it.” (Paula Luu)

The traditional role of business is to make profit. This role has obviously changed in San Francisco, as employees today are dependent on their employer to provide essential services, such as health care. Greg Dalton, who is vice president at the Commonwealth Club of California, elaborates on the employee perspective in a different direction. He argues that businesses take positions on environmental issues because their employees want them to. He refers to an example about companies in Silicon Valley, outside San Francisco, that subsidize their employees who want to drive electric cars, so that they can afford to lease one. Andrew Pannell, who is operations manager of the only public biodiesel station in San Francisco, Dogpatch Biofuels, notes that today, a lot of the businesses that operate in San Francisco have a sustainable initiatives manager. This indicates that sustainable development is prioritized by many businesses. The changed role of business can be partly explained by the active community of San Francisco, where many residents take active part in the sustainable development debate. The residents' working place is one location where they successfully can try to promote for change. The changed role of business has resulted in businesses taking on more responsibility by for example engaging in collaboration with NGOs as a way to meet the increased expectations that they are exposed to.

Development in ICT

None of the respondents mention development in ICT as a driver for collaboration. Even though we asked both open-ended and closed-ended questions, ICT was not considered to be a driving force. The reason behind this is probably that development in ICT is not something that stakeholders in San Francisco witness directly, rather they expect information to be easy accessible. The Bay Area is prominent in technology development, why stakeholders see ICT as a natural part of life. Also, development in ICT is most likely to have developed gradually, why it is unlikely that the stakeholders can see the direct effect of this development. Perhaps, if our study had a longer time perspective, the results would have been different.

4.2.2 Micro level

Achieve mission

Several respondents mention that a driving force of collaboration is to achieve the mission of one's organization. As an example, at PG&E, collaboration is a way to meet the energy savings goals that are set. Also, at New Resource Bank, to achieve the mission of the bank is

described as a key driving force of collaboration. This is also consistent with what Chris Geiger tells us.

“We collaborate with others because we want to succeed.” (Chris Geiger)

Ethan Warsh and Wells Lawson explain this driving force as a need and a necessity, and make the following statement,

“Need... What’s driving us to the table with these people is because we need them.” (Ethan Warsh)

“Necessity, we have to get it done.” (Wells Lawson)

It seems as if the respondents that talk about achieving the organization’s mission as a driving force of collaboration, consider collaboration as a natural part of their work. As an example, Kay Adler and Jenise Bermudez consider collaboration to be well integrated into the New Resource Bank’s core thinking, and a key part of their strategy. Also, Andrew Pannel explains that the reason for Dogpatch Biofuels to collaborate with the local government within the Green Business Program is a way to achieve their mission. He states that although Dogpatch Biofuels did not have to become green, it was closely aligned with their goals as a business, and therefore the collaboration seemed as a natural fit.

When asking stakeholders in San Francisco about downsides of collaboration it is possible to identify a clear theme. Many respondents tell us that collaboration takes a lot of time, and can be a long process. However, it is clear that even though stakeholders in San Francisco consider collaboration to be time-consuming, they continue to collaborate. San Francisco has come a long way in stakeholder collaboration in the city, and several organizations do not necessarily reflect over the fact that they are collaborating. Therefore, it seems as if stakeholders are aware that in order to be successful and achieve the organization’s mission, they need to collaborate, even though clear obstacles exist.

Combine resources and strengths

A number of respondents mention collaborations where the involved stakeholders combine their resources and strengths. Ethan Warsh, who works as an Assistant Project Manager at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, explains that in collaborations, people come in with different perspectives and standpoints. He continues by telling us that because he does not do what other individuals and organizations do, they collaborate. This indicates that a driver of collaboration is to combine resources and strengths. Also, Alyssa Kjar who is employed as Assistant Producer at The Commonwealth Club of California mentions that

businesses in San Francisco collaborate to merge successful technologies to produce something even better. In a similar manner, Michelle Myers mentions that a field where collaboration is developing is where the Sierra Club sees emerging technologies for renewable energy. The companies that provide this technology are in turn interested in making it easier for the Sierra Club to bring more renewable energy online. If this collaborative arrangement will be realized, it will be a combination of strengths, as the Sierra Club has the strength to advocate for renewable energy and the companies have the strength in the technology field. Likewise, Maggie Ostdahl, who works as Sustainable Initiatives Manager at Aquarium of the Bay, tells us about combining strengths in the aquarium's collaborative arrangements with restaurants that want to serve sustainable seafood.

To combine resources and strengths is likely to be a driver of many kinds of collaborations. However, it seems as if San Francisco has come a long way in realizing that combining resources and strengths is a necessity for sustainable development and for organizational success. For example, it exists an NGO in the city for almost every part of sustainable development. NGOs are for example involved in the protection of trees, promotion of education, and support of unemployed. Following this, it seems as if stakeholders in San Francisco have realized that there are other organizations that are more informed within various areas that concerns sustainable development than they are. Stakeholders in the city are humble in the sense that they are aware of that the success of their operations is dependent on combining resources and strengths with other stakeholders.

Access to resources

Many of the respondents agree that because of the need for financial resources to finance sustainable development projects, funding can serve as a driving force of collaboration. This is mentioned by individuals from all three stakeholder groups. Maggie Ostdahl, who represents an NGO, says that they would not be able to do what they do without funding. Likewise, Andrew Pannel, who represents a business, believes that access to financial resources most definitely serves as a driver for collaboration. This is consistent with what Ann Blake states, but she points out that the need for financial resources depends on the question at hand. Paula Luu also believes that access to financial resources can serve as a driving force of collaboration, and tells us about her collaboration with an organization that provides her with information about how she can get access to funding. Also, from a local government perspective, Barry Hooper who is Green Building Specialist at SF Environment

explains that they are to some extent driven by funding. The opinion of Michelle Myers, who represents an NGO, stands out in this question. She argues that getting access to financial resources is not a driving force of collaboration, and that other driving forces such as access to political power are more important. Still, because NGOs, which is a stakeholder group that has limited funding, is a great part of the sustainable development work in San Francisco, access to financial resources appears to serve as a prominent driver of collaboration.

Several respondents claim that getting access to knowledge and expertise is a driving force of collaboration. Kate McGee, who is Lead Sustainability Planner at the San Francisco Planning Department, tells us that collaborating to get access to knowledge and expertise happen frequently. She further explains that because businesses in the city know the local market, the Planning Department does a lot of collaboration with businesses. Beth Schechter further explains that it is important to collaborate, because everyone has different knowledge that you would never be able to obtain on your own. Avi Asherov, who is Planning Intern at the Sustainable Development group at the Planning Department, agrees with the fact that access to knowledge and expertise can be a driving force of collaboration, and exemplifies by noting that an NGO might have valuable knowledge about the local forest. Paula Luu states that by collaborating with the local government, she receives access to people that would never have worked with her otherwise. The local government connected her to different offices in the city, as well as CEOs and relevant management people in the private sector who all provided her with knowledge in management. In a similar manner, Christina Crowell, who is employed as Senior Program Manager for Government and Community Partnerships, tells us that collaboration provides PG&E with access to knowledge.

“They [the partner organizations] know their communities better than we ever could, and they have goals they want to meet so they are very motivated which is great, they have resources we don’t have access to in terms of networks...” (Christina Crowell)

In a similar manner, Anna Frankel notes that certified businesses within the Green Business Program get access to knowledge by networking with other certified businesses. The Green Business Program helps local businesses to adopt environmental practices that are both profitable and sustainable. Certified green businesses are publicly recognized and promoted with a certificate.

“One of the things we try to think of as a benefit for our recognized businesses is that we’re able to do the connections and provide

opportunities for networking and getting together and learning about each other to be on the same green directory.” (Anna Frankel)

Anna Frankel also states that the Green Business Program gives businesses access to knowledge and expertise within different areas that is gathered in one place. To become a certified green business, organizations have to make improvements within various areas such as energy efficiency, water usage, and recycling. Knowledge in these areas is available to businesses within the program, and thus the businesses do not have to make significant efforts to gain such knowledge. It is apparent that access to knowledge and expertise often comes from networking. Stakeholders in San Francisco state that it is about getting access to other organizations and individuals that in turn possess knowledge and expertise within a specific area. Talking about the collaboration between restaurants and the Aquarium of the Bay concerning sustainable seafood, Maggie Ostdahl notes the following about getting access to knowledge.

“...we’re resources, we’re helping to you know advise them, on ways to be more sustainable and to do sustainable seafood, because as business, you know, there is a limited time and capacity that they have to do all the research, that’s been done by various seafood experts so we’re connecting them, you know” (Maggie Ostdahl)

Similarly, Paula Luu mentions that Goodwill SF and the local government benefit from their collaborative arrangement by learning.

“...I think from the perspectives of our other partners, they, especially the city and goodwill is that they recognize that they have a lot to learn from, from collaborating on these processes and I think that’s the highest value that we bring as a start-up to them.” (Paula Luu)

San Francisco is located in proximity to a number of highly respected universities, and is close to the technology leadership in the Bay Area. This contributes to creating an environment where knowledge is considered important, and where the level of education is relatively high. Just over half of the city’s population has a bachelor’s degree or higher. In comparison to California, where this percentage figure equals to one third of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014), the level of education in San Francisco is relatively high. Thus, the high degree of knowledge in the city contributes to making access to knowledge a driving force of collaboration.

Getting access to political power is by some respondents mentioned as a driving force of collaboration. Michelle Myers emphasizes this by stating the following,

“...we really can't be successful in passing something unless you know decision makers think their constituents are on the same page with it... There needs to be enough people in support of our policies that, you know that decision makers think that it's a smart political choice for them, so that usually means identifying constituents outside of Sierra Club members that also find our issues important.” (Michelle Myers)

Political power is addressed as an underlying theme in several interviews. For example, it is mentioned that organizations and stakeholder groups become more powerful in influencing the city's sustainable development work, if they have access to political power. Thus, this serves as a driving force of collaboration. This will be explained further in the section about success factors, under the success factor 'People'.

A couple of the respondents mention that collaboration can lead to positive word of mouth that improves marketing. Kay Adler, who is employed as SVP/IT Director at New Resource Bank, explains that many local NGOs know each other and talk to each other. Therefore, working together with an NGO can help New Resource Bank to get access to new customers within this stakeholder group. Jenise Bermudez, who works as Banking Officer at New Resource Bank, also talks about this, and uses the term referrals. In San Francisco, word of mouth thus appears to be a more effective way of marketing than traditional advertising when seeking to attract NGOs.

Gain legitimacy and credibility

Gaining legitimacy and credibility is according to some respondents a driving force of collaboration. Maggie Ostdahl claims that businesses want to be seen as legitimately doing the right thing. In collaborative arrangements where restaurants that want to serve sustainable seafood collaborate with the Aquarium of the Bay, Maggie Ostdahl tells us that businesses collaborate with the aquarium,

“...so they can be recognized as restaurants who are really leading the way on sustainable seafood... they can say that themselves, but it's nice to be able to have the aquariums and the nonprofit organizations that are saying yeah yeah, like we're working with them...” (Maggie Ostdahl)

Anna Frankel also gives an example of how legitimacy can serve as a driving force for businesses to collaborate with SF Environment. A certified green wedding coordinator sought to employ a lawyer, with the requirement that the lawyer was also a certified green business. The lawyer reached out to the Green Business Program in order to get green, and thus got the job. At PG&E, gaining legitimacy and credibility is also important as explained by Christina Crowell,

“Making sure that our customer’s trust us, think that we are reliable, want to work with us is really important...” (Christina Crowell)

Andrew Pannel explains that lack of credibility is not an issue for Dogpatch Biofuels, rather it is about lack of recognition. Collaboration with SF Environment can help Dogpatch Biofuels to get recognized and he explains it as,

“We wanted to make sure we were not just talking the talk, but walking the walk.” (Andrew Pannel)

Seen from another perspective, Michelle Myers argues that by not engaging in certain partnerships, the Sierra Club can remain legitimate.

Many respondents state that improved image can serve as a driving force of collaboration. Paula Luu says that image can be a driver for collaboration from a business perspective. She brings up an example about Google, whose brand has been tarnished because of negative press. Private buses paid by Google drive Google employees who live in San Francisco to the Google office that is located outside of the city. As Google pay for such private transportation, critics are saying that this indicates that Google considers the public transit system in the area as inadequate. Critics argue that Google, by being a multi-national corporation, should take greater responsibility and invest in public transit, instead of only providing transportation for their employees. By collaborating with an NGO that works for a good cause, Google’s image can be improved. Michelle Myers likewise argue that improved image can be a driving force for businesses and states the following,

“I think that when corporations do want to partner with us, it is to improve their image.” (Michelle Myers)

Kay Adler explains that a potential benefit resulting from collaboration is that New Resource Bank’s name is included in marketing material, but emphasizes that it is not the main focus of collaboration. Beth Schechter similarly argues that collaboration is not just for public relations reasons, but that it looks really good on paper. Ann Blake elaborates on this and says that improved image is a driving force for businesses to collaborate if they have a consumer-

facing brand, and that businesses more upstream in the value chain tend to be more self-driven. Moreover, the Green Business Program can provide recognized businesses with improved image. Maggie Ostdahl says that to the Aquarium of the Bay, being a certified Green Business serves as marketing. Andrew Pannel explains the same as,

“Definitely a feather in our cap.” (Andrew Pannel)

Educating

Several respondents tell us that educating is a driving force of collaboration. As an example, Beth Schechter tells us about Stamen’s collaborations with local NGOs with the purpose to put together internship and education programs. When talking about collaborating for the purpose of education, Alyssa Kjar says that education regarding sustainable development can lead to small changes that add up to something big. She also states that people need to understand the problems for wanting to make an effort to change them.

“I think education is the most important part in the whole process because you can’t have action without knowledge.” (Alyssa Kjar)

When William Shutkin talks about collaboration and education within sustainable development, he says,

“We do a lot of work, our student and our faculty, with companies and the government agencies in and around the Bay Area, and that work is focused exclusively on sustainable management, and how to make companies and agencies more sustainable, and how to embed in them the kinds of principles and practices that we teach in the classroom.” (William Shutkin)

Andrew Pannell explains that Dogpatch Biofuels work with and try to educate bus tour companies, which create a large amount of emissions. By educating them about the benefits of renewable biodiesel, and making them use the fuel in their vehicles, a significant impact would be made.

“Education and outreach has to be a significant part of the way forward.”
(Andrew Pannell)

According to Maggie Ostdahl, it is important to,

“Educating at different levels of the problem... everybody learns in different ways... you need to collaborate at one or a couple different levels of where those decisions are being made.” (Maggie Ostdahl)

Greg Dalton says that while education can be an important driver of collaboration, he questions if information alone will be enough for sustainable development, as we today are not acting upon the information we have.

Innovation

Innovation is not considered to be a prominent driving force of collaboration in San Francisco, even though we addressed the innovation with both open-ended and closed-ended questions. Responses to the question if innovation is a driving force of collaboration include,

“Sometimes.” (Ethan Warsh)

“Um yeah.” (Kate McGee)

“An outside perspective can help.” (Wells Lawson)

The only respondent that gives a clear answer to if innovation can serve as a driving force of collaboration is Paula Luu who states,

“Yes, totally.” (Paula Luu)

Paula Luu explains that she wish she knew more about how to incorporate tech in sustainability solutions. Important to note is that Paula Luu is the only respondent who is a founder of a startup, why innovation could perhaps from her perspective be seen as more important. Furthermore, Kate McGee explains that it is hard to partner with innovators, which could be a reason for why the San Francisco Planning Department does not often collaborate to innovate.

San Francisco is strongly connected to the Bay Area, which could partly explain why innovation is not considered to be an important driving force of collaborative arrangements in the city. In the Bay Area, and especially in Silicon Valley, several large and innovative companies are located. Many of these used to be located in San Francisco, but have relocated to the surrounding areas. As a result of this, a great part of the innovative collaboration is probably present in these areas, rather than in San Francisco. Also, as San Francisco and the entire Bay Area is occupied by companies that attempt to develop innovative solutions, it is likely that innovation is considered as an important element to stay competitive. A possible explanation for innovation not being a driving force of collaboration could therefore be that innovation is considered as better pursued within a company, rather than through collaboration between companies.

4.3 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco

The success factors are broadly divided into two categories, which we name ‘Plan’ and ‘Manage’. The success factors in the category ‘Plan’ regard prerequisites for successful collaboration that are more prominent in the initial phase of a collaborative arrangement. The ‘Manage’ category comprises of success factors that are more important to manage throughout the collaborative process.

4.3.1 Plan

People

For successful collaboration, several respondents stress the importance of collaborating with the right people. Desirable attributes possessed by the right people are explained as collaborative skills, similarity of vision and values, and possession of power. William Shutkin tells us about the importance of collaborating with people who have collaborative skills and know how to manage themselves and others. As collaboration is about time management, organization, and communication, the people collaborating have to be really skilled within those areas.

“Collaboration is about people working together, that’s a skill set and not everybody has that.” (William Shutkin)

Similarity of vision and values of the people collaborating is also considered as important.

“We are only more successful when we form a strong network of collaborative partners. It’s like the path to success, it is in finding people to work with... with the same vision.” (Michelle Myers)

In a similar manner, Maggie Ostdahl says that collaboration is more likely to be successful if it involves people that want to accomplish similar things. An example of a successful collaboration between two organizations that have similar visions and values is that between Coming Home Goods and SFGoodwill. The vision of Coming Home Goods is to contribute to the green economy by up cycling post-consumer textiles into home furnishing, as well as to employ formerly incarcerated people. In a similar manner, SFGoodwill diverts materials from local landfills for reuse, and supports local people in need by providing them with job opportunities. Coming Home Goods receives clothes from SFGoodwill that do not make the stores, and the two organizations exchange knowledge and experiences to improve their individual operations. Paula Luu describes this collaboration as successful, as well as vital for the future of Coming Home Goods. In San Francisco, it appears to be rather easy to find

another organization that share one's vision and values. Numerous organizations in various sectors are committed to sustainable development, and many incorporate this commitment into their vision statements, or hold it inherent in their values. Because of this, if the initiator of a collaboration is committed to sustainable development, it is easy to find an organization in the city with similar visions and values. Thus, simplicity of finding stakeholders with similar vision and values to collaborate with may be a reason to why stakeholders in San Francisco continuously do so. These collaborative arrangements appear to have been successful, why the respondents emphasize similarity of vision and values as a success factor.

Nicole Stein, who is Corporate Responsibility Manager at Umpqua Bank, presents a somewhat contradictory opinion to the above. She argues that it is important to have a diverse group of people within the topic area represented in a collaborative arrangement, in order to make sure that various stakeholders are present. Thus, having similar visions and values seems to be of less importance to her. As the sustainable development work in San Francisco concerns a great number of stakeholders in the city, it seems only fair that as many of these as possible are represented in projects addressing sustainable development. However, as it is both unpractical and impossible for all those affected to be present, it can be important to strive for diversity within the group of people involved in the collaboration. Moreover, Paula Luu explains that most sustainable ideas come from diverse groups. This is understandable, as a large number of diverse people should be satisfied with an idea to classify it as sustainable.

Some respondents talk about the right people to collaborate with in a way that seems to be related to power, and the importance of getting the right individuals and organizations onboard a collaborative arrangement. Chris Geiger expresses it as,

"Having the right people in the room is super important..." (Chris Geiger)

Similarly, Ann Blake stresses the importance of,

"...figuring out who the right players are..." (Ann Blake)

In San Francisco, much of the sustainable development work is governed by political driven policies and regulation. Andrew Pannell explains that the success of sustainable development efforts in the city comes down to politics, and that it often becomes a competition where the ones who have the governor's ear and the strongest voice win. Greg Dalton elaborates on this by emphasizing that money also play a great role in the political environment,

"Money talks in our political system." (Greg Dalton)

In the light of this, it seems particularly important to have the right people on one's side, meaning that the people possess power to influence and affect political decisions.

Choice of subject

To carefully choose what subject to address in a collaborative arrangement appears to be an element of successful collaboration in San Francisco. Maggie Ostdahl explains that it is important to address the kinds of issues that are most relevant to the missions of the collaborating stakeholders. One should not work with issues that are not related to one's mission, and as an example she mentions that because the aquarium's focus is on local issues, it would not experience successful collaboration with the World Bank on a global subject. Instead, the Aquarium of the Bay collaborates with local restaurants that serve sustainable seafood in order to promote and enhance the sustainable seafood movement in the Bay Area. This subject is highly related to the mission of the aquarium, which is to protect, restore, and inspire the conservation of San Francisco Bay and its watershed.

Michelle Myers stresses that the Sierra Club cannot take on everything, which implies that it is important for them to carefully choose what matters to address when entering a collaborative arrangement. In a similar manner, Anna Frankel at SF Environment explains that while one should think about the big picture, it is also important to be realistic regarding the scope of the issue that is addressed in a collaborative arrangement. However, what is considered as realistic is a matter of subjective judgment, and differs between different individuals and organizations. SF Environment has initiated a number of ambitious policies in order to advance sustainable development in San Francisco. As an example, the department came up with the goal to achieve zero waste to landfills by 2020. Even though SF Environment, and probably the people in San Francisco, considers this to be a realistic goal, one can question if others elsewhere also would see it as realistic. The degree of what is perceived as realistic in San Francisco appears to be rather high, which may contribute to the success of the sustainable development work in the city. A reason for why the degree of what is seen as realistic might be the culture of San Francisco. Anna Frankel says that the culture is highly supportive of progressive ideas, which can be traced back to the Gold Rush when San Francisco turned into a boomtown. The mentality of that time lingered and is explained by Anna Frankel as,

"...you got to do what you want to do..." (Anna Frankel)

This mentality is still a part of the mindset of the people in San Francisco. This is according to Anna Frankel a reason for why the people in the city are progressive, and why experimental ideas generally face high acceptance. Scott Mandeville, who is Program Coordinator of the Green and Sustainable Business Programs, at the City College of San Francisco, similarly explains that the city has a long history of being progressive, and has an open and accepting culture.

“Unusual ideas will be more accepted in San Francisco they will be in lots of places.” (Scott Mandeville)

The culture allows for progressive ideas and experimental thinking, which might serve as a reason for why the degree of what is seen as realistic in San Francisco is high. There is a greater likelihood for acceptance and support of forward thinking ideas, than for resistance and opposition. Further, Anna Frankel states that one must know what people want, in order to avoid wasting resources on issues that people do not want. This indicates that the local government listens to the people and focuses on issues that the people find important.

Shared purpose

Different terms for the importance of having a shared purpose in a collaborative arrangement are brought forward by several respondents. Paula Luu says that having a shared purpose definitely is important, and uses the terms shared purpose and shared mission inseparably. Maggie Ostdahl also refers to it as shared mission, while Kay Adler and Jenise Bermudez talks about it as mission aligned. Another term used by Anna Frankel and Greg Dalton is alignment of incentives. Alignment of incentives means that it should be an agreement on the motivation and reason for collaborating. Thus, this appears to mean the same as having a shared purpose. The way these terms are used during the interviews is somewhat synonymous, and it seems as the respondents are referring to the same thing. In a similar manner, Kate McGee states that,

“Scoping it together is really important... The defining of the project has to be done in a collaborative way. Because if you define the project, it’s hard to get your partners onboard, they want to be part of the process in the beginning.” (Kate McGee)

The purpose of the collaborations that are included in this study is to somehow address sustainable development in San Francisco. Naturally, in order for these collaborations to make a positive contribution to the city, it is important that the involved stakeholders are guided by this purpose. Moreover, it exists a great number of collaborations between

stakeholders from different sectors in San Francisco. For example, Ann Blake tells us about her participation in the implementation of the Precautionary Principle in the city. The Precautionary Principle states that precautionary actions should be taken if an activity implies threats to humans or to the environment. During the implementation of the principle, Ann Blake collaborated with other businesses, the local government, and NGOs. There are some fundamental differences between organizations from different sectors that are related to their different roles in the city, regulation, and possible profit motive. This makes it even more important that the organizations are guided by the shared purpose of the collaboration. The purpose of this particular collaboration was to achieve a successful implementation of the Precautionary Principle, and if those involved would not have been guided by this purpose, there is a risk that self-interest could have jeopardized the implementation. However, because all stakeholders were guided by the purpose of the collaboration, the purpose was achieved and the implementation was successful.

Greg Dalton puts it somewhat differently, as he argues that although having a shared purpose in a collaborative arrangement can be important, the collaborating organizations can still want different things. Thus, having a shared purpose does not imply that the collaborating stakeholders agree on the best way to achieve the purpose. Although successful collaboration is likely to be guided by the shared purpose, it does not mean that the shared purpose alone ensures a smooth collaboration where all involved are in agreement.

Goals

The establishment of goals is a useful way to clarify the purpose of the collaboration. Beth Schechter states that it is key to set goals in the beginning of the collaborative process. Otherwise, one can be halfway through a collaborative arrangement and find that goals are in conflict.

“If you don’t establish goals early in the project, it will just go off the rail so easily.” (Beth Schechter)

She further says that having shared goals is key, as it helps the collaborating organizations to move in the same direction. Maggie Ostdahl likewise points out that although it is a challenge, it is important to have shared goals. As much collaboration in San Francisco involves stakeholders from different sectors, setting shared goals can be complicated as these stakeholders have different perspectives and interests. According to Ann Blake, one is more likely to meet the goals, if all have bought into the goals and come up with them together. She

also believes that successful collaborations have specific and defined goals. Similarly, Wells Lawson believes that the more specific the goals are the better as,

“I think everyone can say they are working towards a goal and have different visions of what the goal actually translates to.” (Wells Lawson)

The importance of specific goals is likely to be greater in collaborative arrangements that involve multiple stakeholders, as differing visions is more probable to exist in such arrangements. However, according to Nicole Stein, goals are important even if they are broad. She further stresses the importance of clarity of vision in collaboration, which is related to goals.

“Clarity of what the collaborative effort is really meant to do.” (Nicole Stein)

Christina Crowell explains that goals are important for PG&E in order for them to understand why they make the decisions they do, and what pressures they are facing. Kate McGee says that when SF Environment collaborates with businesses, goals have been very important for driving the businesses in certain directions. Moreover, addressing how the goals should be reached is seen as critical.

“It’s a matter of how do you achieve these goals.” (Immanuel Bereket)

“Outline really clear objectives, and make sure that there is a plan to meet those objectives.” (Michelle Myers)

Barry Hooper stresses that goals alone do not necessarily lead all the way, and that one can be over reliant on goals. It is crucial that it exists a dedication of resources to reach the goals. Ann Blake, as well as Maggie Ostdahl, point out that it is also important to establish measures of improvement to be able to track the collaborative progress. Further, Michelle Myers explains that the collaborating organizations must agree on what each organization should do in order to achieve the set goals. This clarifies the role of each stakeholder, and contributes to having shared expectations in the collaboration.

Shared expectations

It is important that the stakeholders involved in a collaboration have shared expectations regarding what the collaboration is meant to do, and that the expectations of the individual stakeholders are understood by all involved. Paula Luu explains that expectations are related to goals, which are useful for creating shared expectations. She notes that shared expectations are especially important when funding is involved, as it must be an agreement on how the funding will be distributed. Shared expectations also help the collaboration to stay organized.

Beth Schechter explains that in order for the outcome to be representative of the needs of all stakeholders involved, there must exist shared expectations. If two organizations are collaborating and are not aware of what the other one wants, they cannot incorporate the other organization's wants and needs into the outcome. Beth Schechter elaborates on this and says that for successful collaboration, all involved must prioritize and agree upon what is most important considering the established goals. This becomes more challenging when people are not in agreement from the beginning, why,

"Being on the same page is key." (Beth Schechter)

The importance of being on the same page is further explained by Ann Blake, who states,

"If you have a common agreement about what you are heading, you are much more likely to get there." (Ann Blake)

Capacity

Another success factor of collaboration is the availability of sufficient capacity. When talking about capacity, most respondents explain that it includes money, time and people. Nicole Stein refers to it as,

"The resources that it [the collaboration] needs to achieve its goals..."
(Nicole Stein)

According to Maggie Ostdahl, adequate capacity is needed for successful collaboration, but this can however serve as a challenge in San Francisco. Sometimes there are great ideas, but it needs to exist sufficient capacity for the ideas to be realized. She continues and explains that sustainable development initiatives in San Francisco often are driven by NGOs that possess limited capacity in terms money. Because businesses have greater capacity, it is important to improve the incentive structures in order to further increase the involvement of businesses in sustainable development efforts in the city. Maggie Ostdahl further says that the most sustainable alternative is sometimes too expensive, and that,

"Capacity is a constant challenge in the environmental sustainability world." (Maggie Ostdahl)

In a similar manner, Chris Geiger argues that a common problem that SF Environment experiences is that neither other departments of the local government nor NGOs have the resources or time to engage with them. He continues by describing capacity as,

"It's a constant struggle." (Chris Geiger)

Insufficient capacity appears to be a rather common issue in collaborations in San Francisco. A reasonable explanation to this could be that these collaborations are not receiving the

required priority among individuals or within organizations. However, this does not seem to be the most prominent reason in San Francisco, since sustainable development appears to be rather highly prioritized in the city. This is for example shown by the many policies and programs implemented by the local government to advance sustainable development, and by businesses in the city employing sustainable development directors. At the same time though, it exists a great number of collaborations that address sustainable development in the city, and it becomes a battle among these to capture their share of the available capacity. The problem does thus not seem to be lack of priority, but more about the great number of collaborative arrangements in the city that are in need of capacity. This, along with the fact that much of the sustainable development work in San Francisco is driven by NGOs that have limited capacity to contribute to collaborations, result in insufficient capacity being a common issue in San Francisco.

4.3.2 Manage

Relational aspects

Two relational aspects that are expressed as important for successful collaboration by the respondents are respect and trust. Respect seems to be associated with the acceptance of each other's roles, an open and understanding way of working, as well as good communication and listening. Anna Frankel explains the importance of respect as,

“You have to respect whoever you are working with, very much so. You could hate someone, but you still respect their work and their work ethic...”

(Anna Frankel)

Christina Crowell, as well as Ann Blake, says that respect is key in collaborations.

“Respect is a key. I may totally disagree of where you're coming from but I understand it and I respect that you have a reason to be here...” (Ann

Blake)

Although some respondents do not mention the word 'respect', it seems as though they are referring to it. An example is when Wells Lawson tells us about the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure's collaborations with developers.

“We may have different objectives... We both know that we are in those positions and we're going to find a middle ground and we're very open about it.” (Wells Lawson)

Another example is this statement made by Ethan Warsh.

“Say like, look the position you have is a reasonable position, the concern you have is a reasonable concern, but this isn’t the time to deal with that concern...” (Ethan Warsh)

Chris Geiger also seems to be talking about respect when he stresses the importance of listening.

“...active listening which means that you are not simply formulating a response when you’re listening, you are thinking about what’s being said.”
(Chris Geiger)

Because San Francisco is a multicultural city, and the people who collaborate often are of different origin, respect is very important in collaborations in the city. It is vital to respect the different traditions and customs of individuals, and truly listen to diverse standpoints and ideas when collaborating. As San Francisco is described as a liberal city with an open and accepting culture, respect appears to be high in the city.

Christina Crowell further explains that respect goes hand in hand with trust, and that both parts are hugely important for collaboration.

“If you can’t respect someone, you won’t trust them” (Christina Crowell)

Wells Lawson explains the importance of trust by stating,

“I think trust is important in terms of knowing that when you’re talking to folks you can be as transparent as possible and know that you don’t need to be duplicitous just to get your work done... There are people that we work with that we trust, and those are really good relationships, and it’s because they are always being very forthcoming and very transparent even if we don’t agree.” (Wells Lawson)

Beth Schechter states that all involved in collaboration has to trust that they all have each other’s interests in mind. Ann Blake says that trust is key, and that by trusting someone, she knows what to expect from that person. She brings forward an example that reveals the importance of trust. She tells us that when she first started working in San Francisco, there was not much collaboration present between the different stakeholder groups, as there was a low level of trust between the local government and businesses and NGOs operating in the city. This changed over time though as trust was gained, which resulted in increased collaboration with the aim to advance sustainable development in San Francisco. A reason for why trust is particularly important in San Francisco is because much of the collaboration in

the city tends to be informal. Wells Lawson tells us about his collaborations at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure.

“I think they’re informal, which is San Francisco style or west coast, we tend to be more informal on things... Pulling a deal together is a very informal process in the city.” (Wells Lawson)

He continues by stating that informal collaboration gets things done. Immanuel Bereket, who is Associate Planner at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, similarly explains that informal collaboration is efficient in a big city like San Francisco, where many different actors are involved in different projects. In informal collaboration, the need of trust is high, as the collaborative arrangement is not as organized or controlled as if it would have been formal.

Although many agree that trust is needed in collaboration, respondents explain the importance of trust and how to earn it somewhat differently. Chris Geiger explains trust as,

“Part of trust is being credible and part of it is having a history of being dependable.” (Christ Geiger)

Another part of trust is not having a big ego. Chris Geiger clarifies and continues by stating that if people perceive you as mostly self-interested, the level of trust goes way down. In a similar manner, Barry Hooper associates trust with honesty. A somewhat different view is presented by Michelle Myers who says that trust is established by setting objectives. The objectives would thus serve as a control mechanism that in turn increases trust.

Communication

Many respondents bring up good communication as an important part of successful collaboration. Beth Schechter explains good communication as

“Everybody who’s involved needs to have an opportunity to like share their opinion and share their perspective... People need to be able to communicate openly and freely.” (Beth Schechter)

Michelle Myers believes that communication in collaborative arrangements definitely is important. Paula Luu considers communication and transparency to go hand in hand. She explains this as those that are good at transparency, usually are good at communicating. Kate McGee explains that when the San Francisco Planning Department collaborates with NGOs, communication provides them with valuable feedback from the NGOs that can improve the collaborative work.

Ways of communicating that are brought up during the interviews are face-to-face meetings, phone calls and e-mails. Michelle Myers tells us that at the Sierra Club, they usually have weekly phone calls, as well as meetings during collaborations with other organizations. Kate McGee similarly says that at the San Francisco Planning Department, they communicate over the phone or in meetings. Ethan Warsh says that at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, most of the communication with other stakeholders occurs via e-mails. Chris Geiger tells us about the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program, where the City and County of San Francisco collaborates with a range of stakeholders. They have monthly face-to-face meetings with these stakeholders that Chris Geiger describes as very informal, and as an opportunity to do some problem solving. He continues by bringing up another example of a collaborative arrangement called the Green Teams. In this arrangement, the collaborating stakeholders only meet occasionally, which he considers as a problem. In the IPM Program, the stakeholders have gotten to know each other, and developed a shared culture that is not possible to achieve without regular meetings. In a similar manner, Nicole Stein associates good communication with personal relationships. Thus, frequent and regular communication that builds relationships among those who are collaborating appears to be important in collaborations in San Francisco. A reason for this may be because much collaboration in the city is informal, as well as frequently occurring.

Mutual interest, commitment, and action

Mutual interest, commitment, and action also seem to be important for successful collaboration in San Francisco. William Shutkin explains that in less successful collaborations, it comes down to the motivation and interest of people. It is critical that people pay attention and has a will to execute.

“Alignment of interest and shared interest or motivation definitely enhances the chance for success...” (William Shutkin)

Beth Schechter says that at Stamen, all employees must be interested to produce their best work, and continues to explain that this goes for all involved in collaboration.

“When everybody believes in the thing you are doing, then you’ll ultimately work together happier and probably produce a better result.” (Beth Schechter)

In a similar manner, Ann Blake stresses the importance of,

“Getting buy-in from the players...” (Ann Blake)

She elaborates on this and explains that a person does not need to have much knowledge or expertise within the subject that the collaboration addresses, as long as it exists a sufficient interest to learn about it. It is the level of interest that is critical. Nicole Stein emphasizes the importance of activity and engagement in collaboration.

“The more active people are, the faster and easier it is to get things done typically.” (Nicole Stein)

Chris Geiger provides a further explanation to this.

“If people are really dedicated to something, they can make it higher on their priority list.” (Chris Geiger)

Ann Blake tells us an example about the dry cleaning business in San Francisco where lack of interest prevented collaboration from occur. She tried to change the kind of chemicals the dry cleaners use in their operations to a kind that is more environmentally friendly. Although her team provided the dry cleaners with all the tools they needed to make the change, including funding and customer demand, they did not want to make the change.

“There is just resistance that we can’t figure out what that is... We tried basically everything.” (Ann Blake)

This provides a clear example of the importance of mutual interest, commitment, and action for successful collaboration. In this particular case, even if collaboration had occurred between Ann Blake and the dry cleaners, the chance of success would clearly have been limited. Anna Frankel says that at SF Environment, they cannot successfully collaborate with people who do not get done what needs to be done. It takes efforts from all involved and she explains,

“...we put everybody in a room but if everybody wants to sit around and stare at the walls and sit in corners, like that’s, I can’t make people talk to people.” (Anna Frankel)

Wells Lawson similarly states,

“People hate working with people who just don’t deliver.” (Wells Lawson)

Facilitator

Another success factor mentioned by some respondents is to have,

“Someone who can manage the process.” (Ann Blake)

This is by Ann Blake and Chris Geiger referred to as having a facilitator. Ann Blake says that successful collaboration needs to have an excellent facilitator who can manage the process. The facilitator should be neutral and knowledgeable, and strong enough to give all involved a

voice, as well as strong enough to quiet a person if he or she is taking up too much time. Chris Geiger talks about the importance of organization and facilitation in collaboration.

“The success formula is a combination of how well it’s organized and how good the follow-up is... the facilitation of conversations is super important, if you have a bunch of people in the room with highly divergent opinions and it turns into a shooting match it doesn’t help anyone, but if you have a skilled facilitator who can drop common goals and sort of run with that and crystalize it and go to the next step then you can make progress, so facilitation is very important.” (Chris Geiger)

The need of a facilitator appears to mainly be prominent in meetings and discussions. Since much collaboration in San Francisco involves multiple stakeholders who are engaged in the sustainable development work in different ways, the need of having a facilitator who can manage meetings is understandable. Furthermore, Avi Asherov explains that NGOs in the city tend to be very vocal. This provides a further explanation to the need of a facilitator in meetings and discussions.

Andrew Pannell says that a success factor of collaboration is the formation of some sort of clearing house for sharing information. It means that the collaborating organizations have a touchstone to come back to. As an example, Andrew Pannell brings up the Green Business Program. He explains that the program becomes a clearinghouse in the way that it unites a number of different departments from local government and inputs from various city agencies. This can be seen as an intermediary among the collaborating organizations, and in that sense resembles a facilitator.

Win-win situation

Many respondents argue that everyone involved in a collaborative arrangement need to benefit from it. Such benefits can include enhanced legitimacy and credibility, valuable experience that implies learning opportunities, and money. Scott Mandeville says that it is important to demonstrate value to all stakeholders involved, and Beth Schechter argues that if someone is not benefitting, it is a problem for the collaboration as a whole. Although Ann Blake agrees that everyone needs to benefit, she explains,

“You may not need it initially, but it doesn’t last long if someone doesn’t see what the benefit is to them...” (Ann Blake)

The Presidio Graduate School collaborates with over 250 businesses in San Francisco through their experimental learning program, where students work with businesses that attempt to practice sustainable management. William Shutkin explains the reasons behind the success of the collaboration,

“I think we have been successful in our experimental learning program for thirteen years because we manage it well, because it’s really important to us, because our employer partners, our business partners, feel they get a lot of value...” (William Shutkin)

It seems to be an agreement among the respondents that even though it is important that everyone involved benefit, the benefits do not have to be equal.

“May not be equal benefits, that’s kind of utopian right.” (Greg Dalton)

“...if we’re both able to benefit from the partnership then we’ll probably continue to stay partners and collaborate with one another. And those benefits aren’t always 50-50 I think...” (Paula Luu)

Paula Luu tells us about Coming Home Goods’ collaboration with Goodwill SF, and explains that the two organizations are not receiving equal benefits. She says that Coming Home Goods is certainly benefitting much more from collaborating with Goodwill SF, than they are benefitting from working with Coming Home Goods. Kay Adler also explains that equal benefits are not a necessity.

“I think everybody has to at least have something that they feel like they are getting their times worth... every collaboration may not pay off for everybody, but I think you got to feel like you are, it is going to eventually pay off for you some point.” (Kay Adler)

Michelle Myers is more doubtful on the question if all involved has to benefit from the collaboration and says that she does not know and that,

“The benefit might not be immediate.” (Michelle Myers)

The reason for why the respondents do not consider equal, or immediate, benefits as necessary for successful collaboration may be that stakeholders in San Francisco are truly committed to advancing sustainable development in the city. It appears to be acceptable if oneself is not immediately benefitting from a collaborative arrangement, as long as it benefits some part or group of the city.

4.4 Overall view of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco

It seems as if driving forces on a macro level serve as background influences, more than direct driving forces of collaboration between local government, business, and NGOs in San Francisco. These driving forces do not seem to be apparently driving collaboration, but however serve as indirect driving forces of collaboration among the stakeholder groups. On a micro level, the driving force *Achieve mission* seems to be related to the other driving forces, as these can ultimately improve the likelihood of achieving one's mission. For example, by getting *Access to knowledge and expertise* through collaboration, an organization can improve its work and in turn be more likely to achieve its mission. Although *Educating* may not be perceived directly related to achieving one's mission, stakeholders in San Francisco who are involved in the sustainable development work often incorporate improving the awareness of sustainable development into their mission. It seems as if an overall theme of driving forces on a micro level is that stakeholders in San Francisco are aware of that other organizations either have resources that they do not have, or possess knowledge that they do not. By knowing this, stakeholders are humble as they have realized that their organization's success is to a high degree dependent on others.

Overall, the success factors in the category 'Manage' appear to be somewhat more important than those in the category 'Plan' for making collaboration work in San Francisco. The city has a history of stakeholder collaboration, and has experienced success in collaborating to advance sustainable development. One respondent describe collaboration in the city as,

"It is what makes the city more sophisticated than any other place I've been to." (Kate McGee)

Because the stakeholders are accustomed to collaborate, the need of extensive planning of collaborative arrangements is decreased. Effective management of collaboration is on the other hand crucial for its success. As much collaboration in the city is informal, stakeholders seem to be spending less time on planning and setting the direction for the collaboration than they do on managing it. Another observation is that the success of collaboration ultimately seems to come down to the people involved. In addition to choosing the right people to engage in collaboration with, relational aspects and the attitude of the individuals involved appear to be closely connected to the success of the collaboration.

The culture and mindset of the people of San Francisco appear to play a crucial role and be a main reason for the success of the city's sustainable development work.

"Mindset here unlike other places that is really geared towards sustainability and creating a future that's economically and environmentally viable." (Beth Schechter)

"A lot of people just want to do the right thing in this community." (Chris Geiger)

The city has a history of being progressive and forward thinking. The people want San Francisco to be seen as a leader of sustainable development, and take pride in their efforts towards becoming a sustainable city.

"We pride ourselves of being a forward-looking city." (Andrew Pannell)

"...constantly pioneering new ways to at least experiment on different ways or pilot new ideas to reach a more sustainable society" (Paula Luu)

The culture is liberal and supportive of progressive ideas, which contributes to the success of sustainable development initiatives. Further, the people are open-minded and find equality highly important.

"San Francisco has a pretty extensive view of who counts." (William Shutkin)

"...we've also been kind of a hub in capital for social justice over the years. There has been a lot of change that has happened. We're definitely one of the more liberal cities..." (Paula Luu)

Although the shared opinion is that San Francisco has a long way to go to becoming a sustainable city, the city is making great efforts and is truly committed to advancing sustainable development in the city. This commitment serves as both a huge driving force of stakeholder collaboration, as well as contributes to the success of such collaboration.

"When it comes down to it, on a day-to-day basis it [sustainable development] is an ethic for I think for many of us, rather than a quantitative goal." (Chris Geiger)

5. Analysis

In this chapter, the theoretical framework is extended through an analysis between the theoretical and empirical findings. The theoretical framework is extended to include driving forces and success factors that are prominent in the empirical findings, but that are not emphasized by theory. The chapter is structured according to the theoretical framework. The chapter is concluded with a presentation of an extended framework that depicts driving forces and success factors of collaboration between local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city.

5.1 Driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

5.1.1 Macro level

Complex social problems

According to theory, cities are today facing complex social problems, which individual organizations cannot handle alone (Austin, 2000; Woodland and Hutton, 2012). This is in line with what the empirical findings tell us about San Francisco, where for example insufficient housing opportunities is frequently mentioned as a challenge that requires collaboration in order to be solved. As pointed out in the empirical findings, complex social problems can serve as a driving force of collaboration, but this also holds true for complex economic and environmental problems. Sustainable city development is in addition to being a socially sustainable city, also about being economically sustainable and environmentally friendly. Complex economic and environmental problems are not emphasized as driving forces of collaboration by theory, but however comprise two of the three pillars of sustainable development. One reason for theory not emphasizing economic and environmental problems as driving forces of collaboration could be that these problems are generally not considered to involve as high complexity as social issues do. Economic and environmental problems may be considered to be easier to define, and also easier to measure. By being easier to define and measure, they are not considered as complex as social problems. Also, as a result of being easier to define, they could in theory be easier to solve by organizations individually, and thus not requiring the same extent of collaboration. Another reason for theory not emphasizing complex economic and environmental problems as driving forces of collaboration could be that the theories used in this study focus on the social part of sustainable development. However, when talking to stakeholders in San Francisco, both complex economic, social, and environmental issues are brought forward as challenges that require collaboration, why we

think it is important to emphasize that such issues can also serve as driving forces of collaboration.

Development of theory

Cities are today not only facing complex social problems, but also complex economic and environmental problems. These problems are not easy to overcome by individual organizations alone, why complex economic, social, and environmental problems all serve as a driving force of collaboration on a macro level.

Changed role of government

Theory describes the changed role of government, as it is now sharing responsibilities with other stakeholder groups in society, and can no longer be seen as the main problem solver (Austin, 2000). This is in line with what the empirical findings suggest. It is brought forward that one reason for this changed role comes from increased privatization of various functions, which is not as clearly emphasized by theory. Also, citizens' trust in government has improved over time, and the local government is increasingly recognizing that it cannot practice sustainable development successfully in the city without collaborating with other stakeholders. According to theory, governments' ability to regulate is decreased which implies an argument for collaborating with private actors (Newell, 2000). This is not consistent with what the empirical findings suggest. In San Francisco, regulation has, and still does, play a great role in the sustainable development work. However, it is emphasized that businesses and NGOs, as well as the people, are active in influencing regulators. This implies that regulation is not necessarily the result of government alone, but rather the result of several stakeholder groups. Thus, the local government of San Francisco does not collaborate with private actors because of a decreased ability to regulate. Rather, it collaborates with private actors to improve regulation, and to make sure that various stakeholders are part of the development of regulation. This in turn implies a higher acceptance of regulation when implemented.

Changed role of business

According to theory, the role of business has changed in the sense that society expects more from business, and because of this stakeholder collaboration is increased (Rodgers, 2000). This is in line with what the empirical findings suggest. Businesses experience increased expectations from both residents and employees, and do take on much responsibilities within

the area of sustainable development. The empirical findings highlight that employees play a great role in influencing their employers to implement sustainable initiatives and practices. This is not highlighted by theory, which may be because this is not a usual occurrence. It is more likely that an employee can affect its employer in a contextual condition where society has great faith in the individual. This is applicable to San Francisco and the US. Also, employee engagement in sustainable development is a somewhat new phenomenon, which can explain why this is not prominent in theory.

Development in ICT

According to theory, development in ICT has affected the balance of power among local government, business, and NGOs (Bray, 2000). Through this, NGOs have gained greater power (Bendell, 2000). In the empirical findings, development in ICT was not brought forward as a driving force of collaboration. NGOs do play a powerful role in the sustainable development work of San Francisco, but it is difficult to say that this is a result of development in ICT, more than other things. In other locations where technology development is limited, development in ICT may be of greater importance with respect to collaboration. This represents a reason for why theory and the empirical findings differ on this matter.

5.1.2 Micro level

Combine resources and strengths

To collaborate because of wanting to combine resources and strengths is by theory described as a way to compensate for weaknesses of the individual organization (Bendell, 2000). This is in line with what the empirical findings tell us, as stakeholders in San Francisco describe collaboration in the city that combines resources and strengths. In contrast to the driving forces of collaboration where the words ‘access to’ is included, this driving force is more about an exchange of already present resources and strengths. The collaborative partners combine these to produce something better than they could by themselves. This driving force is likely to be more prominent in collaborations that address sustainable development, as it is continuously emphasized by both theory and the empirical findings that for successful sustainable development, various stakeholders need to collaborate to make use of their different abilities.

Access to financial resources

Access to financial resources serves as a driving force of collaboration according to theory (Weisbrod, 1997). This seems to be in line with what the empirical findings suggest, as individuals from both local government, business, and NGOs state that getting access to financial resources can be a driver for collaborating with others. According to theory, getting access to financial resources is a driving force that holds especially true for NGOs (Elkington & Fennel, 2000; Weisbrod, 1997), as they often face limited financial resources. Although one NGO in the empirical findings emphasizes that funding is not a main driver of collaboration, this is probably an exception, as NGOs often face limited financial resources. Getting access to financial resources is a particularly important driving force of collaboration in collaborative arrangements that strive for sustainable development, as many sustainable solutions are more expensive than less sustainable alternatives. In the future, sustainable alternatives are likely to be less expensive due to technological development, research and increased demand.

Access to knowledge and expertise

According to theory, improved access to knowledge and expertise serves as a driving force of collaboration (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). This is consistent with what the empirical findings tell us. Access to knowledge and expertise is frequently mentioned as a driving force of collaboration, as stakeholders possess diverse knowledge and insights. Different stakeholders have diverse knowledge and expertise depending on what area their main focus is on, which makes access to such knowledge and expertise a driving force of collaboration. Getting access to knowledge and expertise is likely to be particularly important for organizations that operate in a sustainable city. As sustainable development to a great extent is about balancing the pillars of sustainable development, stakeholders need to be knowledgeable within several areas in this field. For example, an organization that attempts to develop a solution that concerns energy efficiency in buildings needs to apart from being knowledgeable within energy efficiency, also possess knowledge about how to make the buildings affordable. The organization cannot only focus on making the buildings energy efficient, but also needs to consider the economic aspect. A driving force of collaboration could thus be to get access to this knowledge.

Access to new markets

Access to new markets can according to theory serve as a driving force of collaboration. NGOs can provide business with linkages to different groups in society, and in that way provide the business with access to new markets (Waddell, 2000). The empirical findings show that NGOs can rather help business through spreading positive word of mouth, and in this way expand the customer base of the business. Theory further states that stakeholders can collaborate to create and expand markets for sustainable products and services (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). This is not apparent in the empirical findings. The reason for stakeholders not emphasizing getting access to new markets as a driving force of collaboration the way theory does, is perhaps because of the coincidence that it has not been the case for those stakeholders that participated in this study. Perhaps they have not seen access to new markets as a driving force of collaboration, simply because they have not attempted to access new markets through collaboration, or have not by chance got access to new markets. More than serving as a driving force of collaboration, getting access to new markets may rather be a positive outcome of a collaborative arrangement.

Innovation

According to theory, a driving force of collaboration is to foster innovation and creative solutions (e.g. Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy; Woodland & Hutton, 2012). The way this driving force is described by theory is that an external actor to an organization can question traditional ways of operating that can lead to opportunities for change and innovation (Waddell, 2000). According to the empirical findings, innovation is not considered as a driving force of collaboration. One reason for this could be a coincidence, simply, that the stakeholders included in this study do not collaborate to innovate. However, different views and perspectives that are combined through collaboration can generate new and creative ideas that lead to valuable improvements in a city's sustainable development work. Thus, innovation can be a driving force of collaboration in a sustainable city.

Gain legitimacy and credibility

Gaining legitimacy and credibility is considered a driving force of collaboration by both theory and the empirical findings. According to theory, NGOs can improve legitimacy of a business (Rodgers, 2000), which is in line with the empirical findings. By engaging in collaboration with an NGO, the business can be seen as more legitimate, as it takes on voluntary responsibility that is not necessarily connected to their daily operations. Further,

theory states that government can by collaborating with a private organization gain improved acceptance of decisions (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). This is consistent with the empirical findings, which points out that if multiple stakeholder groups are involved in developing initiatives, policies, and regulation, the implementation and acceptance of the effort is more likely to be successful.

Sustainable initiatives can be used as mere means to promote organizations, why it becomes crucial that the initiator of an initiative is legitimate and credible. Individual stakeholders can through collaborating with other legitimate and credible stakeholders improve one's own legitimacy and credibility. Gaining legitimacy and credibility is probably more important in collaboration that addresses sustainable development, as for sustainable city development, it is important for organizations to be perceived as legitimately doing the right thing, and not to be perceived as green washing. In recent times, a number of corporate scandals have occurred where green washing has been revealed. Therefore, consumers are more skeptical to businesses that initiate efforts that address sustainable development, as the reasons behind such efforts may not be completely truthful.

Improve image

Theory and the empirical findings agree that a driving force of collaboration is to improve an organization's image. According to theory, this is a common driving force for businesses (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). The empirical findings likewise reveal that this is especially true for businesses. Improving one's image is particularly important when an organization's brand has been tarnished, or when an organization is seeking to promote itself. By analyzing the empirical findings, it is noticed that improved image is to a great extent related to gaining legitimacy and credibility. An example of this is when one business states that collaboration is not about gaining credibility, but more about increasing the business's recognition. Increased recognition is in turn considered as a part of improving one's image.

5.2 Added driving forces of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

The following driving forces are not prominent in theory, but considered as important by the empirical findings. Therefore, we supplement the theoretical framework with the following driving forces. No additional driving forces on a macro level were identified.

5.2.1 Micro level

Achieve mission

One driving force of collaboration that is put forward in the empirical findings, but that is not emphasized by theory is to achieve an organization's mission. The way this driving force is described by the empirical findings is that in order for the organization to operate successfully and achieve its mission, collaboration is necessary. Those stakeholders that see achieving mission as a driving force for collaboration, often see collaboration as a natural part of their daily work, and part of their organization's strategy. Furthermore, the stakeholders that talk about achieving mission as a driving force of collaboration do not see an alternative way of working to collaboration. The reason for theory not emphasizing achieving mission as a driving force, is probably because it is seen as a result of other driving forces on micro level. However, we consider this driving force to be somewhat separated from other driving forces.

Access to political power

According to the empirical findings, getting access to political power is a driving force of collaboration. As an example, one stakeholder states that in order to influence political decision makers to support sustainable development policies, the organization needs to identify relevant individuals who possess political power and who can help in influencing political decisions. Getting access to political power is a driving force that is likely to be more prominent in cities with a similar political system to that of San Francisco, and that has similar ways of addressing sustainable development. In San Francisco, many sustainable development initiatives are implemented by the local government, even though the initiative itself can come from other stakeholder groups. This driving force is likely to be considered as more prominent by organizations that address sustainable development by seeking to improve legislation or the implementation of policies. Those organizations that fall into this category are mainly NGOs. In a similar manner, the business sector can also find access to political power as an important driving force of collaboration. Sometimes, businesses are dependent on supportive legislation in order to be able to follow through on sustainable development initiatives. As an example, a business that wants to raise the minimum wage for their workers to improve social and economic sustainability, are often dependent on governmental decisions to actually be able to afford such initiatives. The reason for theory not bringing forward access to political power as a driving force of collaboration is because this driving force is highly dependent on the city's contextual conditions.

Educating

The empirical findings tell us that educating all stakeholders in a city regarding sustainable development is a driving force of collaboration. Several stakeholders talk about education as being an important part of the future sustainable development work. For example, it is stated that people need to be educated in order to take action, and it is also important to educate on different levels on where decisions are being made. This is probably especially true in a sustainable city, as everyone needs to be informed in order to advance sustainable development. For example, for a recycling system to be successful, it is not enough to educate large businesses that perhaps create the largest amount of waste, but also to educate citizens in order to create incentives for all groups in the city to recycle. It is difficult to directly witness some of the effects that unsustainable practices lead to. As a result of this, the need for education about such effects is increased, in order to create awareness. If awareness is increased, it is likely that the need for collaboration to solve unsustainable practices is more apparent. Furthermore, education is a mean to advance sustainable development that is rather easy to practice locally. However, it is pointed out in the empirical findings that education alone is not enough for sustainable development in a city. It is commonly known that people do things even though they know that it can have unpleasant and harming effects. Therefore, although education is necessary to advance sustainable development, it is reasonable to question the impact of education without complementary means such as legislation and fines.

A reason for why theory does not emphasize educating as a driving force of collaboration could be that educational efforts does not have to be pursued in collaboration. However, education about sustainable development might need to be driven by multiple stakeholders in order to reach a broad range of people. If multiple stakeholders collaborate to educate, it is more likely to have a greater effect, than if an individual stakeholder had made the effort. Furthermore, a city needs to have come a long way in stakeholder collaboration in order for education to serve as a driving force of collaboration. It is not apparent how an individual organization gains from a collaborative arrangement that it driven by educating others, which might be another reason for why theory does not point this out.

5.3 Success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

People

It is evident that stakeholders in San Francisco believe that it is critical to choose the right people to engage in collaboration with, which is in line with theory. According to Tholke (2003), one should consider the qualities and abilities one is seeking in a partner when choosing who to collaborate with. Theory further points out the importance of strategic fit between the collaborating organizations (Austin, 2000). The empirical findings explain that attractive attributes of stakeholders to collaborate with are collaborative skills, similarity of vision and values, and possession of power. As collaboration is about people and interactions, those involved must be skilled at working collaboratively. Although this is more apparent in the empirical findings than in theory, it is probably inherent in desirable qualities and abilities of a partner. There is correspondence between theory and the empirical findings on the prominence of the attribute that regards strategic fit. Strategic fit is by theory explained as alignment of mission and strategy (Austin, 2000), while the empirical findings emphasize similarity of vision and values as important. Still, this is very similar. Similarity of vision and values implies that those involved in collaboration have similar interests and priorities, and the collaborative process may therefore be eased. However, if the collaborating stakeholders are highly homogenous, there is a risk of groupthink that may lead to too much focus on conformity that in turn can impair the collaborative work. Also, it is reasonable to question if similarity of vision and values of the collaborating stakeholders is more important than having such visions and values that complement each other.

The empirical findings also point out that diversity among the people who collaborate is important. Since diversity implies that various perspectives and opinions are present, it can result in new ideas and creative solutions. On the other hand, a diverse group of people is likely to have differing interests and priorities, and thus find it more difficult to reach agreement. The collaborative process is likely to be characterized by discussions and be more time-consuming than if the group is homogenous. A diverse group of people in a collaborative arrangement might be seen as contradictory to the people having similar visions and values. Still, it can be valuable to attempt to create a balance between having similar visions and values and striving for diversity in a collaborative arrangement, as a too high level of the one or the other can impair the collaborative process. As stakeholder groups in a sustainable city are heterogeneous, and collaboration among these are required for sustainable

development, a city that is accustomed to collaboration among heterogeneous stakeholders is more likely to experience successful city development.

The attribute that involves possession of power, meaning power to influence and affect political decisions, is highlighted in the empirical findings, but not in theory. The reason for theory not bringing this forward is probably because it is highly related to local conditions. It is likely that possession of power to influence and affect political decisions is important in other cities where the role and function of politics is similar to that of San Francisco.

Development of theory

Because stakeholders in San Francisco believe that the right people to collaborate with often possess power to influence and affect political decisions, we emphasize this as an attractive attribute. It is also important that a diverse group of stakeholders are included in collaborations that address sustainable development.

Choice of subject

Theory emphasizes the importance of carefully choosing what subject to address in a collaborative arrangement. The subject should according to Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007), be suitable to the stakeholders' individual missions. The empirical findings likewise show that for successful collaboration, the stakeholders should address a subject that is relevant to their missions. If the subject that is addressed in a collaborative arrangement is related to the missions of the stakeholders involved, there is a greater likelihood that the stakeholders possess the required resources to successfully address the issue. Also, when the subject relates to the stakeholders' individual missions, the collaborative work is more likely to be prioritized. If the subject does not relate to one's mission, there is a risk that one will not be able to adequately contribute to the collaboration, and that the level of interest and commitment is low. Although, being part of a collaborative arrangement that addresses a subject far from what an organization usually does, can imply valuable opportunities for learning. Further, the subject might become too closely aligned with one's mission. The need for collaborating might then be seen as low, and the stakeholders may feel that they can successfully accomplish the purpose of the collaboration individually. Furthermore, a problem occurs if a certain field of sustainable development is not also a part of some organization's mission, as it otherwise would not be addressed according to this logic.

Further, the findings emphasize that it is important to be realistic in the choice of subject, as well as scope. Theory does not as clearly highlight this. An unrealistic choice of subject can result in time-consuming efforts without a great likelihood of success. Unrealistic behavior may lead to collaborative arrangements that fail, which in turn can lead to lost credibility and respect from other organizations. This can imply difficulties for future collaboration in the city. It is hard to argue that being realistic is unimportant, but it can be wise not to be over realistic regarding sustainable development initiatives. As sustainable development is a somewhat soft aim that is hard to define, it can be difficult to achieve by being completely realistic when choosing what issues to address in collaborative arrangements. Realism may inhibit creativity and innovation, which is needed for sustainable city development. The empirical findings further point out that one organization cannot successfully take on all potential issues, why it is important to carefully choose what issues to address. In a sustainable city, it is essential to make priorities regarding what issues to act upon. Therefore, the stakeholders who are engaged in collaboration must prioritize among all potential issues to address. This is closely related to being realistic in the choice and scope of subject.

Development of theory

In addition to considering the involved stakeholders' mission when choosing what subject to address in a collaborative arrangement, stakeholders in San Francisco find it important to be realistic in the choice. Therefore, we would like to emphasize that in supplement to the choice of subject being suitable to the involved stakeholders' mission, it should also be realistic.

Shared purpose

Theory explains that a shared purpose in a collaborative arrangement is in fact the reason for collaborating, and that those collaborating should be guided by this purpose (Woodland & Hutton, 2012.) The empirical findings agree on this, but it seems difficult to clearly explain the meaning of having a shared purpose. Different terms for describing a shared purpose are used by the stakeholders, which contribute to the vagueness of what it really means to have such a purpose. One reason for this may be that it is seen as natural to the collaborating stakeholders that they have a shared purpose to form the collaboration around. Absence of a shared purpose in a collaboration is likely to result in an increased number of misunderstandings and conflicts. Also, it can lead to inappropriate prioritizations, as well as unsuitable methods and tools to achieve the purpose, which in turn implies a decreased chance of a successful outcome. If a collaborative arrangement involves a homogenous group

of individuals with similar opinions and interests, the importance of having a shared purpose may be reduced. The shared purpose is supposed to serve as a mean for guiding the collaborative work in the agreed upon direction. Homogeneity of the group reduces the need for this, as the individuals are more likely to be in agreement. In a similar manner, if the individuals that collaborate are heterogenous, the importance of having a shared purpose is increased, as there is a greater likelihood that they have differing opinions and interests. A noteworthy opinion in the empirical findings is that having a shared purpose does not imply that the collaborating stakeholders are in agreement regarding how to achieve the purpose. As the shared purpose is supposed to guide the collaboration in the right direction, one can question its usefulness if it does not also imply agreement on how to achieve the purpose.

Goals

Setting clear and shared goals in a collaborative arrangement is emphasized as a success factor by both theory and the empirical findings. According to the empirical findings, the clarity of the goals is related to the clarity of vision of the collaboration. If the goals are clearly defined, there is a greater likelihood that the stakeholders are in agreement regarding what they are supposed to do and achieve in the collaborative arrangement. Theory emphasizes that all involved must agree upon the goals (Tholke, 2003), which is in line with the empirical findings. The reason for why this is important is according to theory that it will guide action, and facilitate evaluation of work. A reason presented by the empirical findings, but that is not as prominent in theory, is that agreeing on the goals increases the likelihood of meeting them. However, this might be seen as implicit in theory. The empirical findings also stress the importance of having a plan to meet the goals. Although theory does not specifically emphasize this, it is likely to be inherent in the explanation that goals serve as a guide for action. Lack of goals can result in misunderstandings of what the collaboration is meant to do, diffuse guidelines and misaligned expectations. However, too much focus on goals can result in reduced creativity and adaptability, as well as tunnel vision. Because the world is constantly changing, it is important to be aware of, and be able to adapt to new circumstances that may affect the collaborative work. There is also a risk of setting too high goals that are not reached, as it can lead to dissatisfaction of those involved in the collaboration, as well as to outside parties and possible investors.

Furthermore, theory points out that the goals should be measurable (McKinsey&Company, 2013), which is not as prominent in the empirical findings. While some stakeholders explain

that it is helpful to have measures of progress, it does not appear as though the goals themselves necessarily need to be measurable. A reason for why theory and the empirical findings differ on this question might be because although it is easy to set measurable goals in theory, it can be difficult to set measurable goals in reality. Moreover, as sustainable development is a process, rather than a static and measurable end result, it is even more difficult to establish measurable goals of sustainable development efforts.

Shared expectations

Theory, as well as the empirical findings, emphasize that having shared expectations in collaboration is important. Theory explains it, as one part is to understand the expectations of the collaborative arrangement as a whole (Andriof & Waddock, 2002), while the other part is to understand the expectations of each stakeholder (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). The empirical findings likewise bring up that having shared expectations refers to knowing what the collaboration as a whole is meant to do, and having a mutual agreement of where the collaboration is heading. The other part, that regards understanding individual expectations, is explained by theory, as it is important to well understand and integrate the needs and requirements of each stakeholder in the collaborative work (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). This is in line with the empirical findings, which point out that there must exist shared expectations in order for the outcome to be representative of the needs of all involved. In order to make collaborative efforts sustainable, the outcome must address all stakeholders' needs, as discontent and resistance is likely to occur otherwise. Moreover, it is according to the empirical findings important to have shared expectations because it helps the collaboration to stay organized and increases the likelihood of success. It is also reasonable to assume that shared expectations avoid unnecessary misunderstandings in collaboration, and reduce uncertainty of those involved.

Respect

Theory and the empirical findings are in alignment regarding the importance of respect for successful collaboration. Theory includes terms such as openness, good communication, listening, and having shared understandings when describing respect (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). The empirical findings similarly highlight these factors when addressing respect. The findings also emphasize the importance of respecting other stakeholders' roles and work. It is further pointed out that respect becomes especially important when the collaborating stakeholders are in disagreement, or when objectives are in conflict. By having

mutual respect in a collaborative arrangement, it is easier to appreciate what the different stakeholders can contribute with to the collaborative work, as well as to reach compromises and agreements. It can be argued that respect is particularly important in collaborations that address sustainable development. Since sustainable development concerns a great number of people and regards equity, it is crucial that the rights and standpoints of all affected are met with respect. If there is lack of respect in a collaborative arrangement, it is unlikely to succeed, since the collaborating stakeholders would most probably not be able to work together effectively. The idea of collaboration is to work together, and to achieve something better than the collaborating stakeholders could have done individually. Without respect for each other's work and opinions, it is extremely problematic to work together. However, having an excessive level of respect for another person can also cause problems. It is a risk that the collaboration becomes unbalanced if the level of respect is uneven. There is also a risk that an excessive level of respect turns into a feeling of fright, and a perception that one person in the collaboration possesses a greater level of power due to this.

Communication

Good communication is considered as a cornerstone of successful collaboration by both theory and the empirical findings. Communicating helps to prevent misunderstandings, clarifies the intentions of all involved and enables brainstorming of ideas as well as encouragement of each other's work. It facilitates synchronization of thoughts and work of the collaborating parties, and through this makes the collaborative process more effective. Silence of a collaborating party is likely to send a signal of lack of commitment and interest, and can result in confusion and misunderstandings.

It is not evident in theory what good communication truly implies. Theory simply notes that all involved in collaboration must have access to relevant information, and that this information must be well understood (Andersson et al., 2013). A somewhat more comprehensive description of what good communication entails is provided by the empirical findings. Good communication is explained as having the opportunity to share one's opinion and perspective, and to be able to do this in an open and free way. Based on how the empirical findings explain good communication, it seems to be closely connected with respect, as theory likewise states (Van Huijstee, Francken & Leroy, 2007). Also brought up in the empirical findings is the form and frequency of communication in collaboration. It seems to be the opinion that face-to-face communication is the best way of communicating. Also, it

is pointed out that frequent and regular communication builds relationships, which is believed to ease the collaborative process. In a similar manner, theory emphasizes that frequent meetings create a safe atmosphere characterized by open communication (Tholke, 2003). It is clear that the way communication is practiced between two parties has an impact on their relationship. Communicating is about more than a simple exchange of information, as the body language one uses and the messages one send contain underlying signals. For example, the way two persons greet each other or end a phone call can reveal much about their personal relationship. The building of relationships resulting from frequent communication means that a shared language for communicating is developed, and that trust is improved. Also, it is more likely that those collaborating feel comfortable with sharing information and ideas, as they have a perception of how ideas will be encountered. On the other hand, organization of meetings requires administration and synchronization of schedules. It also takes a lot of time, and there may come a point where the costs of communication outweigh the benefits. Reaching to a decision can be a time-consuming process if it has to be made in a meeting, which can be a problem if the decision is urgent. Furthermore, communication itself does not necessarily drive the collaboration forward as action also is needed.

Trust

A success factor of collaboration that is prominent in both theory and the empirical findings is trust. Theory emphasizes that trust forms expectations about future behavior (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). This is also emphasized in the empirical findings, where it is stated that trust implies knowing what to expect from another stakeholder. Theory explains trust as relying on another party that it will act in the best interest of both parties (Thorelli, 1986). This explanation seems to be shared by the empirical findings, which note that for successful collaboration, the stakeholders have to trust that they all have each other's best interests in mind. Theory further points out that if trust is present in a collaborative arrangement, risk and vulnerability related to the dependability of the other party is reduced (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Although this is not explicitly brought up in the empirical findings, it can be assumed that by knowing what to expect from another, and trusting that all have each other's interests in mind, both risk and vulnerability is reduced. Trust appears to serve as a foundation for successful collaboration and it reduces uncertainty and saves a lot of time. Trust becomes particularly important when formal contracts are missing and when there is lack of similar control mechanisms.

How to build trust is according to theory done by routine relationships and social bonds. Trust is moreover often based on the reputation and past actions of an individual or organization (Thorelli, 1986). The empirical findings do not bring up routine relations or social bonds as elements that build trust. However, the findings show that having a history of dependability, which is based on reputation and past actions, improves trust. Also highlighted in the empirical findings is that trust is strengthened by being credible, honest, and respectful.

Mutual interest, commitment, and action

It is emphasized in theory, as well as the empirical findings, that mutual interest, commitment, and action are success factors of collaboration. Theory explains that it is crucial that all involved are interested in, and committed to the collaborative work, which means that all put effort into the collaboration (Cullen, Johnson & Sakano, 2000). The empirical findings likewise reveal that a high level of interest by the involved stakeholders is essential, and that all must be motivated and willing to take actions. What is pointed out in the empirical findings, but not in theory, is that interest also leads to happier mood of those who collaborate.

Mutual action is according to theory required for achieving a good result (Wood & Gray, 1991), which appears to be in line with the empirical findings. The findings stress that all must contribute and deliver to the collaborative work, and the higher level of activity, the faster and easier it is to get the work done. Also, it is emphasized that people dislike working with people who do not deliver. This is understandable as it probably results in a heavier workload for those who in fact are committed to the collaborative work. Also, people who lack commitment generally do not produce their best work. This may lead to annoyance and grumpiness, as collaboration is about generating something better than those involved could have done individually. As sustainable development has proven to be complex and difficult to manage, it can be argued that mutual interest, commitment, and action are especially important in a sustainable city. If a collaborating stakeholder lack any of this, it is unlikely that the collaboration is successful, as well as unlikely that the outcome is sustainable.

Win-win situation

Theory and the empirical findings agree that it is important that all stakeholders involved in collaboration receive some benefit from it. Such benefits can comprise of valuable experience that implies learning opportunities, enhanced legitimacy and credibility, and money. Because

collaboration among stakeholder groups is a requirement in a sustainable city, it is important that all collaborating stakeholders benefit in order for them to continue to engage in collaboration. However, theory and the empirical findings differ on the question on how these benefits should be distributed. According to theory, the stakeholders must receive an equal part of the benefits resulting from the collaboration (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Stakeholders in San Francisco seem to be of another opinion, namely that the benefits do not have to be, nor are they likely to be, equal. This is rather perceived as utopian and naïve. The reason for this difference might be that theory brings forward an ideal model of stakeholder collaboration, and the empirical findings reveal how it actually works.

Theory and the empirical findings also differ on the form and degree of benefits that those involved need to receive. Theory states that the benefits should be quantifiable and financial (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). The empirical findings show that although it is important that all involved feel that the time they spend on the collaboration is worth spending, the benefits resulting from it do not have to be immediate, and it is enough to know that the collaborative work will pay off sometime in the future. Theory further explains that financial benefits are needed in order to create incentives for the stakeholders' involvement (Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011). Although it is noted in the empirical findings that financial benefits can serve as incentives for business to engage in collaboration, this does not seem to be a shared opinion among the stakeholders. Neither the local government nor NGOs in San Francisco appear to find financial benefits as important for successful collaboration. Although organizations usually are not keen on disclosing such statements, we do not believe that there has to exist financial benefits in order for collaboration to be successful.

Development of theory

It is evident that stakeholders in San Francisco do not believe that the benefits resulting from collaboration need to be equally distributed among those involved. As theory and the empirical findings highly differ in this question, we find it important to emphasize that the benefits do not necessarily have to be equally distributed. Further, we like to point out that collaboration does not have to be financially beneficial to all involved, and that the benefits do not have to be immediate.

5.4 Added success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city

The following success factors are not prominent in theory, but considered as important according to the empirical findings. Therefore, we supplement the theoretical framework with the following success factors.

Capacity

Having sufficient capacity available represents a success factor of collaboration. Such capacity can consist of money, time, and people. Lack of capacity appears to be a rather common issue in collaborations in San Francisco, why we believe it is important to emphasize sufficient capacity as a success factor. A general reason for why insufficient capacity serves as an issue might be that collaborations addressing sustainable development do not always receive the required priority among individuals or within organizations. Sustainable development initiatives are sometimes considered as efforts made in excess of an organization's usual field of operations. When this is the case, other projects are perceived as more important and the collaboration may suffer since there is not sufficient capacity available. The solution to limited capacity is huge interest and commitment of all stakeholders in the city. It is possible to carry out many initiatives that address sustainable development with limited resources if huge interest and commitment exist. For example, an initiative to reduce transportation by automobile in the city can be successful through a high level of commitment by the driving population, given that the city has a functioning public transportation system. It lies in the hands of the driving population to choose whether to take the car or use the public transportation system. On the other hand, some projects require great resources and are not possible to carry out solely by interest and commitment. It is pointed out in the empirical findings that sustainable development initiatives often require great financial resources, as well as the right people and their time to succeed. This implies that collaboration addressing sustainable development in some cases require great capacity in order to success. Thus, either sustainable development efforts must be driven by organizations that possess an excessive amount of resources, or the efforts must be given the priority they deserve in order to receive sufficient capacity.

We find it rather strange that the theory that is included in this study does not emphasize sufficient capacity as a prominent success factor of collaboration addressing sustainable development. Cullen, Johnson and Sakano (2000) bring forward that mutual commitment in a

collaborative arrangement is a success factor, and inherent in this is that the parties dedicate resources to the collaborative work. This is probably a way of making sure that sufficient capacity is available. However, the article does not specifically include collaborations that address sustainable development, and it is not clear what the dedicated resources consist of. It is also possible that other theory in this study includes capacity as inherent in having a high level of commitment, or see sufficient capacity as an obvious precondition for entering a collaborative arrangement. Another reason for theory not emphasizing sufficient capacity might be that theory instead of considering sufficient capacity as a success factor, regards insufficient capacity as a challenge of collaboration. Thus, if our focus had been on common challenges of collaboration, it is likely that capacity would have been brought forward by theory.

Facilitator

It is pointed out that having a skilled facilitator who can manage the collaborative process increases the likelihood of its success. According to the empirical findings, a facilitator can improve the organization and communication in collaboration, as well as ensure that progress is being made. Furthermore, a facilitator can foster problem solving and be helpful in resolving conflicts. It is important that the facilitator is neutral, as well as familiar with the subject that the collaboration addresses. The need of having a facilitator is often prominent in meetings, where discussions can be time-consuming and inhibit the progress of the meeting. The need of having a facilitator who can manage and organize the collaborative process is likely to increase when the group of individuals who are collaborating is heterogeneous and have diverge opinions. If those collaborating are in agreement and difference of opinions is the exception rather than the rule, the need of a facilitator is less. In collaboration that involves multiple stakeholders, as much collaboration in sustainable cities do, the group tends to be heterogeneous why the need of having a facilitator is increased.

The reason for why having a facilitator is not brought forward as a prominent success factor of collaboration by theory, might be that it is considered as less prominent in collaborative arrangements that address sustainable development. This would however be rather strange, as such collaboration often involves multiple stakeholders with different interests, why the need of a facilitator is increased. Another reason may be that the theory included in this study, does not focus on facilitation of collaboration. Van Huijstee, Francken and Leroy (2007) emphasize, "Facilitating factors, e.g. support from the media or politicians" (p. 84) as a

success factor. However, this does not seem to be referring to having a facilitator who can manage the collaborative process.

5.5 Extended framework

Below, the theoretical framework is supplemented based on the empirical findings.

Table 2 Extended framework: Driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city

Driving forces
<i>Macro level</i>
Complex economic *, social, and environmental * problems
Changed role of government
Changed role of business
Development in ICT
<i>Micro level</i>
Achieve mission *
Combine resources and strengths
Access to resources
Access to financial resources
Access to knowledge and expertise
Access to new markets
Access to political power *
Gain legitimacy and credibility
Improve image
Educating *
Innovation
Success factors
<i>Plan</i>
People
Setting direction
Choice of subject
Shared purpose
Goals
Shared expectations
Capacity *

Manage
Relational aspects
Respect
Trust
Communication
Mutual interest, commitment, and action
Facilitator *
Win-win situation

5.5.1 Explanation of extended framework

The extended framework presents driving forces of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city on a macro and micro level, as well as success factors of such collaboration divided in the categories ‘Plan’ and ‘Manage’. The ‘Plan’ category includes success factors that concern prerequisites for successful collaboration, which appear to be more prominent in the initial phase of a collaborative arrangement. The success factors in the ‘Manage’ category are more important to manage throughout the collaborative process. Collaboration is an iterative process where the different phases of a collaborative arrangement are interrelated. Because of this, the categories ‘Plan’ and ‘Manage’ are interrelated, and a success factor can hence be important in the initial phase, as well as throughout a collaborative arrangement.

The driving forces that are prominent in the empirical findings, but not emphasized in existing theory, are *Complex economic and environmental problems* in addition to social problems on a macro level, and to *Achieve mission, Access to political power, and Educating* on a micro level. The success factors that are derived from the empirical findings are *Capacity* in the category ‘Plan’, and *Facilitator* in the category ‘Manage’. These are marked with *.

The four driving forces that regard getting access to some sort of resource are gathered as sub driving forces to a new driving force that we name *Access to resources*. The way legitimacy and credibility, alongside image is described by the empirical findings, makes it difficult to see them not as being strongly related. *Improve image* is therefore made to a sub driving force to the driving force *Gain legitimacy and credibility*. The success factors *Choice of subject, Shared purpose, Goals, and Shared expectations* regard the setting of the direction of a

collaborative arrangement, why these are made to sub success factors to a new success factor that we call *Setting direction*. Lastly, as *Respect* and *Trust* are interrelated and concern the relationship between collaborating parties, these success factors are made to sub success factors to the new success factor *Relational aspects*. All sub driving forces and success factors are indented in the framework.

The sequence of the driving forces and success factors does not depict any sort of ranking among them, however we have attempted to make the sequence logical.

5.5.2 Contribution of extended framework

The importance of increasing the awareness and understanding of the driving forces and success factors of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city is explained in section 2.5.3. The extended framework builds upon the theoretical framework and supplements it by adding driving forces and success factors that are prominent in the empirical findings, but that are not prominent in theory. This provides a more informed answer to the purpose of this thesis, as well as advances existing theory.

6. Conclusion

This chapter briefly presents the results of the study. Furthermore, the validity of the study is discussed. The chapter is concluded with implications for future research.

6.1 Result relative to the purpose

The purpose of this study was to increase the understanding of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. This included identification of prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements.

An increased understanding of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city is achieved through the development of a framework that presents prominent driving forces and success factors of such collaborative arrangements. This framework was developed in two steps. Firstly, a theoretical framework that depicts driving forces and success factors was developed. This was done to provide a theoretical answer to the purpose. The theoretical framework is presented in section 2.5. Secondly, the theoretical framework was supplemented with empirical findings from personal interviews with 23 individuals in San Francisco. Through an analysis, an extended framework was developed that presents prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration among local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. The driving forces and success factors that are presented in the theoretical framework are generally supported by the empirical findings. Also, driving forces and success factors that are derived from theory were built upon and advanced by the empirical findings. The extended framework is presented in section 5.5.

6.2 Validity

In order to discuss the validity of the framework we use the three aspects of validity formulated by Glaser (1978).

6.2.1 Integration

In this study, we developed a theoretical framework and used it as a structure for the empirical findings as well as the analysis. However, we have formulated categories for the success factors, namely 'Plan' and 'Manage'. The purpose of this is explained in section 5.5.1. The additional driving forces and success factors are strongly supported by the empirical findings. To increase the logicity and ease the understanding of the framework,

we made some adjustments. Driving forces that are interrelated were gathered and made into sub driving forces of a summarizing driving force. We made similar adjustments to the interrelating success factors.

6.2.2 Relative ability to explain

In the introduction, it was noted that more research within the area of sustainable cities is needed (Alusi, Eccles, Edmondson & Zuzul, 2011). It was also emphasized that research should attempt at increasing the understanding of stakeholder collaboration in such a city. This study has increased the understanding of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city by identifying prominent driving forces and success factors of collaboration between local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city. It is somewhat difficult to state that our framework's relative ability to explain, compared to others, is strong, as it does not exist a great amount of literature on stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city. Even though there exist studies that address this field (e.g. Boyle et al., 2013; Khare, Beckman & Crouse, 2011), we have not found a study that provides a summarizing framework where driving forces and success factors are depicted. This study has resulted in the development of a theoretical framework that merges different theoretical areas, as well as an extended framework that has developed theory based on rich empirical data.

6.2.3 Relevance

The results of the study can be generalized to a certain extent. As we attempted to provide an overall view of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city, the ability to generalize is increased. However, because of cities' high degree of contextual conditions such as geographic and demographic variables, political system, and business climate, the ability to generalize is limited. The more similar a city is to San Francisco in terms of such contextual conditions, the more applicable the framework is. Also, the closer in time to 2014 that a study is conducted, the greater the likelihood that the framework will be valid.

The results of this study cannot be generalized statistically. In this study, we have used existing theory to develop our theoretical framework to which we have compared our empirical findings. This is referred to as analytical generalization (Yin, 2003). Our framework can be helpful to, and serve as a tool for researchers who attempt to construct similar frameworks, with the purpose to apply them in other cities. The framework can also be useful

for practitioners such as the local government, business, and NGOs in a sustainable city that attempt to increase and/or improve stakeholder collaboration. The driving forces explain what motivates stakeholders to engage in collaboration, while the success factors describe what makes such collaboration successful.

6.3 Implications for future research

Future research in the field would be rewarding, as it would further increase the understanding of sustainable cities, and specifically stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city. During this study, it has been revealed that San Francisco has strong connections and is highly influenced by the Bay Area, which implies that future research could extend the scope of this study to also include the Bay Area. Furthermore, the empirical findings revealed that the culture of a city highly affects stakeholder collaboration that aims at advancing sustainable development in the city. Therefore, it would be valuable if a similar study incorporated theory focusing more strongly on the role of culture, as it would increase the understanding of stakeholder collaboration. Also, this study has been limited to only studying one case, and thus the purpose of this thesis has only been addressed in a specific city context. Future research could conduct similar studies on other cases. These cases do not necessarily have to be similar to San Francisco in terms of for example geographic and demographic conditions, but could just as well be a larger region, or a part of a city, with differing conditions where the purpose of the study is applicable. Furthermore, this study had a limited time frame, and thus we have not been able to study how stakeholder collaboration evolves over time. Therefore, future research could benefit from a more longitudinal approach spanning a longer time frame. Also, future research could attempt to separate the driving forces and the success factors between the stakeholder groups. This would provide a deeper understanding of stakeholder collaboration in a sustainable city. Also, future research could attempt at increasing the understanding of stakeholder collaboration through a quantitative study. For example, the extended framework could be remodeled into a questionnaire that allows respondents to rank the importance of each driving force and success factor.

7. References

- Alusi, A., Eccles, R., Edmondson, A. & Zuzul, T. (2011). Sustainable Cities: Oxymoron or the Shape of the Future? Working paper, no. 11-062, Harvard Business School, Available Online: <http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/11-062.pdf> [Accessed 7 March 2014]
- Andersson, K., Angelstam, P., Axelsson, R., Elbakidze, M. & Törnblom, J. (2013). Connecting Municipal and Regional Level Planning: Analysis and Visualization of Sustainability Indicators in Bergslagen, Sweden. *European Planning Studies*, [e-journal] vol. 21, no. 8, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 8 March 2014]
- Andriof, J. & Waddock, S. (2002). Unfolding stakeholder engagement, in J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted & S. Sutherland Rahman, (eds), *Unfolding stakeholder thinking*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Austin, J. (2000). *The Collaboration Challenge*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Backman, J. (2008). *Rapporter och uppsatser*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Bay Area Census. (n.d.). San Francisco Bay Area, Available Online: <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/bayarea.htm> [Accessed 21 April 2014]
- Bendell, J. (2000). Introduction: Working with stakeholder pressure for sustainable development, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Boyle, C., Head, P., Hood, D., Lawton, M., Lowe, I., O'Connor, M., Peet, J., Schreier, H. & Vanegas, J. (2013). Transitioning to sustainability: pathways, directions and opportunities. *Sustainable development*, [e-journal] vol. 16, no. 3/4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 24 February 2014]
- Bray, J. (2000). Web wars: NGOs, companies and governments in an Internet-connected world, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2013). *Företagsekonomiska forskningsmetoder*, Stockholm: Liber
- Calton, J. & Kurland, N. (1996). A Theory of Stakeholder Enabling: Giving Voice to an Emerging Postmodern Praxis of Organizational Discourse, in D. Boje, R. Gephart & T-J. Thatchenkery, (eds), *Postmodern Management And Organization Theory*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Camagni, R., Capello, R., Nijkamp, P. (1998). Towards sustainable city policy: an economy-environment technology nexus. *Ecological Economics*, [e-journal] vol. 24, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 25 February 2014]

- Cambridge Dictionary. (2013). Urbanization, Available Online: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/urbanization?topic=towns-cities-and-villages-general> [Accessed 23 January 2014]
- Clarkson, M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, [e-journal] vol. 20, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 17 February 2014]
- Crane, A. & Matten, D. (2010). Business ethics: Managing corporate citizenship and sustainability in the age of globalization, 3rd edn, Oxford: University press
- Cullen, J., Johnson, J. & Sakano, T. (2000). Success Through Commitment and Trust: The Soft Side of Strategic Alliance Management. *Journal of World Business*, [e-journal] vol. 35, no. 3, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 8 March 2014]
- Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, [e-journal] vol. 20, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 21 February 2014]
- Egger, S. (2006). Determining a sustainable city model. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, [e-journal] vol. 21, no. 9, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 25 February 2014]
- Elkington, J. & Fennell, S. (2000). Partners for sustainability, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Fassin, Y. (2008). The Stakeholder Model Refined. *Journal of Business Ethics*, [e-journal] vol. 84, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 25 February 2014]
- Freeman, E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach, (reprint 2010), New York: Cambridge University Press
- Friedman, M. (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, 13 September, Available Online: <http://www.umich.edu/~thecore/doc/Friedman.pdf> [Accessed 17 February 2014]
- Giddings, B., Hopwood, B. & O'Brien, G. (2002). Environment, economy and society: Fitting them together into sustainable development. *Sustainable development*, [e-journal] vol. 10, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 4 February 2014]
- Glaser, B. (1978). Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory, Mill Valley: Sociology Press

Glavič, P. & Lukman, R. (2007). Review of sustainability terms and their definitions. *Journal of cleaner production*, [e-journal] vol. 15, no. 18, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 3 February 2014]

Haughton, G. (1999). Environmental Justice and the Sustainable City. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, [e-journal] vol. 18, no. 3, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 3 February 2014]

Haughton, G. & Hunter, C. (1994). *Sustainable Cities*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd

Hopwood, B., Mellor, M. & O'Brien, G. (2005). Sustainable Development: Mapping Different Approaches. *Sustainable Development*, [e-journal] vol. 13, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 29 January 2014]

Joss, S., Tomozeiu, D. & Cowley, R. (2011). *Eco-Cities: A Global Survey 2011*, [e-book] London: University of Westminster International Eco-Cities Initiative. Available through: <http://www.westminster.ac.uk/?a=119909> [Accessed 26 February 2014]

Khare, A., Beckman, T. & Crouse, N. (2011). Cities addressing climate change: Introducing a tripartite model for sustainable partnership. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, [e-journal] vol. 1, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 18 February 2014]

Lee, J., Hancock, M. & Hu, M-C. (in press). Towards an effective framework for building smart cities: Lessons from Seoul and San Francisco. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* (2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.08.033>

Lee, J., Phaal, R. & Lee, S-H. (2013). An integrated service-device-technology roadmap for smart city development. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, [e-journal] vol. 80, no. 2, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 26 February 2014]

Lopez-De-Pedro, J-M. & Rimbau-Gilabert, E. (2012). Stakeholder Approach: What Effects Should We Take into Account in Contemporary Societies? *Journal of Business Ethics*, [e-journal] vol. 107, no. 2, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 24 February 2014]

Marceau, J. (2008). Introduction: Innovation in the city and innovative cities. *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, [e-journal] vol. 10, no. 2-3, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 5 February 2014]

McKinsey&Company. (2013). How to make a city great [pdf] Available at: <http://mckinseysociety.com/make-city-great/> [Accessed 29 January 2014]

Mitchell, K., Agle, B. & Wood, D. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, [e-journal] vol. 22, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 17 February 2014]

- Newell, P. (2000). Globalisation and the new politics of sustainable development, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- OECD. (2008). Sustainable development: Linking economy, society, environment. Available Online: http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/environment/sustainable-development_9789264055742-en#page1 [Accessed 4 February 2014]
- OECD. (2012). OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050: The Consequences of Inaction. Available Online: www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/environment/oecd-environmental-outlook-to-2050_9789264122246-en#page1 [Accessed 23 January 2014]
- Parmar, B., Freeman, E., Harrison, J., Wicks, A., Purnell, L. & De Colle, S. (2010). Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art. *The Academy of Management Annals*, [e-journal] vol. 4, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 20 February 2014]
- Phillips, R. (2003). *Stakeholder Theory and Organizational Ethics*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Post, J., Preston, L. & Sachs, S. (2002). Managing the Extended Enterprise: The New Stakeholder View. *California Management Review*, [e-journal] vol. 45, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 25 February 2014]
- PWC. (2012). Cities of Opportunity [pdf] Available at: <http://www.pwc.com/us/en/cities-of-opportunity/2012/pdf-download.jhtml> [Accessed 29 January 2014]
- Redclift, M. (1996). *Wasted: Counting the Costs of Global Consumption*, London: Earthscan Publications Limited
- Roberts, N. & Bradley, R. (1991). Stakeholder Collaboration and Innovation: A Study of Public Policy Initiation at the State Level. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, [e-journal] vol. 27, no. 2, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 8 March 2014]
- Rodgers, C. (2000). Making it legit: New ways of generating corporate legitimacy in a globalizing world, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Roseland, M. (2000). Sustainable community development: integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. *Progress in Planning*, [e-journal] vol. 54, no. 2, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 29 January 2014]
- Rowley, T. (1999). Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. *Academy of Management Review*, [e-journal] vol. 22, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 24 February 2014]

San Francisco Department of the Environment. (2013). San Francisco Climate Action Strategy: 2013 Update [pdf] Available at: http://www.sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/engagement_files/sfe_cc_ClimateActionStrategyUpdate2013.pdf [Accessed 20 April 2014]

Satterthwaite, D. (1997). Sustainable Cities or Cities that Contribute to Sustainable Development? *Urban Studies*, [e-journal] Vol. 34, No. 10, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 21 February 2014]

Selsky, J. & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice. *Journal of Management*, [e-journal] vol. 31, no. 6, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 10 March 2014]

Siemens AG. (2011). US and Canada Green City Index: Assessing the environmental performance of 27 major US and Canadian cities [pdf] Available at: http://www.siemens.com/entry/cc/features/greencityindex_international/all/en/pdf/report_northamerica_en.pdf [Accessed 20 April 2014]

Siemens AG. (2012). The Green City Index: A summary of the Green City Index research series [pdf] Available at: http://www.siemens.com/entry/cc/features/greencityindex_international/all/en/pdf/gci_report_summary.pdf [Accessed 4 mars 2014]

Sustainable Development Commission. (2009). Prosperity without growth? The transition to a sustainable economy [pdf] Available at: http://www.sdcommission.org.uk/data/files/publications/prosperity_without_growth_report.pdf [Accessed 4 mars 2014]

The World Bank Group. (2014). Sustainable Development Overview. Available Online: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/sustainabledevelopment/overview> [Accessed 27 February]

Tholke, M. (2003). Collaboration for a Change: A Practitioners Guide to Environmental Nonprofit-Industry Partnerships [pdf] Available at: <http://www.greenbiz.com/sites/default/files/document/CustomO16C45F43021.pdf> [Accessed 12 March 2014]

Thorelli, H. (1986). Networks: Between Markets and Hierarchies. *Strategic Management Journal*, [e-journal] vol. 7, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 11 February 2014]

Thornbush, M., Golubchikov, O. & Bouzarovski, S. (2013). Sustainable cities targeted by combined mitigation-adaptation efforts for future-proofing. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, [e-journal] vol. 9, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 2 April 2014]

Trist, E. (1983). Referent Organizations and the Development of Inter-Organizational Domains. *Human Relations*, [e-journal] vol. 36, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 11 March 2014]

- UN. (1992). Agenda 21 [pdf] Available at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf> [Accessed 27 February 2014]
- UN. (2010). Sustainable development: From Brundtland to Rio 2012 [pdf] Available at: http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/gsp/docs/GSP1-6_Background%20on%20Sustainable%20Devt.pdf [Accessed 22 January 2014]
- UN. (2012). The future we want [pdf] Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/sustainablefuture/> [Accessed 6 February 2014]
- UN Centre for Human Settlements (HABITAT). (1996). *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements 1996*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). State and County Quickfacts. Available Online: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/0667000.html> [Accessed 20 April 2014]
- Van Huijstee, M., Francken, M. & Leroy, P. (2007). Partnerships for sustainable development: a review of current literature. *Environmental Sciences*, [e-journal] vol. 4, no. 2, Available through EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 11 March 2014]
- Vangen, S. & Huxham, C. (2003). Nurturing Collaborative Relations: Building Trust in Interorganizational Collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, [e-journal] vol. 39, no. 1, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 5 February 2014]
- Waddell, S. (2000). Complementary Resources: The win-win rationale for partnership with NGOs, in J. Bendell, (ed), *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited
- Waddock, S. (1991). A Typology of Social Partnership Organizations. *Administration & Society*, [e-journal] vol. 22, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 10 March 2014]
- WCED. (1987). *Our Common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press
- Weisbrod, B. (1997). The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Its Entwinning with Private Enterprise and Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, [e-journal] vol. 16, no. 4, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 12 March 2014]
- Wood, D. & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, [e-journal] vol. 27, no. 2, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 7 March 2014]
- Woodland, R. & Hutton, M. (2012). Evaluating Organizational Collaborations: Suggested Entry Points and Strategies. *American Journal of Evaluation*, [e-journal] vol. 33, no. 3, Available through: EHL Library website: <http://www.lusem.lu.se/library> [Accessed 31 January 2014]

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3d edn, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yin, R. (2011). *Kvalitativ forskning från start till mål*, Lund: Studentlitteratur

Appendix 1: List of respondents

Name	Title	Organization	Date of interview
Kay Adler	SVP/IT Director	New Resource Bank	2014-03-26
Avi Asherov	Planning Intern at the Sustainable Development group	San Francisco Planning Department	2014-03-25
Immanuel Bereket	Associate Planner	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure	2014-03-14
Jenise Bermudez	Banking Officer	New Resource Bank	2014-03-26
Ann Blake	Founder & Principal	Environmental and Public Health Consulting	2014-03-20
Christina Crowell	Sr. Program Manager for Government and Community Partnerships	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	2014-03-18
Greg Dalton	Vice President	The Commonwealth Club of California	2014-03-18
Anna Frankel	Green Business Specialist	San Francisco Department of the Environment	2014-03-19
Chris Geiger	Municipal Toxics Reduction Coordinator	City and County of San Francisco	2014-03-24
Barry Hooper	Green Building Specialist	San Francisco Department of the Environment	2014-03-19
Alyssa Kjar	Assistant Producer	The Commonwealth Club of California	2014-03-18
Wells Lawson	Sr. Project Manager	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure	2014-03-25
Paula Luu	Founder	Coming Home Goods	2014-03-24
Scott Mandeville	Program Coordinator of the Green and Sustainable Business Programs	City College of San Francisco	2014-03-17

Kate McGee	Lead Sustainability Planner	San Francisco Planning Department	2014-03-25
Michelle Myers	San Francisco Bay Chapter Director	Sierra Club	2014-03-21
Maggie Ostdahl	Sustainable Initiatives Manager	Aquarium of the Bay	2014-03-17
Andrew Pannell	Operations Manager	Dogpatch Biofuels	2014-03-21
Beth Schechter	Education and Outreach Manager	Stamen	2014-03-20
William Shutkin	President and CEO	Presidio Graduate School	2014-03-18
Nicole Stein	Corporate Responsibility Manager	Umpqua Bank	2014-03-17
Ethan Warsh	Assistant Project Manager	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure	2014-03-25
Mary Wong	Vice President/Store Manager	Umpqua Bank	2014-03-17

Appendix 2: Interview guide

General introductory questions regarding reasons for addressing sustainable development and the importance of sustainable cities.

San Francisco and sustainable development

- Do you consider San Francisco to be a sustainable city?
 - In what way?
- San Francisco is considered to be prominent in its sustainable development work, what do you believe to be the reasons for this?
- How is your organization involved in the sustainable development work of San Francisco?
 - What are goals of this involvement?
 - How do you manage them?
 - How do you follow up on them?
- What is your organization's motivation for involvement in sustainability efforts?
- How does your organization contribute to the sustainable development of San Francisco?
 - Specific results?

Stakeholders in San Francisco

- Can you tell us who you consider to be the main stakeholder groups in the sustainable development work of San Francisco?
- Are some stakeholder groups more important than others?

Stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco

- Do you collaborate with other stakeholders in sustainable development efforts in San Francisco?
 - Who?
- How do you collaborate with other stakeholders?
 - Goals? Short-term? Long-term?
 - Type of interactions?
 - What levels in your organization are involved in the collaboration?
 - Other organizations involved in the collaboration?
 - Differences between different collaborations?
- Can you tell us about the success of these collaborations?
 - If successful, what do you believe to be the reasons behind the success?
 - If less successful, what do you believe the reasons are for this?
 - Differences between different collaborations?
- Can you tell us about potential obstacles or problems you have encountered when collaborating with others?
 - How did you handle the obstacle/problem?
 - Differences between different collaborations?

- What do you consider to be the driving forces for collaborating with other stakeholders in sustainable development efforts?
 - Macro/Micro?
 - Some more important than others?
 - Differences between different collaborations?
- What do you consider to be the benefits of such collaboration?
 - For your organization?
 - For San Francisco?
 - Differences between different collaborations?
- Are there any downsides of the collaboration?
 - Differences between different collaborations?
- Can you tell us about important elements of successful collaboration?
 - Some more important than others?
 - Differences between different collaborations?

Appendix 3: Article in Harvard Business Review

Collaborate for sustainable city development

Stakeholder collaboration is a requirement for successful sustainable development in cities. Here's how San Francisco makes it work. *By Sofia Leeb and Cecilia Rudeberg*

A growing world population and rapid urbanization, along with challenges originating from climate change, have resulted in the emergence of sustainable cities. Such cities attempt to advance sustainable development in the city, without compromising the needs of coming generations. Although urbanization can lead to increased economic growth and productivity, cities consume a considerable amount of energy and are centers of waste creation. Urbanization can also create social problems and inequalities, as well as have dangerous environmental effects that put citizens' health at risk. Transportation complications, insufficient resource supply and poor infrastructure support represent other potential issues. How cities decide to deal with these challenges have implications for the well-being of the entire world population.

In today's world, we are seeking to address global sustainability problems, but fail to achieve advancement towards a sustainable society in cities. Many cities do respond to the ongoing climate change, but fail to execute long-term strategies for this purpose.

There is a need of a new way of thinking, and for different ways of creating more successful and sustainable cities. There is not only one way of addressing sustainable city development. Therefore, each individual city has to be aware of how it wants to address sustainable development, and work with a broad spectrum of partners from both the public and private sector.

Sustainable development in cities requires collaboration among government, business, and NGOs. It is not possible for governmental

actors, financial institutions, planners, builders, or citizens alone to overcome the challenges of sustainable development. Therefore, it is essential to include all stakeholders in sustainable development efforts, and allow for coordination, integration, and resource sharing that benefit all. During the last two decades, stakeholder involvement has increased in cities, and both businesses and NGOs' roles have enhanced in the pursuit of creating sustainable cities.

San Francisco is a city that has come a long way towards becoming a sustainable city. One reason for this is the successful stakeholder collaboration present in the city. In our research, we have interviewed individuals from the local government of San Francisco, as well as businesses and NGOs operating in the city. We have through this been able to identify critical success factors of stakeholder collaboration in San Francisco. This article provides a framework for making stakeholder collaboration work.

Collaborate with the right people

It is critical to choose the right people to engage in collaboration with. When seeking to collaborate with other stakeholders in the city, one should carefully consider the qualities and abilities that one is looking for in a partner. Attractive attributes in a partner are collaborative skills and a similar vision to one's own. As collaboration is about people and interactions, those involved must be skilled at working collaboratively. If the partners also have similar visions, they are more likely to have similar interests and priorities, which will ease the collaborative process. It may also be desirable that a partner possesses power to influence political decisions, if politics play

Idea in Brief

THE PROBLEM

The world population is growing and is by 2050 expected to reach nearly 9.2 billion. Urban areas are at the same time projected to contain almost 70 % of the world population. This puts high demands on cities in terms of infrastructure, resource supply, and energy usage. How cities deal with these challenges have implications for the well-being of the entire world population.

THE ARGUMENT

It is not possible to overcome the challenges of urbanization, and to advance sustainable development in cities alone. Collaboration among government, business, and NGOs is a must, and there exist great opportunities for making such collaboration work.

THE SOLUTION

These eight recommendations – collaborate with the right people, set the direction, make sure sufficient capacity is available, build relationships, communicate, ensure mutual interest, commitment and action, use a facilitator, and create a win-win situation – provide valuable support to those who attempt to improve stakeholder collaboration to advance sustainable development in cities.

an important role in sustainable development efforts in the city.

Set direction for the collaboration

It is critical to set the direction for the collaboration early on in the process. Included in this is to choose what subject the collaboration is going to address, develop a shared purpose that the collaboration should be guided by, establish goals, and create shared expectations. The subject addressed should be suitable to the involved stakeholders' individual missions, and reflect their combined abilities. For example, an NGO that works with planting trees in the city is more likely to experience successful collaboration if the subject regards green city areas, than if it would address the city's energy use. A shared purpose that the partners are guided by when they act and make decisions will significantly ease the collaboration. In a city striving for sustainable development, the shared purpose integral in all collaborative arrangements should preferably address some area of the city's sustainable development. More specific aims should be formulated in clear goals. By formulating goals that the partners understand and agree upon, the work and the evaluation of the work will be more efficient. Obviously, it is important to have a plan to meet the set goals. Finally, by having shared expectations, the work is eased, as the partners know not only what others expect from them, but also what they can expect from their partners.

Make sure sufficient capacity is available

Successful collaboration requires sufficient capacity in terms of money, people, and time. Sustainable development initiatives generally require great financial resources, as well as people and their valuable time to succeed. A common issue is that collaborations that address sustainable development does not always receive the required priority among individuals or within organizations. Sustainable development initiatives are sometimes considered as efforts made in excess of an organization's usual field of operations. When this is the case, other projects are perceived as more important and the collaboration may suffer since there is not sufficient capacity available. Thus, make sure that sufficient capacity to meet the goals of the collaboration is available.

Build relationships

Collaboration is about people working together, why it is important to build relationships. It is essential to respect one's partner, both in a current collaborative arrangement and for the sake of future successful collaboration. Respect is about recognizing and valuing each other's work and knowledge, and act accordingly. Also vital in a collaborative arrangement is trust. As stakeholders in a city have different interests, trust must be present so that those collaborating partners can be sure that all involved will contribute to the collaboration, and not act in self-interest. Trust implies knowing what to expect from a partner, and thus reduces uncertainty. Respect and trust can be earned, as well as lost, over time, why it is critical to always act in a way that improves both respect and trust.

Communicate, communicate, communicate

Good and frequent communication is a cornerstone of successful collaboration. As sustainable development is a debated concept that individuals associate with different meanings, good communication among the city's stakeholders is essential. Good communication can be explained as having the opportunity to share one's opinion and perspective, and to be able to do this in an open and free way. Communication helps to prevent misunderstandings and to clarify the intentions of all involved. Communication enables brainstorming of ideas and encouragement of each other's work. It facilitates synchronization of thoughts and work of the collaborating partners, and through this makes the collaborative process more effective. Silence is likely to send a signal of lack of commitment and interest, and can result in confusion and misunderstandings. Face-to-face communication is often the best way of communicating in a collaborative arrangement, and frequent communication helps to build relationships. Such building of relationships means that a shared language for communicating is developed, and that trust is improved. Also, it is more likely that those collaborating feel comfortable with sharing information and ideas, as they have a perception of how ideas will be encountered.

Ensure mutual interest, commitment, and action

It is key that there exist mutual interest, commitment, and action among the collaborating stakeholders from the start of collaboration. All involved must contribute and deliver to the collaborative work, and the higher level of activity, the faster and easier it is to get the work done. People dislike working with people who do not deliver, as it results in a heavier workload for the ones who are actually committed to the collaborative work. Also, people who lack commitment generally do not produce their best work. Sustainable development is not an easy aim, and the city will not experience success in the area without sufficient commitment from everyone involved. Sustainable development requires long-term thinking and consideration of future generations, which requires that the city's stakeholders are truly committed and act accordingly in collaborative arrangements.

Use a skilled facilitator

A facilitator is someone who manages the collaborative process and ensures that progress is being made. The use of a facilitator will improve organization and communication in collaboration, and foster problem solving. It is important that the facilitator is neutral, as well as familiar with the subject that the collaboration addresses. The need of having a facilitator is often prominent in meetings, where discussions can be time-consuming and inhibit the progress of the meeting. The need of having a facilitator who can manage and organize the collaborative process is likely to increase when the collaborating partners are diverse and have disagreeing opinions. If those collaborating are in agreement and difference of opinions is the exception rather than the rule, the need for a facilitator is reduced. In collaborations that involve multiple stakeholders, as many collaborations in sustainable cities do, the group tends to be diverse why the need of having a facilitator is increased.

Create a win-win situation

All involved in collaboration should benefit from it. It is not fair if only one stakeholder benefits, and nor is it likely that the collaboration is successful if that is the case. Benefits can for example include enhanced credibility, learning opportunities, money, an expanded customer base, and improved image. Such benefits create incentives for stakeholders to engage in collaboration, and to continue collaborate, why it is critical that these benefits exist. The benefits do not have to be equally distributed among the stakeholders, but it is important that all involved feel that the time they spend on the collaboration is worth spending.

The question for cities is not whether to address sustainable development, but rather in what way. Stakeholder collaboration has proven to be a successful method for cities to advance sustainable development. Although it is not easy to collaborate for sustainable development, it does exist great opportunities for making such collaboration work. As urbanization and climate change is upon us and the cities we live in, stakeholder collaboration with the aim to advance sustainable development is here to stay.