Testbed-Mentality: The government of a testbed for sharing in Sege Park in Malmö

Adam Baig

Department of Human Geography

SGEM08

VT 2022

Examiner: Mirek Dymitrow

Supervisor: Lorena Melgaço

Abstract

This thesis investigates how urban experimentation is governed in the new development district in Sege park in Malmö. Together with with private developers and a local NGO the municipality test and experiment with solutions for how the sharing economy can contribute to reduce the future resident's climate impact and living costs. By using the theoretical lens of governmentality this thesis focusses on how the municipality govern the actors in the development and the political rationales that informs this government. Semi-structured interviews with urban planners, developers and the NGO have been conducted. The interviews have been transcribed and then analysed using Mitchell Dean's framework for analysing governmentality. The study has found that the municipality governs through neoliberal technologies of government which are directed at guiding, consulting and encouraging developers and residents to take responsibility for the development. Essential to this government is the promotion of certain subject-positions (The responsible developer, the spider in the web- NGO and the Sharing class-residents) with certain qualities and capabilities which can perform a desirable conduct and realize the objectives for the development in Sege park. This governmentality is also informed by a test-bed mentality which promotes urban experimentation in Sege Park as a practice which is urgently needed to solve urban sustainability problems by testing new ways to develop urban space, and most importantly, in this process, produce knowledge for future development which can drive and induce societal change.

It is argued in this thesis that a testbed-mentality enables a further neoliberalization of planning to progress and develop in Sege Park under the cover of an ambition to measure, evaluate and plan for an uncertain sustainable future. It is also argued that this mentality can justify experimental sites as exclusive spaces built, planned and developed by and for certain actors. The study has also found that the development in Sege park can be understood as a further development of public-private partnerships in Malmö especially in connection to the emphasis on building good relations with the private developers, to give them a freedom of action rather than restrictions and to incorporate them as essential actors in the planning and development process. It is argued that this development enables developers to have an increased power over urban planning practices in Malmö which also means that they can steer the development according to their interests.

Keywords: Urban experimentation, experimental governance, sharing, governmentality, neoliberal governmentality, testbed-mentality.

Word count: 19226

Acknowledgments

Writing this thesis has been an interesting and immensely educational process and experience. Hopefully I have not left to many trails of fire behind me and I would like to acknowledge and appraise the people who have been a part of this journey and made it possible.

First, I would like to thank Malmö stad and the environmental department especially Juliet, Olov and Krusse for taking an interest into my research- proposal and offering me the possibility to gain access to contacts, material and information regarding the development in Sege Park. I would also like to thank the interviewees for taking their time to share their thoughts and experiences from Sege park.

Conducting most of these interviews with Victor Nyman has been a pleasure and I'm very thankful for the many discussions we've had about the interviews and the development process. I would also like to thank Andrea Karlsson for sharing material, information and insights about Sege park from her research. And also the interviews and discussions we've conducted together.

I would like to thank Lorena for giving me inspirational, critical and indicative supervision which has been priceless. Your ideas, comments and advice have been both challenging and empowering which has given me focus, structure, confidence and a lot of inspiration.

Finally, a thank you goes out to friends and family who have put up with this enterprise and I would especially like to thank Amanda for always holding my hand and keeping me from slipping into darkness.

Last but not least I would like to thank Elias for many hours in the library and other things.

Table of Contents

1.Introduction

Urban experimentation has become a popular phenomenon within urban development and planning policies in many Nordic cities in recent years (Eneqvist & Karvonen 2020). Testbeds, pilots, and urban living labs are concepts which cities use in urban planning to bring together different actors to design, test, monitor and evaluate innovations and solutions that address problems and challenges related to sustainability and climate change. The importance of the experiment is not necessarily the intervention in itself but the assembling and communication of knowledge from the intervention. By producing knowledge for urban development experiments function to imagine alternative sustainable futures for cities and also to make them visible on the international arena as attractive places for progressive and sustainable change (Karvonen et al. 2014).

Municipalities have an important role in urban experimentation and can take on different strategic functions in the experimental development (Eneqvist & Karvonen 2020). Urban experimentation can be understood to be situated in the emergence of governance the last 25 years as a response to decreased municipal funding which has sparked the need to involve private actors and civil society as collaborators and innovators in urban development (Marvin et al. 2018:22). As a mode of governance urban experiments frequently involve collaborations between municipalities, private companies, civil society and academia. These collaborations often focus on co-creation and distributed decision- making in the development process. This means that the actors involved in experimental processes may face new expectations on their roles and responsibilities when it comes to urban development and planning which can reconfigure the relationships between public and private actors in new ways (Mukhtar-Landgren 2021), and also blur the power-relations and responsibilities between them (Eneqvist & Karvonen 2021). A problem with these power-dynamics concerns aspects of democracy. Municipalities are responsible to protect democratic and public values such as citizen representation, accountability and equity when it comes to urban development and planning. This gives municipalities a legitimate position and trustworthiness to envision and plan priorities for local urban development (Kronsell & Mukhtar -Landgren 2020:130). If power is shifted to private or non- public actors in urban experimentation public values run the risk of becoming sidestepped by private interests (Eneqvist et al 2021:15). This can lead to experimental sites becoming exclusive spaces in cities where only certain actors participate in the development and benefit from the experimentation (Levanda 2019).

On the background of these problems it becomes important to unravel the power-relations and responsibilities between actors involved in urban experimentation and governance (Evans 2016, Karvonen et al 2014, Berglund-Snodgras & Mukhtar-Landgren 2020, Mukhtar-Landgren et al. 2019, Eneqvist et al. 2021, Caprotti & Cowley 2017). Especially as experimental interventions and experimental governance are becoming increasingly important strategies for municipalities to address urban sustainability (Eneqvist et al 2021).

This thesis sets out to scrutinize the power dynamics in urban experimentation by doing a case study of experimental governance in Sege park in Malmö. Malmö is the third largest city in Sweden and have made a transformation since the 90's from an industrial to a post-industrial global city. Like many other post-industrial cities, Malmö has committed to brand its city image as a creative, green and sustainable city (Holgersen 2017: 14). One of the latest trends in this branding has been to label the city as an urban living lab, a place for innovation and new thinking, where different solutions for sustainable development are tested. The new development district in Sege park is framed as an important strategic locale to achieve this vision for Malmö (Malmö Stad 2021). As a testbed and an urban living lab Sege park will be used to test the possibility to live "a good life within the planetary boundaries at a reasonable cost" by engaging the future residents in sharing(Leonette 2021). The development of sharing solutions in Sege park has been initiated by the municipality together with private housing developers, a national program for sharing, Malmö-Lund university and a local NGO (Malmö stad 2021). By collaborating with these actors, the municipality hope to produce an area which can become a spearhead and a leading example for urban sustainable development (Leonette 2021).

1.1. Research question

This thesis will investigate how relations of power are structured in this collaboration and what role, responsibilities and influence the different actors have in the development. By using Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality (Foucault 1979) as a theoretical lens, this study focuses on how the municipality in Malmö governs the test-bed development of sharing solutions and how the actors involved are conducted in this process. The main research question for this thesis is framed as follows:

- How is the development of a test-bed for sharing-solutions governed in Sege park in Malmö?

The thesis is also guided by two sub-questions, concerning: How the government in Sege park can be related to neoliberal strategies of government, and, how these strategies relate to previous and contemporary urban planning practices in Malmö?

1.2. Disposition

The structure of this thesis begins with **Section 2** where I will discuss previous urban development and planning in Malmö and how the city has been described as a neoliberalized city. I will then turn to give a background on the development in Sege park and also briefly discuss Swedish housing politics and the concept of the sharing economy in relation to the development in Sege Park. In **Section 3** Governmentality is presented as the theoretical lens and the basic concepts around this theory are discussed. The focus then turns to how governmentality is related to neoliberal strategies of government and how urban experimentation can be understood as a mode of neoliberal planning. I then present Mitchell

Dean's analytical framework and discuss how and why this framework is relevant for studying urban experimentation and answering the research question. In **Section 4** the methodology is presented. Here I discuss how I have collected and handled the material for the thesis and why this material is relevant for the research. In **Section 5** the findings from the analysis are presented and discussed. This section is structured into 4 dimensions which follows Dean's analytical categories. In **Section 6** the findings are summarized and further discussed in relation to previous development and neoliberal planning practices in Malmö. In **Section 7** the conclusion of the thesis is presented and discussed in relation to the research question. Here I also discuss considerations and proposals for future research.

2. Background

In studies of governmentality the art of government is understood as a dynamic process which maintain and transforms earlier forms of government (Dean 2010: 31). To understand how government is exercised in the present "An ´analytics of government´ must write a history of the present in tracing the trajectories that have forged the forms of government under study" (Oels 2006: 189)

In order to trace the governmental trajectories which permeates the development of Sege park the next section will outline a brief history of urban development in Malmö with a focus on the development of the Western Harbour to discuss how urban planning has been conducted. A key feature of this development is how the city of Malmö has gradually incorporated private housing developers as important stakeholders in urban development and planning of the city.

2.1. Urban development and planning in Malmö

The city of Malmö has made a transformation since the 1990s from an industrial city to a post-industrial city. Following the decline of important manufacturing industries during the 1980s such as the eminent Kockum shipyard the city faced a socio-economic crisis with high unemployment, declining population and economic stagnation. The national economic crisis in the early 90s in Sweden also increased these socio-economic problems in Malmö (Holgerson & Malm 2015). In the face of these crises the local government in Malmö together with the business sector, the university and the cultural life envisioned and planned for alternative futures for the city. These plans envisioned that Malmö should be transformed from an old industrial city by starting its trajectory for economic growth as a global entrepreneurial "knowledge city". This was to be done by attracting highly educated and creative people, building attractive urban environments, upgrade the inner city, the university and connect the city to the continent through the Öresund-bridge (Dannestam 2009: 128)

Tove Dannestam (2009: 252-54) have made a thorough investigation into the transformation of Malmö's identity towards an entrepreneurial city and how public-private collaborations was an essential part of this transformation. She has demonstrated how the collaboration between public and private actors in Malmö was conducted through informal personal meetings between the political elite and business sector where common goals were articulated, envisioned and later implemented through formal government planning processes. The informal collaboration between the politicians and the business sector resulted in discourse coalitions between welfare and economic growth ideals which were then institutionalized and materialized into a strong public-private collaboration in Malmö's urban development and planning. This collaboration is justified as the municipality takes on the role as a provider and promoter of welfare and local economic growth. This has led to that actors

from especially the building and housing sector, the IT- sector and consultancy branch have become important partners in urban development in Malmö (Ibid: 2009: 166).

The development of the renowned Western Harbour-district is often described as the project that initiated and marked the economic regeneration and a green trajectory for the city of Malmö (Nylund 2014). During the economic crisis in the 90's there had hardly been any construction of housing in Malmö and with the new vision for the "knowledge city" the local government in Malmö saw an urgent need to stimulate the construction of housing as fast as possible in order to initiate the transformation of the city (Land developer 2022, 16:01). The optimism to build housing and re-develop the city resulted in a strategy to enable and stimulate private developers to build "green housing" in the Western Harbour (Holgerson 2017:165, 211, 240).

When the economic crisis of 2008 came the municipality lowered the prices for land-allocations in the Western Harbour to maintain the profitability for the developers so they could build housing. The city also worked to promote a good relationship and communication with developers and other private actors and to remain open and positive for input from these actors in the urban development process. Structured dialogue-meetings were also introduced in the Western Harbour as a strategy to strengthen the trust and cooperation between the municipality and the developers and to incorporate the developers into the development and planning of sustainable infrastructure (Holgerson 2017:165, 211, 240).

This structured form of dialogue meeting has also been used in the development of other sustainable high-profile areas such as Hyllie, Norra Sorgenfri and now recently in Sege Park. Dialogue meetings in Malmö is a process in which housing developers cooperate with different municipal administrations to develop a new area with sustainable features. The developers are obliged to participate in a dialogue with the municipality as the land allocation contract is signed for the area. The dialogue is essentially meetings between the developers and the municipal administrations where they discuss and plan for the development of the area. Since these meetings take a lot of time and resources from the municipality it is only conducted in special areas in Malmö (Palm & Smedby 2019:3).

Ståle Holgerson (2017:218) argues that working and collaborating with private developers have been an important part in building Malmö's green profile as developers have been allowed and encouraged to invest, initiate, promote and build "green" housing and infrastructure and, most importantly, turn it into profit for themselves and the city's brand. The municipality is seemingly dependent on private developers to build housing and upgrade the urban structure as they possess resources which the municipality doesn't have such as: capital, investment possibilities and the capacity to build (Dannestam 2009:165). The urban development of Malmö has become more than a question of just whom to plan for "but also whom to plan with" (Holgerson & Baeten 2017: 1177).

The increasing role, influence and power for private actors in urban planning in Malmö and the focus on economic growth and city branding in urban policy has led many scholars to talk

about Malmö as a neoliberalized city (Rodenstedt 2014, Baeten 2012, Listerborn 2017, Pries 2020). The next section will discuss critical perspectives on how the urban development in Malmö can be understood as neoliberal process and what this has meant for the development of urban space in Malmö.

2.2. Malmö, a neoliberal city?

Guy Baeten (2012) argues that urban development and planning in Malmö can be understood as a form of neoliberal planning which favours corporate elitist interests and sidesteps social matters, debate, disagreements and disputes while giving promise of building a better city for the whole population. Public goals which do not coincide with the profit maximising ideals of the private sector, such as long term social and environmental goals, are abandoned in the urban planning process and the built urban environment becomes excluding and unjust (Ibid). Baeten maintain that Malmö is not a neoliberal city, neoliberalism has rather transformed the city in different ways and the city is not completely neoliberal since it has not made a clean break from its social democratic past:

> "In the city of Malmö, we can indeed observe a 'variety of neoliberalism' that carries a significant share of social-democratic, modernist elements, as well as Keynesian elements. Neoliberalism, here, too, is first and foremost a restructuring ethos: it believes in the good of the market but that does not automatically imply the implosion of the sphere of collectivity. Malmö's neoliberalisation rises out of modern social democracy but does not constitute a fundamental break with it" - Baeten 2012: 26).

Baeten(2012) have analysed the large- scale development of the city district of Hyllie in Malmö which started in 2007. He argues that this development is a continuation and normalization of the urban planning strategy used in the Western Harbour with a focus on top-down planning, privatization of public land, attraction of wealthy residents and spectacular architecture (Baeten 2012:39). An essential part of this strategy in Hyllie is the transfer of public land to private stakeholders such as housing developers who take on functions in urban planning which have previously been carried out by the public realm such as identifying population targets, planning design and overall aims. The role of the city is reduced to administer and facilitate a good climate for market forces which is considered a good climate for the development of the city (Baeten 2012: 39).

Johan Pries (2020) have further investigated the relationship between Malmö's social democratic rule and neoliberal urban strategies through a historical account of urban planning in Malmö. Pries argues that the welfarist ideals of social government, such as the provision of services aimed at increasing the collective well-being, has been re-articulated into neoliberal ideals where the city tries to become attractive and competitive by planning urban space for desirable and non-desirable residents imbued with certain human capital and "attractiveness". In this sense the city of Malmö plans urban space to accumulate certain human resources. This focus on attracting people with certain human resources in urban planning is often

related to a neoliberal strategy to attract "the creative class" (Listerborn 2017, Pries 2020) The creative class can be understood as highly educated, entrepreneurial, creative and talented people by different means. This class is imagined to be a human resource which can drive urban growth by creating job opportunities and tax revenues in a given space which will also benefit the uneducated and low-income classes. The human resources from the creative class is in this sense believed to generate capital which will trickle down throughout society. In order to develop urban space, or make it grow, planning should therefore seek to create urban environments which attract the creative class (Listerborn 2017: 16).

Carina Listerborn (2017) argues that Malmö´s urban development since the 90´s has been focused on building the "4th urban environment" which entails an urban landscape featuring flag-ship buildings and districts with opportunities for businesses to thrive to attract an entrepreneurial and creative class of residents, as exemplified in the development of the Western Harbour. This strategy was not only aimed at attracting creative residents but also "creative" stakeholders such as entrepreneurs, developers, economists, architects, researchers, planners and trend analysists to come together in different participatory forms to plan for the 4th urban environment.

The focus in urban planning to develop Malmö for the creative class and stakeholders has been argued to produce and worsen the socio-economic divides which are present in the city in the form of segregation, polarisation, increasing income- gaps and violence (Pries 2020, Baeten 2012, Listerborn 2017).

Hoai Tran & Yvonne Rydin (2019) have shown that urban planning in Malmö not necessarily focus on spectacular large scale development agendas that marks the planning of Hyllie and the Western Harbour. The plans for Norra Sorgenfri instead emphasize the construction of open public spaces as a means to create everyday meetings and integration in order to solve the social problems of segregation and polarization in the city. Different types of housing are also planned to attract people with different lifetyles, ages and socio-economic backgrounds. The authors argue that these types of solutions in the built environment are naïve measures to address the social problems and segregation in the city. The type of housing and environment which is envisioned is more likely to attract middle class residents and the "creative class" rather than vulnerable social groups. The authors highlight the conflict and tensions between combining a rhetoric of social integration with economic development as the later implies the construction of commodified physical environments which are exclusive to a certain segments of the citizens (Tran & Rydin 2019:32-34).

2.3. The development in Sege park

Malmö is well renowned internationally for its commitment to sustainable green urban planning and development. The municipality has been appointed as "the most environmentally friendly municipality in Sweden" five times the last decade (Malmö stad

2022) and have also received a number of international prizes and recognitions for its green city profile (Holgerson & Malm 2015). The city's green trajectory is often traced back to the development of the Western Harbour which has become an international attraction for it's spectacular architecture and green housing. Ståle Holgerson & Andreas Malm (2015) discuss how profit maximising ideals and environmental concerns are fused together in the urban development of the Western Harbour. The authors argue that this development is driven by a need from the municipality to address a crisis of capital accumulation with an environmental makeover. A phenomenon which they define as a green fix. The goal with an urban green fix is to attract capital by projecting a green image of the city. Environmentalism is thus used as a means for economic growth and also functions to address the global political demand for commitment to sustainable urban development (Holgerson & Malm 2015). The development of Sege park can be understood to be situated in this green-city branding as it is to become a spearhead sustainability project and storefront for exhibiting the sustainable development in Malmö (Lopez 2021).

The history of Sege park goes back to the 1930's when the area was built into a mental hospital district located in the eastern part of Malmö (Kirseberg). Since the mental hospital operations was moved in 1995 the site has partly been used as a testbed for different eco-tech solutions. In 2012 the municipality decided that the park should be rebuilt into a new residential area and started to work on a comprehensive plan for the area which was approved in 2015. Since 2020 construction has been underway and the future residents are planned to be fully moved in by 2025(Malmö stad 2022c).

In line with the municipalities land allocation strategy municipal land was sold to private housing developers to develop the area. The developers were chosen through a land allocation competition which had a strong focus on sustainability and innovation (Malmö stad 2016). In Sweden municipalities have a planning monopoly which means that they decide where, how and when planning is conducted within their territory. Though municipalities have a strong autonomy when it comes to planning, they still have to incorporate national goals and objectives in their comprehensive plans and follow the Planning and Building Act (Plan och-Bygglagen, PBL) (Nylund 2014: 47). Municipalities do have leverage to choose who they sell their land to through different methods such as price competitions, concept competitions and direct land allocations. Through these different methods of land allocation, municipalities can set the price for the land and place demands on rental levels, the form of housing and also place demands on sustainable development criteria and requirements (SKR 2021:8).

Land allocations have become an important instrument for municipalities in Sweden to push for sustainable housing in sustainability-profiled districts and flagship projects where land is sold from the municipality to private developers (Candel 2021:8). When entering into a land allocation agreement with a municipality in these type of districts private developers often become directly involved in the development and planning of sustainability measures with the municipality (Candel et al. 2021). Since 2015 the PBL restricts municipalities from placing special requirements on the technical properties of private constructions (tekniska särkrav) which go beyond the national standards. This legal block was put in place to create better

conditions for Sweden's growing demand for housing construction by reducing the costs for private companies to build housing. The block has created difficulties for municipalities to implement their urban sustainability goals as they might not be able to see through their ambitions for the built environment in urban development projects. (Candel 2021).

In Sege Park the municipality has been keen on engaging the developers in the development in order to achieve the vision for the park. The developers are obliged to partake in a dialog-process (Byggherredialog) where they are supposed to network, discuss and take decisions together on development matters in the area (Malmö Stad 2016). The municipality initially took responsibility for structuring the dialog-process which started in May 2017. Throughout the process the responsibility for the dialog has shifted to the developers who are now handling it by themselves which is unprecedented when it comes to this form of dialogue in Malmö (Palm & Smedby 2019). The municipality have also had "individual sustainability talks" (Individuella hållbarhetssamtal) with every developer. The aim with these conversations has been to keep track of how well the developers live up to the goals they initially committed to when they were assigned the rights by the municipality to buy land and build in Sege Park (Malmö stad 2018).

The vision for Sege Park puts a strong emphasis on sharing-economy where the residents are supposed to share resources and services to reduce their footprint on the environment, their living costs and to build and strengthen their community (Leonette 2021). The sharing economy is a concept which has spured a great deal of interest in relation to sustainable urban planning in in cities in recent years. It is believed to have the potential to reduce the environmental impact from urban consumption and production, to strengthen social cohesion and to stimulate economic growth, job creation, innovation and entrepreneurship and to brand city images (Voytenko et al. 2021).

The sharing-project in Sege Park is intended to facilitate and enable co-creation between the actors involved in the development and later also the residents. As people start to move into the park, which is estimated at the end of 2022/begining of 2023, the plan is to transform the area into an urban living lab. A key function with the living lab is to measure and evaluate the effect of the different sharing solutions in order to estimate which solutions that might be replicated and scaled up to other development areas, not only in Malmö but also in other cities on a global scale. An important slogan for the development of Sege park is that the area will become a "spearhead" and an international role model for sustainable urban development, and sharing (Leonette 2021).

While the development in Sege park is initiated and formally led by the municipality there is a strong focus on collaboration between the different stakeholders involved. Besides the municipality and the developers this collaboration includes actors from academia, energy companies, a local NGO and a national program for sharing economy called Sharing Cities. The Sharing Cities programme has given financial support for the development of sharing solutions in the park between 2017- 2021.Through this support a business/concept model "Sege parks-modellen" for sharing solutions has been developed. The business-model is a

concept for how the NGO can provide sharing solutions and maintain an area presence to enable co-creation of sharing activities among the residents. The developers have organised themselves into an economic association which will order and procure the services from the NGO (Sharing cities 2021). This association is eventually supposed to be operated by the residents and different housing and tenancy associations in the area (Developer1 2022: 36:43). So far a business- agreement about the provision of sharing services between the developers and the NGO has not been signed. The agreement has been under negotiations since august 2021(NGO 2022 42:43).

3. Theory

Foucauldian analysis has been used by urban scholars to critically examine the ways in which power operates through strategies of planning, to unravel the political rationales shaping these strategies and to problematize the ways in which these operations affect socio-spatial change (Huxley 2018:208). In relation to these critical perspectives the concept of governmentality has prominently been used to scrutinize how neo-liberal political thought and practices have turned the discipline of planning into a market directed enterprise (Allmendinger & Haughton 2012, Davoudi & Madanipour 2013, Huxley 2018: 209, Levanda 2019, Pries 2020).

Neoliberalism has become an arguably dominant political rationale in contemporary western societies. This has also led to what has been referred to as a neoliberalization of planning (Baeten 2018:105). The neoliberalization of planning implies that the development of urban space takes a more market focused approach in which ideals of economic growth are merged into the conventional core of traditional planning practices. Traditionally, as a public institution, urban planning has focused on the improvement of urban space and the life within it. The call for market directed approaches to plan urban space emerged in the 1970's and was promoted as a more effective way to organize planning than through state intervention. Neoliberal planning does not constitute a clear break with traditional urban planning but should rather be understood as a hybrid which gradually transforms planning and the relationship and power-dynamics between the state and the market (Ibid). Neil Brenner & Nik Theodore (2005: 102) argues that neoliberal practices doesn't look the same all over the world but are "articulated through contextually specific strategies". To unravel the particular spatial and temporal dynamics of neoliberal practices they further need to be studied at the local level.

Using governmentality as a theoretical lens this thesis aims to show how government is exercised in Sege Park by attempting to conduct the housing developers and future residents to perform certain actions and behaviours through neo-liberal technologies of government. It also aims to show how planning for a test-bed for sharing in Sege park can be understood as a continuation and development of the neo-liberalization of urban planning in Malmö. The next section will outline Foucault's concept of governmentality "the conduct of conduct" and discuss how governmentality can be used as an analytic instrument, by using Mitchell Deans (2010) governmentality framework, to study how the experimental development in Sege park is governed.

3.1. Governmentality

At his lectures at College de France in 1979 Foucault defined the term governmentality as a concept for understanding how power operates in modern western liberal states.

> The term itself, power , does no more than designate a (domain)* of relations which are entirely yet to be analysed, and what I have proposed to call governmentality, that is to say, they way in which one conducts the conduct of men, is no more than a proposed analytical grid for these relations of power. - Foucault 2008:186

The term governmentality semantically links governing(rule) with mentality (modes of thought) which indicates a relationship between the exercise of power and political rationality. In this sense the exercise of power is informed by a particular political rationale and an analysis of governmentality seek to establish how particular technologies of power are informed by a particular political mode of thought, or several (Lemke 2001: 191). In this sense "technologies" refers to practices, strategies and mechanisms which are a part of the exercise of government. From a governmentality perspective power is exercised by "conducting the conduct of men". This means that rather than forcing individuals to act and behave in a certain way the state, or other governing authorities or actors, guide individuals to certain actions and behaviours by giving them certain options to choose from. Foucault says that "To govern, in this sense, is to structure the possible field of actions for others" (Foucault 1982:789). The possible field of actions is structured as to enable individuals to make "free" choices which can realize a particular behaviour or action that serves a specific end (Foucault 1982:790).

The "conduct of conduct" refers to a form of self-government in which individuals govern and discipline themselves by questioning and regulating their behaviour according to specific norms which express what actions and behaviours that are "good", desirable, aspirational and even righteous to choose (Dean 2010: 19-20). As opposed to the law or disciplinary regulations which prohibits certain behaviours and actions and creates a dual understanding of what is permitted and forbidden.

Government and the exercise of power within governmentality operates through an element of freedom in which individuals are perceived to be, and possibly, perceive themselves to be, free to choose how to act and behave. The perception of freedom creates an indirect confrontation between the governing power and the individual which relieves the relationship from any direct conflicts as opposed to when the governing power use force or coercion to govern (Foucault 1982: 789-90). Government in its wider sense refers to all the different forms of power and strategies that authorities, not just the state, deploy in order to govern individuals (Dean 2010:18). By the use of force, the law, surveillance, discipline or more indirect unconfrontational forms such as technologies of self-government (Foucault 2009: 110).

In order to direct actors to govern themselves the "production of subjects" is a central part of how power operates through governmentality. Foucault describes subjects as an identity from which individuals perceive themselves, the world around them and their place or meaning in this world. This perception shapes how individuals act and behave (Foucault 1982:781). Power operates by producing certain subject-positions or identities with certain attributes, capacities and qualities which can realize the ends to that of which the government seek to accomplish. In this sense power produces governable and malleable subject-positions which are receptible to certain government strategies. If individuals accept these subject -positions and understand themselves and their world accordingly they can become manageable and governable. Foucault maintains that individuals not necessarily accept or conform to subject-positions produced under a specific governmentality. There is always resistance to subject-positions and individuals can behave and act in a counter- conduct to specific forms of power and government (Dean 2010: 21). Individuals are thus understood to be in the position of simultaneously undergoing, exercising and producing power relations. They are the vehicles of power within the netlike organization of societal power-relations (Foucualt 1980:98).

A Foucauldian approach to study how power operates also sees the production of knowledge as an integral part of the power-dynamics in society. Knowledge and power are understood to be linked together by "truth". Knowledge carries assumptions about truth by defining what is right or wrong and good or bad (Foucault 2008:19). Power further operates by producing certain truths and knowledges which inform and reinforce a particular governmentality, in this sense power is productive. Studying power and the mechanisms of power means to study the "politics of truth":

> So, insofar as what is involved in this analysis of mechanisms of power is the politics of truth, and not sociology, history, or economics, I see its role as that of showing the knowledge effects produced by the struggles, confrontations, and battles that take place within our society, and by the tactics of power that are the elements of this struggle(…)This analysis simply involves investigating where and how, between whom, between what points, according to what processes, and with what effects, power is applied. – Foucault 2009:2-3

The different relations in society, for example, the relations of production, sexuality or family are not founded on themselves but founded in relation to each other in a circular way where they are both the effect and cause of each other (Foucault: 2009: 2). In this sense power cannot be reduced to a particular source but has to be understood as always relational and productive.

The next section will discuss neoliberal governmentality and how urban experimentation can be related to neoliberal practices in urban planning.

3.2. Neo-liberal governmentality and urban experimentation

Governmentality is a mode of government which Foucault related to a neoliberal rationality. Thomas Lemke (2000, 2001, 2007) has made a thorough account on Foucault's lectures about neoliberal governmentality and elaborate key features of neoliberal forms of government in contemporary societies: "Neo-liberalism is a political rationality that tries to render the social domain economic and to link a reduction in (welfare) state services and security systems to the increasing call for 'personal responsibility' and 'self-care'"(Lemke 2001:203). Lemke argues that neoliberal government can be understood as direct and indirect forms of intervention by state apparatuses to guide and control individuals. A neoliberal rationality tries to conduct individuals by promoting a congruence between a moral and a rational-economic subject. An essential strategy in this is to render individuals responsible for social risks, welfare and life in society. The role of the state is partly reconfigured from its traditional regulatory role and instead functions to enable collectives and individuals to solve societal problems by actively participating in self-government: "This participation has a 'price-tag': the individuals themselves have to assume responsibility for these activities and the possible failure there of "(Lemke 2001:202). State sovereignty and its power to intervene is not understood here as being reduced but rather displaced from formal to informal technologies of government where new actors take up previous state responsibilities which creates new relations between state, the market and civil society (Lemke 2007:58).

Dean (2010:194) propose 2 technologies of government which are important for neoliberal governmentality, or what he calls advanced liberal government: technologies of agency and technologies of performance.

Technologies of agency acts to transform the status of actors, both citizens, public and private, in order to make them capable of performing certain objectives of government (Dean 2010: 196-99). In this context, agency can be understood as something which is produced for the purpose of a particular regime of government and it relates to the production of subject-formations of a certain governmentality. And there are two types of agency: The first one concerns the different ways in which non-state actors are contracted by the state to perform certain public services through agreements and contracts that states the expected performance from these actors. The other type of agency refers to citizenship and the ways in which empowerment, consultation and negotiation is used to engage and activate citizens and communities to take responsibility for their own risks and become self-managed. The empowerment of citizens can be achieved by a form of pluralism in which targeted citizen groups enter into partnerships with public, private and third sector actors (Dean 2010: 196-99). These actors are also a part of promoting the "responsibilization" of citizens (Barnett et al. 2008: 626).

The Technologies of performance can be understood as the surveillance and evaluation of performance by, for example, setting performance indicators and calculating, measuring and evaluating the performance of a certain actor in order to shape conduct towards an optimization of performance and trust in connection with contracts. While technologies of

agency are deployed to transform actors capacities, the technologies of performance turn these capacities into calculable, comparable and manageable data (Davoudi & Madanipour 2013: 558-559. Technologies of performance are thus deployed to turn individuals into self-managing actors who conduct themselves by self-calculation (Dean 2010: 197-98).

Table 1: Neoliberal technologies of government[1]

Neoliberal technologies of government	Strategies	Examples from Sege Park
Technologies of agency	Private-actors are contracted to perform public services through contract and agreements	Sustainability commitments in Land allocation contract
Technologies of citizenship & Pluralism	Citizens are empowered and consulted to take responsibility for development by engaging in partnerships with private, public or civil society actors	Climate contracts for future residents
Technologies of performance	Evaluations, measurements, surveillance and calculations to conduct actors to self-conduct	Individual sustainability talks to follow up on sustainability commitments

Simin Davoudi and Ali Madanipour (2013) depart from Dean's technologies of government and conceptualize "Localism" as a key strategy in neo-liberal planning. Localism refers to a strategy in which neighbourhoods are targeted and prioritized as local spaces for strategic urban development. Neighbourhood planning or localism is here understood as a process in which communities are mobilized to shape and plan their neighbourhoods by themselves while simultaneously being measured, calculated and evaluated in order to achieve governmental objectives for urban development and planning (Davoudi & Madanipour 2013: 558-559). They argue that this strategy signals "a shift of emphasis from government technologies of performance to technologies of agency, without abandoning the former".

> As such, localism has given the neo-liberal technologies of agency a distinct and explicit spatial dimension in the form of an assumingly well-defined geographical area called neighbourhood. Its manifestation in planning is the assumption that our capacities can be best utilised if we engage in neighbourhood rather than, for example, city or regional or national planning. The technologies of agency are seen as being both reflected in and mobilised through the local space. - Davoudi & Madanipour 2013: 558-559

---

[1] My own table constructed from Dean's definitions of neoliberal technologies of government.

Antony Levanda (2019) discuss how neighbourhoods targeted for urban experimentation similarly can function as strategic locales for neo-liberal planning. Levenda have studied how neoliberal governmentality influence the design and proliferation of urban experimentation in a smart -tech project in a neighbourhood in Austin, Texas. In this project households were targeted for energy efficiency solutions tested by different private companies. In these interventions the residents were integrated as key actors in self-managing their use of energy and promoted as responsible for the potential socio-environmental change from experimentation. The residents who were tested on were largely upper-middle class residents who could afford to live in the neighbourhood and who had an interest in green tech and energy conservation, they were referred to as "early adopters" in the experimentation.

Levanda argue that this form of urban experimentation can be understood as a neoliberal governmentality in which the responsibility for the success of the experiments is placed onto the conduct of individuals, in this case the creative class, while private companies can stimulate their tech-development and profit from the experimentation (Levenda 2019). This can have splintering effects in a city as certain areas become "high valued spaces" for experimentation where certain actors are allowed to participate in urban development while others are excluded (Levanda 2018:59). As noted by Karvonen et al. (2014) urban experiments are often enrolled into dominant urban agendas of neoliberal economic growth which tend to privilege certain actors that are aligned with these perspectives. Evans (2016) argues that a critical account of urban experimentation therefore should try to uncover whose interests are addressed by experimentation and who is invited to experiment?

Urban experimentation can further be seen as a practice which is informed by neoliberal mentalities and strategies which mobilize certain actors to participate in experimentation and which takes the form of strategic locales for sustainable urban development. The next section will outline Dean's(2010) analytical framework for studying governmentality which will be used to answer how urban experimentation is governed in Sege park.

3.3.   Dean's analytical questions for studying governmentality

An essential part of governmentality theory is Foucault's discussion of the art of government as a problematizing activity. He means that in order for something to become governable it has to be constructed and defined as a problem. A critical analysis of government and governmentality identifies how different solutions to a problem are constructed and how these solutions are the result of a specific problematization (Foucault 1984: 389). Problematizations create the necessary frames, the structured field of possibilities, for the possible solutions to a problem. The art of government is initiated as something or someone is constructed and defined as a problem (Nyberg 2017:40-1).

As noted by Evans (2016) urban experimentation can be seen as a mode of problematization through which cities are rendered governable by addressing certain urban "problems" often in response to an urgent need to do induce societal change, as is often the case with climate

change for example. As a mode of problematization urban experimentation frame and dictate how urban life and urban politics are to be conducted and planned in the future. Experimental sites can further be understood as essential spaces for the exercise of power over urban sustainable development in cities (Levanda 2019). To study how this power is exercised and how relations of power are structured from a governmentality-perspective means to study urban experimentation and governance as a problematizing activity.

According to Foucault problematizations are constructed through certain "practical regimes" which are elements in the form of identities, strategies, knowledges and technologies that together constitute the form a certain problem of government (Dean 2010: 30-32). To study and analyse modes of governmentality Dean (2010:40) suggests "an analytics of government" where we must ask "how" -questions in order to reveal the strategies, knowledges, rationalities, identities and agencies which are a part of a problematization of government:

> "To ask ´how´ questions of government, then, is also to ask what happens when we govern or are governed. Crucial to the resultant power relations are the capacities and liberties of the various actors and agencies formed in practices of government. To ask how governing works, then, is to ask how we are formed as various types of agents with particular capacities and possibilities of action".

As discussed in the introduction of this thesis urban experimentation and governance creates new functions and new relations between public and private actors in urban development and planning (Mukhtar-Landgren 2021). To understand how relations of power are arranged through these dynamics means to reveal the capacities, identities and possibilities of action for the actors involved in urban experimentation in Sege park.

Dean proposes 4 analytical questions, or dimensions, which can be used to reveal the regimes of practices of a certain problematization and understand how power operates through government: *The examination of fields of government, The concern for the technical aspects of government, The approach to government at a rational and thoughtful activity* and *The attention to the formation of identities* (Dean 2010: 41-44).

The first dimension, **The examination of fields of government**, concerns the visualization of the necessary fields in which government is to take place, the frames for the problematization. This entails asking how the specific problematization of objects and individuals is described, brought into light, and how it obscures and hides other forms of problematizations. Fields of visibility makes it possible to define the problems which are to be governed, the solutions which are to be implemented and how the relations of power are going to be organized. (Dean 2010: 41). Looking at the development in Sege Park I focus on how experimentation and sharing are framed as solutions to problematizations of climate change, sustainability and affordability of housing in urban development.

The second dimension, **The concern for the technical aspects of government,** concerns the technologies (strategies, tactics, mechanisms, instruments) which are deployed to achieve the

ends of a specific governmentality. Investigating this dimension requires understanding through what means, procedures, instruments, mechanisms, tactics the government of conduct is going to be realized (Dean 2010.42). In this section I will discuss some of the technologies of government which are used to govern the conduct of the developers and the future citizens.

The third dimension, **The attention to the formation of identities,** concerns the different collective and individual identities which are produced by a specific governmentality. This section focuses on which types of persons and identities are present in the problematization and how these identities and their attributes, capacities and statuses are to be transformed to solve the problem. In such a light, one needs to understand the types of conduct that are problematized and how they are to be reformed. While the articulation of identities does not determine how actors will act, they still promote and attach specific expectations of conduct to certain actors (Dean 2010: 43-44). In this dimension I have focused on how the identities of the NGO, the developers and the future residents are promoted and how their attributes, capacities and statuses can realize a healthy and climate neutral life in Sege park and beyond.

Dean's fourth dimension, **The approach to government at a rational and thoughtful activity**, concerns the types of knowledges and truths that informs and are produced by the problematization of government and how these aspects are to be transformed and how they render certain issues governable (Dean 2010: 42-43). Under this theme I analyse the modes of thought/mentalities which underpin and arise from the use of urban experimentation and governance in the development of Sege park.

Table 2: Analytical framework for studying governmentality[2]

Analytical categories/ Dimensions	Questions	Examples
The examination of fields of visibility	What problems are to be solved? How are they to be solved? Whom are to be governed?	Problem: Urgent need to address climate change Solution: Urban experimentation and governance
The concern for the technical aspects of government (Technologies of government)	By what instruments, procedures and strategies is rule accomplished?	Experimentation, data collection, measurements, knowledge production, evaluations
The attention to the formation of identities	What forms of self are presupposed by practices of government? Which transformations are sought?	Innovative and creative partners with capacity to test and experiment different solutions
The approach to government as a rational and thoughtful activity	Which forms of though arise from and inform the activity of governing?	To induce radical societal change and to imagine alternative sustainable futures

The dimensions are seen as interrelated and together reveal the elements of a problematization of government. In this sense the problematizations are not static but constantly being

---

[2] Inspired by Angela Oel's table 2006:189

produced, developed and transformed through the practices of government (Dean 2010:31). As a critical inquiry an analytics of government tries to show how taken-for granted ways of doing things and thinking about them are the result from a certain problematization and a certain organisation of practical regimes (Dean 2010:31).

4. Methodology

4.1. Material

The main material for the thesis has been collected by conducting semi- structured interviews between Marsh and April 2022 with 3 urban planners, a land developer, 4 private housing developers and one representative from the local NGO. The interviews were planned to last for roughly one hour but lasted between 40 min to 2,5 hours depending on who how much time the interviewees had and how much they had to say when answering the interview-questions. The interviews are sources of information regarding the particularities of the development in itself which might not be found in planning documents or other written sources. The interviewees can thus be considered as both informants: providers of information about the research topic and the development process in general, and as respondents: the interviewees thoughts about the research topic and the development process (Dannestam 2009: 46).

Besides the interview's web-page material, primarily from Malmö stad, about the development in Sege Park has been used (Malmö stad 2021, Malmö stad 2022b, Malmö stad 2022c, Malmö Stad 2022d, Leonette 2021) and also planning- and strategic documents such as *Hållbarhetsstrategi för Sege Park* (Andersson et al. 2015), *Markanvisningsprogram för Sege Park*(Malmö stad 2016), *Slutrapport från Sharing Cities*(Sharing Cities Sweden 2021), *Individuella hållbarhetssamtal i Sege Park – förslag till vidare hantering av byggherrarnas intressen*(Malmö stad 2018) and *Anteckningar individuellt hållbarhetssamtal Boklok*(Malmö Innovationsarena 2018) and *Byggherredialogen i Sege Park: –reflektioner två år in i processen* (Palm & Smedby 2019) has been used as material for both the background and the analysis.

A semi- structured interview-style has been adopted to offer a flexibility in the interview, to keep a conversational flow, to increase the depth of the responses and pay close attention to what the interviewee says. This is a way for the researcher to understand how the interviewee frames and understands the world and what the interviewee finds important in explaining a particular social phenomenon (Bryman 2008:438). A semi-structured interview has a list of topics or questions with a focus on the research topic. Questions are not necessarily asked in a specific order but remain flexible to the interviewee's answers, although most of the questions are often handled during the interview (Bryman 2008: 438).

The interview- guide which was used is structured by 6 wide themes which have been developed to identify how the interviewees understand the different aspects of the development- process, their role in the development, the target image for Sege park and how the development process has been governed. These themes are: Introduction,

Testbeds/experiment, Sustainability/sharing, Citizens, Relations and Future. These themes have been enriched with potential sub-questions in order to help out in finding possible angles or questions under the theme which are presumed to be relevant for the respondent's answers during the interview (King et al. 2019: 69-70). The interview-guide has been slightly changed depending on who is interviewed in relation to their role in the development, more questions have also been added during the period of interviewing and analysing. Two standard guides have been used, one for the developers and one for the urban planners (See Section 10 Appendix) .

The block quotes from the interviews which have been used in the analysis have been translated from Swedish to English. The quotes have then been sent to the interviewees to be approved and some quotes have been adjusted according to suggestions from the interviewees. The quotes were sent both in English and in Swedish to the interviewees.

4.2.   Transcribing the interviews

In order to analyse the responses from the interviews they have been recorded and transcribed to text with the consent of the interviewees. The interviews have not been transcribed in full. Instead I have listened to the recordings of the interviews and identified the main parts of interest for my research which were transcribed in full. The parts which have not been relevant for the research have been briefly explained in the transcriptions (King et al 2017:194).

4.3.   Respondents and informants

The 3 urban planners and the land developer whom have been interviewed have been selected as respondents due to their involvement in instances in the development process, such as the land allocation process, the developers dialogue, the sustainability talks and the development of sharing solutions where they have interacted closely with the housing developers and the NGO. The planners work on 3 different departments of the municipality, 2 planners from the Environmental department (Miljöförvaltningen), 1 planner from the Urban building department (Stadsbyggnadskontoret) and one land-developer from the Urban development department (Stadsutvecklingsavdelingen). The 4 housing developers which have been interviewed represent private housing companies which will build different types of housing. 3 of the developers will build condominiums and one will build tenancies. These housing developers have been selected as they had the time to participate in an interview under the timeframe of the thesis. Due to the scope and timeframe of this essay there has not been enough time to contact and interview all the housing developers. This means that the voice of all the developers in Sege Park is not represented.

4.4. Research collaboration

In order to have access to contacts from Malmö Stad and other actors in the development of Sege Park this essay has been written through a collaboration with the municipality. Two other students from SLU writing their master thesis have also participated in this collaboration and interviews and document material have been shared between us. As a part of our agreement with Malmö Stad we have, as far as possible, conducted the interviews together in order to save time for the busy actors involved in the development. This has meant that we have had to combine our interview questions and to some extent compromise between our different questions. This has mainly been the case for me and another student. Since the third student wanted to conduct most interviews alone. Since our research deals with similar topics and questions this has worked out fine and we have been able to get relevant answers for our research. As some interviews have been conducted alone by one of the students the rest of us have been able to access these interviews through, notes, recordings and transcriptions. This allowed us to later conduct interviews with follow-up questions with the same actors. During the interviews we each had certain questions from the interview- guide which we were supposed to ask in order. Since we wanted to remain dynamic to the interviewees answers and ask follow-up questions this order was not always followed but the themes in the interview-guide were generally covered. A downside to doing interviews with other students has been that the interviews have been very long which has increased the burden of transcription. A positive aspect with the collaboration has been that we have been able to discuss different aspects about the interviews which has helped to process and understand the different interviewees answers about the development better. Through the collaboration with Malmö Stad there were also two meetings with 3 planners from the environmental department. In these meetings we, the students, could ask questions about the development in general and also consult the planners about whom might be relevant to interview for our research.

4.5. Situated knowledge

As discussed in section 3.3, analyzing governmentality means to study the practical regimes which are used to govern and the modes of thought and knowledges which inform and are a part of these practices. Practices can be understood as material in that they happen and take place as physical events, actions and behaviors as for example making measurements, doing evaluations, making policy and urban planning etc. They can also be understood as ideational in that they are ways of thinking about the world which structure what can be known, thought and done, by for example framing and thinking about a problem in a certain way. Material and ideational elements are understood to interlink and overlap in a dynamic process that creates the field of operation for government (Dean 2010:41). An essential part of governmentality is further to understand how these material and ideational elements combine and interact to make sense of what happens when we are governed or govern. I therefore see the concept of governmentality to be compatible with a critical realist perspective. Such a perspective stipulates that social reality can be studied by conceptualizing how various material and ideational components combine and interact (Sayer 2000:8-9). From the

perspective of a critical realist epistemology our knowledge of the world is socially constructed. Meaning that when we produce knowledge about the world this knowledge derives from the social context in which we exist. This social context is also related to certain material circumstances which shape our ideas of the world. This being said, our knowledge of the world is not completely relative to our understanding of it. There are unknown happenings and consequences which take place regardless of our understanding of reality. The ontological position from a critical realist perspective acknowledge that the "reality" which we can perceive is not an objective reality but always filtered through a subjective lens (Yucel 2018). As knowledge is understood to be contextually and socially situated this thesis can be understood as a product of my subjective lens and the social context in which I exist. I would therefore like to point to some factors that have influenced this research and the results.

Having lived in Malmö since 2013 in different parts of the city I have witnessed the segregation and polarization which is present in the city. In relation to this observation I find that urban development and planning in Malmö should have a more critical approach to how new neighborhoods are planned and what kind of people the development will actually attract and benefit. Especially in high-profile areas such as Sege Park where the municipality devotes a lot of time and resources. As such my political standpoint is in line with the critical perspectives about Malmö's urban development which are presented in section 2.2. This political standpoint has affected the interviews by trying to uncover how the interviewees relate to inclusion and possible exclusion in Sege park, and also the analysis of the results by presenting answers which confirm or relate to my idea of that Sege park run the risk of becoming an exclusive space. While these aspects create a bias in the research it is also an important part of the critical ambition to problematize practices of planning which may re-produce an unjust and excluding urban environment. This has also included to highlight when the interviewees express critical opinions about the development in Sege park.

A challenge throughout the research process has been to collaborate with Malmö stad while at the same time analyze the development through a critical perspective. By meeting and interviewing city planners, the developers and the NGO the development and planning process is understood to be very complex, difficult and strenuous for many of the actors involved. It is also understood that many of the actors are struggling in the face of structural and organizational constraints to plan for more inclusive and better futures for Malmö's citizens. Becoming aware of these aspects during the research has challenged my own bias and critical inclination and has also helped to nuance the analysis by paying close attention to the transcriptions and what the interviewees say and mean. Since I have worked at Malmö stad before in relation to the development in Sege Park I also had previous knowledge about the development process which has affected how I approached my research topic. This pre-understanding of the dynamics in Sege park has helped me to look deeper into the development and finds angles which otherwise might be overlooked.

4.6. Use of analytical framework

The analysis of the material has been structured by using Dean's (2010) 4 analytical questions of government. This framework has been used since it enables my research to ask analytical and critical questions about how government is exercised to the gathered material and gives a clear structure for presenting the results. The 4 different dimensions can be understood as different analytical categories which are at the same time overlapping and together constitute parts of a problematization of government (Dean 2010:33). Each dimension has been structured with different sub-themes to make it easier to navigate between the different findings under each dimension. The analytical questions presented in Table 1 are also repeated in each dimension to give the findings a clearer connection to the analytical framework.

5. Findings and analysis

5.1. The examination of fields of visibility of government

Analytical questions: What problems are to be solved? How are they to be solved? Whom are to be governed?

5.1.1. A good, healthy and climate-neutral life at a reasonable cost

> I don't work to make it nice for 1500(residents). I work for change and that here we are testing the change. (…) And again, this is a test- bed, we can't just do more of what we're doing and think we're going to have a change that's sustainable (…)[3]

In this quote Planner3 describes that Sege park is supposed to become a spear-head sustainability area, a test-bed, were real change is tested and were urban living and planning will have to break new grounds to achieve a sustainable urban development (Planner3 2022 09:28). Planner 3 means that many sustainability measures in Sweden aren't within the planetary boundaries and mostly designed for the wealthy. And if everyone would live like people do in Sweden it would take many planets to support the planets population. This entails that current urban development is unsustainable and needs to change. The development of a testbed in Sege park is focused on contributing to the concept of "one planet living" (2022:05:38) which permeates that human- kind should live a good life within the resources of one planet (Hållbarhetsstrategin 2015: 6). In Sege park the focus also lies in making a good and sustainable life accessible for more people and that sustainable living should be possible for a reasonable cost (Leonette 2021).

How to achieve this becomes further elaborated when the sharing economy is explained as to how it can contribute to a societal good and also to lower the environmental impact from urban living:

> The sharing economy contributes to reducing emissions through better use of resources. When it happens through citizen engagement, it also provides greater security through better relationships. If we create an increased value for products, a second- hand value, we are also more careful about products. There is then an opportunity to reduce the social cost of, for example vandalism, maintenance, environmental clean-up and the like. In other words, lower expenditure for society. In a holistic perspective, the sharing economy can also

---

[3] Jag jobbar inte för att det ska bli fint för 1500(boende). Jag jobbar för förändringen och att här testar vi förändringen. (…)Och igen det här är en testbädd vi kan inte göra bara mer av det vi gör och tro vi ska få en förändring som är hållbar – Planner3 2022 09:28, 14:05

improve the quality of life for citizens through lower expenditure and increased security.[4]

Here citizen engagement through sharing is framed as a key solution to the problematization of unsustainable urban development. The citizen engagement can create social security and community, and can also have positive effects on individual and societal economy and climate change. This reasoning puts a responsibility on the future community to manage issues of health, security (Dean 2010: 196) and climate change by engaging in sharing. The provision of welfare is addressed by enabling residents to participate in self-government over social risks (Lemke 2001:202). The concept of the testbed and the sharing economy takes a prominent role as a problem- solving activity. These activities are organized as to change and transform the behaviours and actions of the future residents so that they can enjoy a good healthy and sustainable life.

5.1.2. Access to sustainable and affordable housing

Another problematization which makes sharing a solution for urban development in Sege Park is the problem of combining sustainability with affordability: "if it ain't affordable it ain't sustainable". This aspect problematizes that newly built housing, and especially "sustainable housing", is very expensive in Sweden and excludes "most people" (Sharing cities 2021). One planner means that this is a recurring dilemma when it comes to urban development and housing politics, that new housing is costly and will not be available for everyone (Planner 2: 44:53). In the Sharing Cities strategy, a potential solution for the problem of expensive sustainable housing is addressed:

> One way could be to reduce the private spaces and offer more shared spaces at property, block and neighbourhood level. In this way reduce both the rent and the need to own everything. But how do we know that it will actually be housing for more people and not just more housing? This too needs to be monitored and made visible[5]

Planner3 problematizes this reasoning and argues that it is also important to remain critical as to what smaller apartments actually can do when it comes to housing prices:

> And something that I try to bring up, or we try to bring up, is also: will there be more housing, or will there be housing for more people? So again, lifting out and making small housing if they are still very expensive and everything

---

[4] Delningsekonomi bidrar till minskade utsläpp genom bättre nyttjande av resurser. När det sker genom engagemang från medborgare ger det också en ökad trygghet genom godare relationer. Om vi skapar ett ökat värde för produkter, ett andrahandsvärde, är vi också mer rädda om produkterna. Då finns det möjlighet att minska samhällskostnaden för till exempel vandalisering, underhåll, miljösanering och liknande. Det vill säga lägre utgifter för samhället. I ett helhetsperspektiv kan delningsekonomi också ge en ökad livskvalitet för medborgaren genom lägre utgifter och ökad trygghet. – Sharing cities 2021:4

[5] Ett sätt skulle kunna vara att minska de privata ytorna och erbjuda fler delade ytor på fastighets, kvarters- och områdesnivå. På så sätt kan man sänka såväl hyran som behovet av att äga allt själv. Men hur vet vi att det faktiskt blir bostäder för fler och inte bara fler bostäder? Även detta behöver följas upp och synliggöras. – Sharing cities 2021:6

becomes very expensive, it only becomes more housing for those who can afford and not for those who are far away from the housing market.[6]

As there are no guaranties for smaller apartments or housing to provide affordable housing it is the costs of living which sharing can potentially reduce and make Sege park more accessible for more people. As the same planner says:

> In Sege Park we want to make it possible for everyone to live sustainably (a good and healthy life at a reasonable cost), not just the green upper class, who can afford newly built housing prices. We address this by lowering the cost of living, since we won't be able to target the high cost for housing. We investigate this by using the sharing economy as a tool. We believe that if it's not affordable it's not sustainable[7]

Sharing is here understood as a tool to even out the gap between those who cannot afford newly built housing and those who can. Those who cannot afford, that is to say those who aren't "the green upper class", will have to engage in sharing to lower their living costs and thus be able to live in Sege Park. What remains obscured and hidden in this reasoning is the cost of sharing, the price tag of participation and self-management *(Lemke 2001:202). What kind of work will the residents actually have to do to lower their living costs to manage and even out the prices of housing? How much unpaid sharing would a resident have to do in order to lower their living costs? Planner 4 & 3 had no answers to these questions but explained that there is no knowing what will work and how it will work and that's why it's so important to experiment, to be transparent about it and to communicate the learnings for future urban development to achieve a societal change (Planner 3 & 4 2022). The conduct which is envisioned in the park is further a conduct which is to be conformed to the prices for housing. This follows a neo-liberal rationality where urban development is imagined to change society and social life within the frames of the market (Lemke 2001: 203).

The sharing-model for Sege park which has been developed by the NGO and the developers is seen as a potential new way of conducting sustainable urban planning: "Another expected effect is that this way of planning for a new district could become a model for the development of other residential areas and that Sege Park will also become an international leading example"[8]. In this sense it is not only the behaviours of the future residents which is

---

[6] Så också nått som jag försöker lyfta eller vi försöker lyfta I alla sammanhang är också: Blir det fler bostäder, eller blir det bostäder för fler? Därför igen, att lyfta ut och göra små bostäder om dom ändå är svindyra och allting blir jättedyrt så är det bara fler bostäder för dom som har råd och inte dom som står långt bort från bostadmarknaden. – Planner3 2022 47:57

[7] Det här hur vi adresserar då att det (sege park) ska bli för alla, alltså det gröna folkhemmet, istället för att göra grön akupunktur för den gröna överklassen eller hållbar akupunktur. Då har vi känt: Jamen det ända vi känner att vi kan påverka just i det här, är ju istället för bostadskostnader så är det levnadskostnader och det är där vi ser delning som något att undersöka(The quote in english was reworked and translated by the interviewee) – 3 2022 46:26

[8] En annan förväntad effekt är att detta sätt att planera för en ny stadsdel ska kunna bli en förebild för utvecklingen av andra bostadsområden och att Sege Park även ska bli ett internationellt ledande exempel - Sharing Cities 2021: 7

going to be changed but also "the way of planning". This "way" entails that developers and civil society take on new functions and responsibilities when it comes to urban planning. One planner explains that the role for the municipality is to facilitate and support these actors in the process in order to address societal challenges in the development of Sege park (Planner3 2022: 48:47). As will be shown in the next themes this facilitating and supporting role requires the municipality to govern both the developers and the future residents towards a certain conduct.

5.2. The concern for the technical aspects of government

Analytical questions: By what instruments, procedures and strategies is rule accomplished?

5.2.1. Conducting the developers to become responsible, innovative and trustworthy

In the land allocation programme the municipality presented the vision and overall goals for Sege Park. Based on this vision and goals the developers who were interested to build in the area wrote a formal application where they presented and stated their goals and commitments for their projects in the park. The different applications were then compared and evaluated by the municipality who then selected those developers who were granted a land allocation contract.

The municipality has no legal means to give the developers penalties if they don't commit to the stated goals, except for technical building standards which go under the PBL. Instead, the municipality reliy on its role as land allocator to evaluate the performance of the developers for upcoming land allocation competitions (Land developer 2022, 23:02), and, by engaging in a dialogue with the developers were they try to consult, encourage and explain to the developers that following their commitments is a good thing for the development of the park (Planner2 2022 1: 10:15).

Individual sustainability talks
To steer the developers to comply with their commitments in the allocation-contract the municipality use dialogue through "Individual sustainability talks" (Individuella hållbarhetssamtal). The sustainability talks are also used as a means to build a closer relationship with the developers, to discuss the developer's ambitions, what challenges they face, what their strong and weak points are, how they can further develop or improve their ambitions, goals and express what they may need from the municipality to be able to reach their goals (Malmö Innovationsarena 2018). The talks are documented and followed up by the municipality. Since 2018 there has been 3 talks with each of the developers held by three representatives from different municipal administrations (Planner 2 2022 1:07:05). The latest one was a survey with questions about how the developers saw their own performance in the project in relation to their goals. Planner2 explains these talks as a strategy to make the developers aware that their commitments to the goals in Sege Park are not forgotten. That it is a matter of trust since the land was sold to the developers based on their stated ambitions and

that the municipality will be disappointed if the developers don't commit (Planner2 2022 1:07:05-1:11:11)

This strategy resonates with Dean's (2010) definition of neoliberal technologies of performance. The sustainability talks can be understood as a form of surveillance and evaluation which is intended to shape the developers conduct towards an optimization of performance and trust. The sustainability talks are also supposed to turn the developers into self-governing actors which express, evaluate and develop their own ambitions. The developers are expected to conform their conduct as they may need to compete for future land allocations.

The process of selecting developers for land allocation, based on previous experience in other projects, is an informal process, undocumented and unstructured, where planners discuss and weigh their previous experience about certain developers. One Land developer acknowledges that there is a risk that these discussions become dependent on the personal opinions and experiences of the planners but maintain that this risk is no worse than other aspects of doing evaluations (Land developer, 23:47-25:33). Other planners, at other departments, explain that they think that the power to allocate land gives the municipality leverage to place harder demands on the developers during the development, however they remain unsure as to what extent this is actually done in practice and how it is done (Planner2 1:1:11 & Planner3 06:47 2022).

In the interviews some of the developers acknowledge that the land allocation competition is a powerful tool for the municipality to govern the development and to raise demands on the developers during the development -process (Developer 2022 1,3). One developer explains that there is an important gain in performing well in the eyes of the municipality for upcoming land allocation competitions and that the sustainability talks have been a good way to understand how the municipality works and what they want from the developers (Developer1 2022: 1:03:22). One developer is however surprised that the municipality haven't been tougher when it comes to raising demands on the developers during the development-process. The developer says that the municipality is " sucking up"(fjäskar) to the developers too much instead of governing and placing demands and that it seems like the municipality is very dependent on the developers for the development (Developer4 2022, 40:11).

While the technology of performance could be seen as a way for the municipality to govern in the absence of legal power to place demands and induce penalties it could also be understood as a way to govern in the face of neoliberal politics where market actors are seen as essential actors for achieving urban development and should be given resources and a freedom of action rather than restrictions (Baeten 2018:105). This is also related to previous planning practices in Malmö where "good" public/private relationships are promoted and flexible policies for market actors are implemented (Holgerson 2017, Dannestam 2009). These dynamics becomes especially apparent in the other technology of government the "developers dialogue" (byggherredialogen).

The Developers-dialogue
The municipality initially set the agenda and conducted the dialogue -meetings in order to frame the target image for Sege Park. This responsibility has gradually been shifted to the developers who now conduct the dialogue meetings themselves:

> Initially, the city was the main driving force in the dialogue and raised issues that were important for the common understanding and development of the area, based on the target image for Sege Park. Later in the process, we decided together with the developers that the agenda for the meetings would instead be based primarily on their needs and what they saw as necessary for them to make various joint decisions to move the process forward[9]

A land developer explains that there has been an ambition to plan the dialogue-meetings together with the developers to make them feel an ownership in the development process (Land-developer 2022, 20:15). The land-developer means that the most important aspect from the developers dialogue is to bring the municipality and the developers closer to each other, to understand each other better and to learn from one another for future urban development (Land developer 2022: 32:39).

By initiating the dialogue and setting the frames for its structure and vision, and also initially supervising it, the municipality tries to create a deliberative and participatory structure in which the developers are supposed to mobilize themselves into a team. Planner3 says that the dialogue has been a tool to make the developers see each other as team-players rather than competitors. And to make them understand that they will benefit from working together and that this will add value for everyone in the process (Planner3 2022, 25:04). Giving the developers a freedom of action is also considered an important part of the innovative process in the dialog therefore there should not be to many and strict demands on the developers which might hamper a freedom of action and creativity in the development process (Land developer 2022, 28:57). Another strategy to build trust, team spirit and inspiration has been to go on two field-trips to "sustainable cities", one that went all the way to Amsterdam where the developers and planners together visited different areas in the city which had a focus on sustainability (Planner3 2022 12:45).

The developers dialogue can be understood as a technology of agency (Dean 2010). It is structured as to enable the developers to change and develop their status and capabilities as individual competitors into the status of an entrepreneurial collaborative group which can produce innovative solutions for the test-bed. This has very much come true since the developers, through the dialogue, have organized themselves into an economic association which they operate independently. This also means that the developers discuss and make

---

[9] Initialt i byggherredialogen så var det i huvudsak staden som höll i taktpinnen och lyfte upp frågor som vara viktiga för den gemensamma förståelsen och utvecklingen av området, med utgångspunkt i målbilden för Sege Park. Senare i processen så bestämde vi tillsammans med byggaktörerna att dagordningen för mötena istället i första hand skulle utgå ifrån deras behov och vad de såg behövdes för att de skulle kunna fatta olika gemensamma beslut för att föra processen framåt - – Planner2 2022 1:01:05

decisions about the development in the park which the municipality have no insight or say in. While the dialogue functions to govern the developers it also functions to give them more power in urban planning. The focus on strengthening of the public- private relationships enables the developers to efficiently articulate what they want and need from the municipality.

5.2.2. Conducting the future residents to share

In Sege Park's case, A key strategy to enable sharing lies in turning the park into a living lab where the residents are involved in developing sharing solutions through dialog and collaboration with the municipality, the developers, the NGO and a researcher from Malmö University. As the primary provider of the sharing services in the park the NGO is an essential actor in this development. The NGO's approach is not just to develop services but also to work with the social infrastructure in the area and to activate the inhabitants so that they take part in the creation of sharing solutions and services:

> (…)very much is about activation when it comes to things like this. You can have a great range of different sharing services but if you don't work with activation, nobody will use them anyway. So that's why we started to talk to some of the people who had signed up for the different houses.[10]

The NGO has conducted interviews with potential future inhabitants and the students in the student housing in the park to establish what kind of expectations there are when it comes to sharing solutions and community-building. The municipality will also have one planner from the environmental administration who will work together with a researcher from Malmö University to engage in dialogue with the future residents about motivation for sharing. These strategies to empower, consult and activate the future residents towards a conduct of sharing can be understood as neoliberal technologies of citizen agency and pluralism (Dean 2010: 194). By entering into a partnership with the NGO and the municipality the residents are supposed to be mobilized into a self- managed sharing-community. The performance of the residents when it comes to sharing and climate impact is also planned to be measured, evaluated and communicated to the residents.

One strategy which is being discussed as a potential tool to activate citizens, to investigate their motivation for sharing, measuring the effects from sharing and also to share knowledge about sharing is the use of climate contracts. Planner4 explains that the climate contracts can be signed by those residents who are interested in changing their lifestyle into a more sustainable mode of living:

> It is again a thing that should be, so to speak, enabling if you feel that: I would like to try and get help to be able to live a good life and healthy life within the

---

[10] (…) väldigt mycket handlar liksom om aktivering när det handlar om sådana här saker. Man kan ha jättebra utbud av olika delningstjänster men om man inte jobbar med aktivering så kommer ingen använda sig av dom ändå liksom. Så att vi började höra väldigt mycket med dels folk som hade satt upp sig på intresseanmälningar på olika hus. – NGO 2022 32:23

limits of the planet. Then there is a platform that you can become a part of and evaluate how it goes and so on[11]

Residents will be encouraged to sign climate contracts as they move in. The climate contracts will also incorporate the IVL- measurement tool which has been developed through the sharing cities project[12]. This measurement tool will be used for predicting and measuring the climate performance from different sharing solutions. These data are to be used to see which measures that have an effect on different "climate-classes" or "avatars" behaviour and climate performance. The different avatars represent households with different types of climate - conduct ranging from "sharing is scary" to "best in the class" (Sharing Cities 2021:11).

Another strategy which is being discussed in the developers economic association (DEA) is to have a digital-app for the whole neighbourhood where the different sharing functions of the park can be overviewed and accessed by the residents (Developer2 2022, 33:34). This app could also function to compare the sharing/climate performance between the different estates and even at an individual level (Developer1 2022, 29:56). This is seen as a way to encourage the residents to perform a sustainable conduct. Developer1 explains that the app could be a way to communicate to the residents and for example say: "(…) right now you have been super good, now you have saved so much water. What if you shower this much shorter, and so on. So we want to try to encourage people to live sustainably but we don't want to force them to"[13].

The climate contract and the neighbourhood- app will be used to articulate and communicate desirable/undesirable performance to the residents. These technologies operate through an element of freedom (Foucault 1982: 789-90) where participation is a choice of volunteering to be measured, calculated and evaluated in order to become informed of one's performance and conduct oneself to a healthier, climate-neutral and good life. The plans for the neighbourhood- app could be seen as more intrusive technology since it will also be connected to other more practical functions in the area and information about the sharing functions. Following what Davoudi and Mandanipour (2013) discuss as localism, conducting the future residents in Sege Park is to be achieved through their mobilization towards shaping and planning the neighbourhood, while simultaneously being measured, calculated and evaluated. The activation of the residents is essential in order to enable them to choose and volunteer to live a good, affordable and climate neutral life.

---

[11] Det är ju återigen en grej som liksom ska vara så att säga möjliggörande att om man känner: Jag vill gärna prova på och få hjälp med att liksom kunna då leva ett gott och hälsosamt liv inom planetens gränser så liksom finns det en plattform där man kan ingå och utvärdera hur det går och sådär. (The quote in english was reworked and translated by the interviewee) Planner4 2022 10:27

[12] This information was given through a mail-conversation with Planner4

[13] (…) just nu har ni vart superduktiga nu har ni sparat såhär mycket vatten tank på att om ni duschar såhär mycket kortare? Så jah! Så att vi vill ju försöka uppmana folk till att leva hållbart men vi vill inte tvinga dom till det. - Developer1 2022, 29:56

5.3.   The attention to the formation of identities and subject-positions.

Analytical questions: What forms of self are presupposed by practices of government? Which transformations are sought?

5.3.1. The responsible and innovative developer

As discussed before, the developers are seen as capable actors which can be encouraged through different mechanisms to become responsible, trustworthy, creative, innovative and collaborative agents and achieve the objectives of government, see 5.2.2. These traits are clearly defined and stated in the land-allocation program for Sege Park:

> In order to achieve the objectives of Sege Park The City of Malmö has developed a sustainability strategy. The strategy is primarily an agreement between the municipal administrations on the measures that and who is responsible for them. But to achieve the objectives, we will also need to involve you, the developer. It is important that you have commitment to the issues and that you feel have the skills and experience to contribute. Your innovative capacity and your willingness to contribute to the development is important (…)You as a developer should therefore be prepared to enter into a cooperative organization and be able to contribute your know-how to the project.[14] –

The developers are expected to take responsibility for their commitments, to work together and to provide solutions for services in the park. As competitive market actors the developers are also understood to have capabilities that can be transformed: through competition they can be ambitious while collaborating with other developers in to produce sharing solutions. The developers economic rationale, which means their concern for cost, investments and capital return transforms them into accountable and committed actors, reinforcing a neoliberal rationality where the view of a congruence between a moral and economic subject is promoted (Lemke 2001:201).

The developers are to become more than just builders in Sege park they are also to become committed and responsible for sustainable urban development and to provide welfare by building an infrastructure for sharing. To achieve a "sustainable change" in the face of neoliberal urban politics where municipal land is sold to private developers and there are limited policy instruments to govern, the developers further need to be promoted as responsible, trustworthy and innovative subjects. As discussed by Holgerson (2017) and Dannestam (2009) the promotion of private developers in urban development in Malmö is not

---

[14] För att målen för Sege Park ska kunna uppnås har Malmö stad arbetat fram en hållbarhetsstrategi. Strategin är i första hand en överenskommelse mellan de kommunala förvaltningarna om vilka åtgärder som ska genomföras och vem som ansvarar för dem. Men för att uppnå målen kommer vi även att behöva involvera dig som är byggherre. Det är viktigt att du har engagemang för frågorna och att du känner att du har kompetens och erfarenhet att bidra med. Din innovative förmåga och din vilja till att bidra till utvecklingen är betydelsefull. – Malmö stad 2016:9

a new phenomenon and relates to an intimate relationship between the economic and political elite in Malmö which has been developed since the 90's.

5.3.2. NGO- The spider in the web

One land developer describes the NGO as "the spider in the web" when it comes to the sharing solutions and services in the park (Land developer, 2022 54:35). The NGO is a non-profit organisation and has previously been working with an initiative in Malmö to combine social sustainability with bike-reparations by creating spaces where unaccompanied refugee youths can learn how to work with bicycle repairing (Malmö stad 2022d). The NGO is promoted as a cohesive and multifaceted actor that can provide both social, economic and physical infrastructure for the sharing solutions in the park (Planner4 2022, 15:26, Planner3 2022, 38:59). Furthermore, the NGO is depicted as a social enterprise that can spread, link and expand the services and solutions produced in the park to other areas in the city, as Planner4 explains when asked about if there is a risk that the park could become an exclusive world of it's own:

> "Well, what can I say, it's a strength that it's a world of its own because it's easier to create a local culture in a more enclosed area as you can see in Kirseberg and in general in places that are a bit more isolated. But then you have the segregation part so to say and that the ideas might stay there but it's a lot of the work that goes on with, I mean the NGO, for example, as a social enterprise really wants to use Sege park as a test- bed and want to be able to take the ideas to work in processes in like new urban development areas as a whole(...)[15]

The possible problem of segregation and entrapment of ideas and sharing-conduct within Sege park can be solved by the NGO's aims to expand social and sharing solutions beyond the borders of Sege park. If Sege park becomes a world of its own it can still provide development to other areas through the NGO. The NGO acknowledge that they have an ambition to grow and to develop their solutions further in other urban areas (NGO 2022, 1:19:06). They have started to work with the sharing-model developed in Sege Park in other newly produced areas where the residents are a more "purchase-strong" socio-economic group. Their ambition is however to work with these solutions in other areas which are not necessarily newly built (NGO 2022, 42:43).

The developers also express their hope that the NGO's business model is successful and grow to provide solutions outside of the park (Developer 1, 2, 3,4 2022). There is however a need

---

[15] Nämen vad ska man säga, det är en styrka att det är en egen värld för att det är lättare att skapa en lokal kultur i liksom ett mer inringat område och att så det kan man se ju på Kirseberg liksom, rent allmänt på platser som är lite grann mer isolerade. Men då har du ju också segregrationsdelen liksom och att idéerna kan stanna där men det är ju mycket av det arbetet som går ut på med, alltså jag menar Drevet som samhällsaktör vill ju verkligen använda sp som en testbädd och liksom vill ju kunna ta idéerna till att jobba i processer i liksom nya stadsutvecklingsområden som helhet(…)(The quote in english was reworked and translated by the interviewee)- Planner4 2022, 27:29

to first focus on the main target group which are the residents in Sege Park. One developer explains that since the economic association pay for the NGO's services it is the developer's customers, their residents, whom must always come in first hand. If people from other areas wants to enjoy the services it is up to the NGO, if they have the opportunity and time to spare, to see to that (Developer2 2022, 31:21). Developer2 says that there have been some concerns among other developers that the NGO might get too much profit from the sharing-services if people from other neighbourhoods also use/buy these services. Since the developers will finance the first year of the NGO's business some are concerned that the NGO can profit from their investments. This has put some breaks on the negotiations between the NGO and the developers (Developer2, 35:58).

The NGO functions as a link for the provision of sharing services from the developers to the future residents in Sege park. The developers indirectly become providers of a kind of welfare service which also strengthens their profile as responsible actors in urban development. As a social enterprise, the NGO links the economic actors(the developers) with civil society and the social realm in order to enable urban development and welfare provision. A potential glitch in this relationship is however the relationship between the developers and their customers. As the NGO already possess the capabilities and agency which the municipality is promoting they are not seen here as an actor which needs to be conducted.

5.3.3. Sharing subjects: "Best in the class" or "Sharing is scary"

One of the key solutions for solving the problem of one planet living and affordable housing lies in conducting the future citizens to a sustainable behaviour. This view is based on the premise that residents need to engage themselves and participate in the development of, especially, sharing solutions. As discussed in section 6.2 this involves strategies such as pluralism and digital measurements to activate the citizens.

The digital measuring model, see 6.2, p32, which is going to be tested in the park features 3 categories or "avatars" which articulate the expected and desirable conduct from the future citizens. The model will be used to identify/predict what effect different sharing solutions/services and individual choices will have for CO_2-emissions in the area. These avatars represent categories of choices and behaviours which are structured as desirable and undesirable (Dean 2010: 19-20). The description of the model states that the calculations will be based on solutions that the residents themselves can control (Sharing cities 2021). In this sense it is up to the residents to conduct themselves by calculating their climate performance and adjust their performance/conduct to improve their sharing-profile.

Avatar	Transport	Bostad	El och värme	Mat	Prylar
"Bäst i klassen"	Reser endast kollektivt	Liten boyta, delar utrymmen + klimatsmart byggande	Har ursprungs-märkt el och fjärrvärme	Äter helt vegetariskt	Delar elektronik, kläder och möbler
Medelsvensk	Genomsnittliga resvanor för en svensk	Genomsnittlig boyta för en svensk + klimatpåverkan för ett standardbyggprojekt	Genomsnittlig el- och fjärrvärmeförbru kning för en svensk	Äter som en medelsvensk	Delar inga prylar
"Sharing is scary"	Kör bara egen bil	Stor boyta och genomsnittlig klimatpåverkan för Sege park	Fjärrvärme och solceller enligt mål för Sege park	Äter som en medelsvensk	Delar inga prylar

Tabell över Avatarer och mätområden, IVL

Figure 1: Sharing cities 2021:11

The type of person who can become a sharing-subject or "best in the class" or experience the good life is one who is interested in doing and discover new things, people and relationships, as one planner puts it:

> It is common that most people are used to owning things but perhaps less accustomed to sharing things outside their immediate relationships. And that it can lead to interesting experiences, if one is interested in general in doing new things and discovering things. I think that the sharing economy, that there is a lot of interesting aspects in that. A good life for those who find it interesting to try new things and getting to know new people and that can be trying out completely new things that you wouldn't have thought of otherwise (…)[16] – Planner4 2022, 02:26

The "good life" is thus facilitated for a particular type of person who is interested in trying out new things and to make new acquaintances. When discussing those type of persons who do not have the sharing-qualities or who might not want to or be able to engage in sharing Planner4 says that there is a need to further understand how these persons think, using dialogue, and come up with solutions that can be adjusted to their needs (Planner4 2022, 08:09). Planner3 means that it remains to be seen how "sharing is scary" will be conducted but that the power of information and to show how sharing can become possible through measurements is a key factor to enable more people to engage in sharing and the development of sharing solutions (Planner3 2022, 41:16).

---

[16] Det är vanligt att de flesta människor är vana vid att äga saker men kanske mindre vana att åtminstone utanför sina omedelbara närmsta relationer dela saker. Och att det kan leda till intressanta upplevelser, om man är intresserad allmänt av att göra nya saker och att upptäcka saker så tänker jag att delingsekonomi att det finns mycket intressant i det. Ett gott liv för den som tycker att det är intressant med att prova nya saker och att lära känna nya människor och det kan ju vara att testa på helt nya grejer som man inte hade tänkt på annars(…)– Planner4 2022, 02:26

Those who possess or conform to the qualities of sharing -conduct can also inspire others to follow suit and even bring sharing-conduct to new arenas. Planner4 says that those who learn to share in Sege Park can spread their sharing experience and knowledge to other parts of the city when they move:

> "(…)the services are not just available for those who live in Sege Park, even if they are the main target group. But I mean Sege Park is not a closed neighbourhood, it's available, and I think people will move as well and hopefully maybe take with them the experiences and the opinions that you get from having lived in an area like that and hopefully kind of influence the new housing situation you're in"[17]

The sharing testbed in Sege Park will then hopefully supply/produce sharing-ambassadors which will move to other parts of the city were sharing-conduct and societal change can be further spread. By becoming a sharing- subject the residents can also conduct the conduct of others. They become vehicles of change, the bearers of desirable experiences and knowledges which can inspire others to want to be the same, to enjoy the good life.

5.3.4. Target-groups for future sharing subjects - The sharing class

The NGO was asked in the interview about whom the future residents which they consult are and what their socio- economic status is. The NGO explains that they have mostly talked to future residents who will live in condominiums and could be seen as middle-class with "a bit of purchasing power":

> But either way, it feels a bit middle-class because it's people who somehow still can afford to buy a condominium, for example. But still people who might want to live smaller, it may also be for cheaper reasons that they want to do so. But it is a group that in some way has, well has a bit of purchasing-power compared to at least some areas in Malmö that it is not…We have begun to work a lot with other areas since we developed what was then called the Sege-parks model, but now perhaps is more the Drevet- model. But then we are in areas where you can talk about a group with much more purchasing power.[18]

---

[17] (…) tjänsterna är ju inte bara tillgängliga för dom som bor i sp, framförallt är det ju, dom är huvudmålgrupp liksom men jag menar sp är ju inte ett stängt område utan det är ju tillgängligt och så och att jag tänker att människor kommer att flytta liksom och förhoppningsvis kanske ta med sig dom upplevelser, erfarenheter och åsikter som man får av att ha levt i ett sånt område och förhoppningsvis liksom påverka den nya bostadssituationen man är i. (The quote in english was reworked and translated by the interviewee) - Planner4 2022 27:29

[18] Men antingen, men det känns nog lite medelklassigt känns det väl för det är ju personer som på något sätt ändå har råd att köpa en bostadsrätt tex. Men ändå folk som åtminstone vill bo lite mindre, det kan också vara av billigare skäl som de vill de också så. Men det är ju en grupp som på något sätt ändå är, amen är lite köpstark liksom kanske jämfört med iaf en del områden i Malmö att det inte, vi jobbar ju har börjat jobba mycket med andra områden också sen vi utvecklades det som då kallades Sege parks- modellen men som nu kanske är mer Drevet-modellen. Men då är vi ju i områden där man pratar om en mycket mer köpstark grupp. – NGO 2022 41:16

The NGO further explains that most of these people live in a villa outside of town and they are a part of a villa-association where there is no engagement among the members of which they are tired. Many also say that they see living in Sege park as a chance to live without a car which they feel forced to have since they have summer houses to go to and therefore they would want to be a part of a car-pool. Many are interested in cultivation and recycling and are prepared to run or partly run different sharing services (NGO 2022 38:44). The profile of these residents can be understood as a form of "creative class" which has been similarly promoted in previous development projects in Malmö (Listerborn 2017, Baeten 2012, Tran & Rydin 2019). The creative class in Sege park or the "sharing class" are however not supposed to generate capital which will trickle down but rather a trickle down of a conduct of sharing which will enable a sustainable and affordable living in the park and in other areas. The sharing class engagement, commitment, knowledge and socio-economic status are capabilities which will benefit those who aren't as committed to sharing or doesn't know how in the park or in other urban areas. The sharing-class's capabilities will also benefit the developers and the municipality as they perform sustainable behaviours and actions which cement the sustainable profile and helps to increase the attractiveness of the park. The sharing class can be understood as "early adopters" (Levanda 2019) in the experimentation. Their capabilities gives them the privilege to be the first ones to participate in the development of the sharing solutions and since they will spread sharing- conduct to other residents this privilege is also justified.

5.4. The approach to government as rational and thoughtful activity.

Analytical questions: Which forms of though arise from and inform the activity of governing?

5.4.1. Urban experimentation and governance understood as a progressive and necessary urban development

The testbed in Sege park is not only a way to "test change" but also a way to show the will to test change. Planner2 explains that the park was labelled as a testbed in order to show that the municipality tries to do things differently:

> I think that there is absolutely a huge benefit that it was expressed that Sege park would be a test- bed initially in connection with the Sustainability strategy. That says something about the fact that we want to dare to do this, try to do things slightly differently and dare to put emphasis on these issues.[19]

---

[19] Jag tycker absolut att det finns en stor nytta med att man tidigt i processen, i hållbarhetsstrategin, gav uttryck för att Sege Park skulle va en testbädd. Det säger ju att här vill vi våga göra, försöka göra saker något annorlunda och lägger vikt vid de här frågorna- Planner2 2022 40:38

The testbed further functions as a site where alternative sustainable futures can be envisioned and planned (Karvonen et al. 2014). This speaks to the municipalities strategy to brand itself as a progressive and attractive knowledge city (Dannestam 2009) and a green city (Holgerson & Malm 2015), and, to show that it's willing to take action on sustainability issues (Karvonen et al 2016). This branding has indeed been successful as the municipality has been appointed Sweden's most environmentally friendly municipality 2021 and 2022. In both these appointments the focus on testbed-development is promoted as an essential and progressive part of the city's work towards a more sustainable urban development (Malmö stad 2022b, 2021).

As discussed by Holgerson & Baeten (2017: 1177) the question of "whom to plan with" is an important question for the municipality. The close collaboration and building of partnership between the municipality, the business sector and the citizens is also framed as a progressive trait of the sustainable development in Malmö as a whole (Malmö Stad 2021, 2022). The increasing influence from non-public actors in urban planning and development is also promoted as a necessary development. The problematization of "one planet living" confirms that change has to be tested, that society urgently have to find new and innovative ways to plan and live in urban spaces to find a sustainable existence. In this sense there is an urgent need to be creative and innovative in urban development and planning which also means that non -public actors promoted with these capacities (the responsible developer, the sharing class and the NGO-spider in the web) become legitimate collaborators in Sege Park. And, as discussed in 5.1, "they way of planning" also needs to change to enable "real" societal change. Through these assumptions urban experimentation and experimental governance become essential modes of government to open up urban space for "radical" change (Eneqvist et al. 2021) and for certain actors (Levanda 2019).

5.4.2. Testbed- mentality and the production of knowledge

Since the experimentation with sharing is uncertain and open-ended the different sharing solutions have to be measured and evaluated to see if they have an effect (Sharing cities 2021:4). Planner 4 & 3 explains that there are no answers as to what will actually work, and the question remains if and how the future residents will share and whom will share and if they can reduce their costs of living? The important aspect in this is to be transparent about what works/doesn't work and communicate it further in order to achieve a societal change in future development (Planner3 2022 41:48, Planner4 2022 08:39).

With the promise of generating important knowledge which can provide insight on how to develop urban space in the future the testbed becomes a legitimate concept for the municipality to invest into. It is a progressive development even if it is uncertain what the consequences will be since the consequences will be "communicated" further into the future. This mentality renders the problem of one- planet- living and the affordability of sustainable housing into a matter of measurements, calculations and evaluation. As described in the sharing cities strategy:

The math is clear, reducing non-renewable production reduces emissions. But how do we know this is happening? That there is a reduction? This needs to be measured and monitored. Only then can we who work to create the conditions for the sharing economy know if it is effective in achieving the goals of living within the planet's limits (…) But how do we know it will actually be housing for more people and not just more housing? This too needs to be monitored and made visible[20]

In this sense societal change does not necessarily have to come through actual changes or transformations in the urban structure in Sege park but as information and data which potentially can be used to plan for how future urban life could be improved and structured. Through this test-bed-mentality urban experimentation can reproduce existing urban structures as long as the results are measured, calculated and mediated with the ambition to use it to induce change. Sege park can further become an exclusive space as long as there are measures taken to communicate and spread the knowledge produced within this space. The critique on urban experimentation argues that experimental spaces run the risk of becoming exclusive spaces for certain actors (Levanda 2019, Evans 2016). What is exemplified in Sege park is that a testbed -mentality can contribute to this development by justifying experimental sites as exclusive urban spaces. Since these spaces are testing, but more importantly measuring the potential of "new" sustainable ways of living which will contribute to sustainable development in other parts of the city, and might even become exported on a global scale, their exclusiveness is justified. The ends justify the means, even though the ends are unknown and uncertain.

---

[20] Matematiken är tydlig, genom en minskad produktion av icke-förnybart minskar utsläppen. Men hur vet vi att detta sker? Att där finns en minskning? Detta måste mätas och följas upp. Först då kan vi som arbetar med att skapa förutsättningar för delningsekonomin veta om den är effektiv och når målen om att leva inom planetens gränser (…) Men hur vet vi att det faktiskt blir bostäder för fler och inte bara fler bostäder? Även detta behöver följas upp och synliggöras. – Sharing Cities 2021: 4, 6

6. Summary of findings and discussion

This section offers a summary of the findings from the analysis and discuss how the government in Sege park relates to previous urban development and planning practices in Malmö.

- **Visible problems:** Sege park is rendered a space to be planned and governed in order to solve the problematization of providing affordable and sustainable housing and living for more people. The solution to this problem is to create a testbed for sharing solutions which hopefully can provide a healthy, secure and climate-neutral life for the future inhabitants and community. In order to provide a test-bed for sharing solutions non-public actors are invited to participate in the development. Together these actors will create solutions which will enable the future residents to conduct sharing and engage in community building. An aspect which is obscured by this problematization concerns the "cost" of sharing. This cost is related to the work inhabitants have to put into sharing practices in order to reduce their costs of living to even out the high prices for newly built sustainable housing. This cost remains unknown to the planners however they hope that experimenting with sharing and measuring and communicating the effects of different solutions will provide a better picture of how sharing can make sustainable housing available for more people in future developments.

- **Technologies of government:** In order to conduct the developers to become a capable group the municipality rely on dialog and evaluation to guide the developers to take responsibility for their commitments and for the development of solutions for sharing services. In order to make the developers take responsibility and feel an ownership in the process the municipality also give the developers a freedom of action. This freedom is given as to enable the developers to be creative and innovative in the development which is an essential ingredient for the test-bed. This form of government relates to previous urban development in Malmö where developers-dialogue has also been used to engage the developers in the planning and development process, as discussed by (Holgerson 2017). A new feature in this development is the strategy to let the developers in Sege Park take over the dialogue and run it by themselves which has also resulted in an economic association currently run by the developers alone. This can be seen as a further neoliberalization of planning (Baeten 2018) in which market actors, the developers, are able to steer urban development further according to their needs and interests. The focus on experimentation in Sege Park enables the developers to improve their trademark and technological infrastructure (Levanda 2019) by testing innovative solutions for urban living with support from the municipality and the national sharing program. This form of governance further signals an increased role and power for developers in urban development in Malmö. The planner's emphasis on building a good ground for relationships, evaluating the performance of the developers for future projects and the

municipality's promotion of private-public partnerships in sustainable development also suggests that this power looks to increase in the future.

Dialog is also a tool to conduct the future residents to become a community and share. In this dialog the NGO together with the municipality and a researcher are going to consult and activate the residents to become mobilized into a self- managed sharing-community. Digital tools such as the neighbourhood-app and climate contracts which measure sharing-performance are also being discussed as potential tools to activate and motivate the future residents to engage in sharing. These strategies are understood as a neoliberal planning practices which resonates with Davoudi and Mandanipour's (2013) concept of localism and Dean's (2010) concept of technologies of government through pluralism. These strategies signals a responsibilization of communities and individuals for sustainable urban development. This responsibilization is guided by an element of freedom in which individuals must choose to want to live a sustainable and good life. The strategies of localism and pluralism are further structured as to enable individuals to choose a conduct of sharing. The social and material preconditions to be able to make this choice are not discussed by the interviewees. And when asked about it they referred to the importance of measurements and follow-ups to better understand what obstacles there might be for individuals to share, also in relation to the cost of sharing.

As highlighted by Mukhtar-Landgren (2021) and Eneqvist & Karvonen(2021) experimental governance reconfigures the relationships and responsibilities between public and private actors in new ways. It has been shown in this thesis how the responsibility for the future development of sharing is shifted from the municipality, to the developers, to the NGO, and finally to the future citizens.

- **The attention to the formation of identities:** The developers are promoted as responsible and innovative actors which can realize the objectives of government. They are also seen as competitive and economic actors. Through their competitive and economic rationale they become manageable and can be conducted to see the benefits of working as a group to achieve good-for-all solutions in the development. By promoting the developers as responsible actors who commit to create sharing-solutions they become legitimate buyers of municipal land and partners in urban development and they can also be allowed to steer the development and get increasing influence over planning practices. As discussed by Holgerson (2017) and Dannestam (2009) the promotion of private developers in urban development in Malmö is not a new phenomenon and relates to an intimate relationship between the economic and political elite in Malmö which has been developed since the 90's and have resulted in a strong focus on public- private partnerships in urban development. As these dynamics progress the municipality needs to make sure that their partners are promoted as legitimate actors who have the agency to realize the municipality's objectives for urban development which means to provide welfare and sustainability.

The local NGO is promoted as a cohesive and multifaceted actor that can provide both social, economic and physical infrastructure for the sharing solutions in the park. The NGO is also depicted as a social enterprise that can spread, link and expand the services and solutions produced in the park to other areas in the city. As the "spider in the web" the NGO is promoted as an essential link between the municipality, the developers and the future residents when it comes to the provision of sharing services. By offering sharing services in the park which the developers can purchase the developers also become providers of sharing solutions which cement their profile as responsible and innovative developers. It also legitimizes their status as actors with investment power since it is their capital which initially pays for the sharing solutions. The municipality's role as facilitator and provider of urban development, welfare and sustainability is also legitimized through the partnership with the NGO as they provide a link to organise the solutions for the problems of government.

The future residents whom are expected to become sharing-subjects are promoted as people who are interested in trying out and discovering new things, meet new people and build new relationships. Those who poses these qualities and engage in sharing can also become sharing ambassadors whom spread their learnings and experiences to their neighbours and acquaintances which can enable a spread of sharing conduct. Those future residents who have initially been targeted for participating in the development of sharing solutions in the park can be seen as the creative class or in this case the sharing class. The sharing class engagement, commitment, knowledge and socio-economic status are capabilities which will benefit those who aren't as committed to sharing or doesn't know how in the park or in other urban areas. The sharing-class's capabilities will also benefit the developers and the municipality as they perform sustainable behaviours and actions which cement the sustainable profile and helps to increase the attractiveness of the park.

- **The approach to government as a rational and thoughtful activity**: The experimentation with sharing in Sege park can be understood to be informed by the municipality's strong focus on branding Malmö as a green and progressive city. The experimentation is framed as something which is new, innovative and can bring societal change, even on a global scale. In relation to this the organisation of experimental governance with developers, NGO and citizens is also framed as a progressive and innovative trait of the sustainable development in the city and also functions as a branding mechanism. This also functions to legitimize these actors as collaborators and partners in urban development and enables a shift of responsibilities to these actors.

"Change" is in first hand connected to the production of knowledge from the experimentation by doing measurements and evaluations of the effect of different sharing solutions. The uncertainty concerning experimentation and its results is neutralized by the need to find alternative ways for urban living and planning and by

the production of important knowledge for future development. This can be understood as a testbed-mentality which entails that change does not have to come in the form of actual changes in the urban structure but as knowledge about how the urban structure possibly could be changed. It is argued in this thesis that this mentality can justify experimental sites as exclusive spaces built, planned and developed for certain actors by giving the promise of generating knowledge and subjects(sharing-ambassadors) which could be used to change the way of urban life and the way of urban planning. This type of mentality is not a new phenomenon in the urban development in Malmö but has rather taken a new form through the experimentation with sharing. As discussed by Listerborn (2017) the arguments for building the 4th urban environment and attracting the creative class and creative stakeholders was based on creating exclusive spaces which were promoted to later develop and benefit the whole urban sphere through trickle- down economics.

While the dynamics around the government over the test-bed in Sege Park is advocated as an innovative and ground-breaking enterprise towards societal change, the findings in this thesis suggests that it can rather be understood as a continuation of the increasing power for private developers in influencing and steering urban planning and development in Malmö. In this sense the testbed-mentality can be understood to give effective cover and heed the way for a continuation of a neoliberalization of planning and consequently urban space.

7.Conclusion

In relation to changing roles for public and private actors in urban planning when it comes to experimental governance this thesis has set out to study how relations of power are structured in a testbed-development in Sege park in Malmö. The main research question for this thesis has therefore asked: How is the development of a test-bed for sharing-solutions governed in Sege park in Malmö? This question has been answered by showing how the municipality governs through a neoliberal governmentality in which developers and the future residents are guided, consulted and encouraged to take responsibility for the development of sharing solutions through certain technologies of government. These technologies of government can be seen as strategies which relate to a neoliberal rationality and this finding also answer the first sub-question in the thesis.

These strategies are understood to be informed by a test-bed mentality which promotes urban experimentation in Sege Park as a practice which is urgently needed to solve urban problematizations by testing new ways to develop urban space, inviting innovative actors to do this and most importantly, in this process; produce knowledge for future development which can drive and induce societal change. I argue that this mentality can justify experimental sites as exclusive spaces built, planned and developed by and for certain actors. This does not mean that urban experimentation and governance necessarily are strategies which will produce exclusive environments. To avoid such a development I argue, I line with Evans(2016) and Levanda(2019), that urban experimentation and planning needs a critical engagement with questions about who is being served by the experimentation and who is allowed to participate? As experimentation is framed as an open-ended process it is important to address these questions early in the planning process before the experimentation starts so that these critical questions are not just postponed to become future learnings from the experimentation.

To answer the second sub-question the thesis has also discussed how the neoliberal technologies of government relate to previous urban development and planning practices in Malmö. The development in Sege park can be understood as a further development of public-private partnerships in Malmö especially in connection to the emphasis on building good relations with the private developers, to give them a freedom of action rather than restrictions and to incorporate them as essential actors in the planning and development process. It is argued that this development enables developers to have an increased responsibility and power over urban planning practices in Sege park which also means that they can steer the development according to their interests. An important question remains as to how this power-shift affect the dynamics between public and private interests in the development and this is a topic which needs further research. The increasing influence for the developers does not mean that the municipality lacks power over the development. The planning monopoly is still an important leverage for the municipality which is acknowledged by the interviewees. One aspect, besides the policy to build good public-private relationships, which might undermine this leverage is the lack of communication between the different municipal

administrations about how this leverage can be used to govern the development in Sege park. In relation to this, another aspect which has been beyond the scope of this thesis to address concerns the power-relations between the different municipal administrations and how these relations affect the government of experimentation in Sege park? This is also an important topic for future research.

The study has also found that civil society and citizens are promoted as key partners together with the developers in the development of sharing solutions. In this promotion the NGO takes an essential role as an intermediary, "the spider in the web", between the municipality, the developers and the citizens when it comes to sharing. The promotion of these actors in the development has here been related to previous promotion of the creative class and creative stakeholders in urban development in Malmö. The NGO can also be seen as an essential legitimizing actor for the municipality as they have a strong social profile and provide the solutions for sharing.

An important aspect for future research is to further study the effects which the planning practices in Sege Park have on the urban geography in Malmö. As suggested by many scholars, the development and planning practices in previous projects such as Hyllie and the Western Harbour has created exclusive environments which have contributed to the polarization of the city. In relation to the problem of inclusion, democracy and equity it remains to see how sharing will be conducted in Sege park as people start to move in. Further research in this matter should scrutinize the practices of sharing, what effects they have, who participates, who can participate, who benefits from it and what the actual cost of sharing is?

8. References

Andersson et al. (2015) - Hållbarhetsstrategi för sege park: Bilaga till planprogrammet för Sege Park, 6047. Malmö stad 2015-01-2020 - https://malmo.se/download/18.76b7688614bb5ccea094934e/1491305596575/6047%20Sege%20Park%20H%C3%A5llbarhetsstrategi%20150203.pdf

Baeten, G. (2012). Normalising Neoliberal Planning: the case of Malmö, Sweden. I G. Baeten, & T. Tasan-Kok (Red.), Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning (s. 21-42). Springer.

Baeten, G. (2018). Neoliberal Planning. In M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, & V. Watson (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory* Routledge.

Barnett, C. & Clarke, N. & Cloke, P. & Malpass, A. (2008). The elusive subjects of neo-liberalism. Cultural Studies - CULT STUD. 22. 624-653. 10.1080/09502380802245902.

Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2005). Neoliberalism and the Urban Condition. City. 9. 101-107. 10.1080/13604810500092106.

Bryman, A. (2008). Samhällsvetenskapliga Metoder. Liber AB

Candel, M. (2021). Using Sustainability-Oriented Developer Obligations and Public Land Development to Create Public Value. Sustainability. 14. 57. 10.3390/su14010057.

Candel, M. , Karrbom Gustavsson, T. & Eriksson, P. (2021) Frontend value co-creation in housing development projects, Construction Management and Economics, 39:3, 245-260

Caprotti, F. & Cowley, R. (2016). Interrogating urban experiments. Urban Geography. 38. 1-10. 10.1080/02723638.2016.1265870.

Curtis, S. K., & Lehner, M. (2019). Defining the sharing economy for sustainability. Sustainability, 11(3), 567. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030567.

Dannestam, T. (2009). Stadspolitik i Malmö: Politikens meningsskapande och materialitet. Lund University.

Dean, M. 2010. Governmentality: power and rule in modern society, utgåva 2. SAGE Publications 2010 London, S: 293

Eneqvist,E., Algehed, J., Jensen, C. & Karvonen, A. (2021): Legitimacy in municipal experimental governance: questioning the public good in urban innovation practices, European Planning Studies, DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2021.2015749

Eneqvist, E. & Karvonen, A. (2021). Experimental Governance and Urban Planning Futures: Five Strategic Functions for Municipalities in Local Innovation. Urban Planning. 6. 183-194. 10.17645/up.v6i1.3396.

Evans, J. (2016). Trials and Tribulations: Problematizing the City through/as Urban Experimentation: Trials and Tribulations. Geography Compass. 10. 429-443. 10.1111/gec3.12280.

Evans, J. & Karvonen, A. (2013). 'Give Me a Laboratory and I Will Lower Your Carbon Footprint!' — Urban Laboratories and the Governance of Low-Carbon Futures. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. 38. 10.1111/1468-2427.12077.

Fastighets- och Gatukontoret (2021) - Markansvisnignspolicy – Malmö stad 2021 - https://malmo.se/download/18.708924eb178fd76a14c6f1d/1621512745924/Markanvisningspolicy.pdf

Fitzmaurice, C. & Ladegaard, I. & Attwood-Charles, W. & Cansoy, M. & Carfagna, L. & Schor, J. & Wengronowitz, R. (2020). Domesticating the market: Moral exchange and the sharing economy. Socio-Economic Review. 18. 81-102. 10.1093/ser/mwy003.

Foucault, M. (1980). In Gordon, C. (ed.), Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977, Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault, M. (1980) 'Two Lectures', in Michel Foucault: power/knowledge (ed. C. Gordon), Brighton: The Harvester Press, pp. 78–108.

Foucault, M. (2008). The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the collége de France 1978-1979. Palgrave Macmillan New York 2008, S :346

Foucault, M. (2009). Security, Territory, Polpulation: Lectures at the college de France 1977-1978. Palegrave Macmillan New York 2009, p:417

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. Critival inquiry, Vol 8, No. 4. (Sommaren, 1982), S: 777-795, The University of Chicago Press

Foucault, M. (1984) – Rainbow Paul 1984. The Foucaul reader. Pantheon books 1984, S: 390

Haughton, G., & Allmendinger, P. & Oosterlynck, S. (2013). Spaces of Neoliberal Experimentation: Soft Spaces, Postpolitics, and Neoliberal Governmentality. Environment and Planning A. 45. 217-234. 10.1068/a45121.

Holgersen, S. (2017). Staden och kapitalet. Malmö i krisernas tid. Staden Och Kapitalet. Malmö i Krisernas Tid, 402.

Holgersen, S. and Malm, A. (2015): '"Green x" as cri- sis management. Or, in which world is Malmö the world's green- est city?', Geogra ska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography 97 (4): 275–290.

Holgersen, S. & Baeten, G. (2017). Beyond a Liberal Critique of 'Trickle Down': Urban Planning in the City of Malmö: Beyond a Liberal Critique of 'Trickle Down'. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. 40. 10.1111/1468-2427.12446.

Huxley, M. (2018). Countering the ´dark side of planning´. In M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, & V. Watson (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory* Routledge.

Lopez, Gustav 2021. Profitable sustainability: A critical discourse analysis of sustainability in urban developments in Malmö. Master thesis, Lund University 2021

Karvonen, A., James E., and Bas van Heur. (2014). The politics of urban experiments: realising radical change or reinforcing business as usual?, in M. Hodson and S. Marvin (eds) After Sustainable Cities?, London: Routledge, pp. 104-115

Kronsell, A. & Mukhtar-Landgren, D. (2020). Experimental Governance of Smart Mobility: Some Normative Implications. 10.1108/978-1-83982-650-420201007.

King, N. , Horrocks, C. , Brooks, J.. (2017) Interviews in qualitative research. Second ed. Sage Publications Ltd, 2017

Lemke, T. (2001). 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society, 30*, 190 - 207.

Lemke, T., (2002), "Foucault, governmentality and critique" Rethinking Marxism 14(3) 49–64

Lemke, T. (2007), "An indigestible meal? Foucault, governmentality and state theory" Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory 8(2) 43–64

Leonette (2021)- Att dela framtiden I Sege Park och vägen dit - Viable cities 10/6 2021 https://medium.com/viable-cities/att-dela-framtiden-i-sege-park-och-v%C3%A4gen-dit-5be69d5ea744 - Last visited 2022-08-16

Levanda, A. M (2018). Urban living-labs for the smart grid. In Marvin, S., Bulkeley, H., Mai, L., McCormick, K., & Palgan, Y. V. (Eds.) (2018). Urban Living Labs: Experimenting with City Futures. Routledge.

Levenda, A. (2019). Thinking critically about smart city experimentation: entrepreneurialism and responsibilization in urban living labs. Local Environment. 24. 1-15. 10.1080/13549839.2019.1598957.

Listerborn, C. (2017). The flagship concept of the '4th urban environment'. Branding and visioning in Malmö, Sweden. Planning Theory & Practice. 18. 1-22. 10.1080/14649357.2016.1264615.

Malmö Innovationsarena (2018) – Anteckningar individuellt hållbarhetssamtal Boklok. 2018-01-22

Malmö stad (2016) - Markanvisningsprogram för Sege park- 02- 2016 - https://malmo.se/download/18.4f363e7d1766a784af121dcc/1614764574517/Markanvisning%20Sege%20Park_feb%202016.pdf

Malmö stad (2018) - Individuella hållbarhetssamtal i Sege Park – förslag till vidare hantering av byggherrarnas intressen. Malmö stad 2018-07-09

Malmö stad (2021) – Malmö utsedd till sveriges miljöbästa kommun 2021 – Malmö stads wep page11/5 2021 - https://malmo.se/Aktuellt/Artiklar-Malmo-stad/2021-05-11-Malmo-utsedd-till-Sveriges-miljobasta-kommun-2021.html - Last visited 2022-08-16

Malmö stad (2022b) – Malmö utsedd till miljöbästa kommun - igen. - https://malmo.se/Aktuellt/Artiklar-Malmo-stad/2022-05-19-Malmo-ar-utsedd-till-Sveriges-miljobasta-kommun---igen.html - Last visited 2022-08-16

Malmö Stad (2022c) - Sege Park - https://malmo.se/Stadsutveckling/Stadsutvecklingsomraden/Sege-Park.html - Last visited 2022-08-16

Malmö stad (2022d) – Drevet har flyttat in I Sege Park- Malmö stads webpage 24/8 2021 - https://malmo.se/Aktuellt/Artiklar-Malmo-stad/2021-06-22-Drevet-har-flyttat-in---i-Sege-Park.html - Last visited 2022-08-16

Mukhtar-Landgren, D. (2021). Local Autonomy in Temporary Organizations: The Case of Smart City Pilots. Administration & Society. 10.1177/00953997211009884.

Mäntysalo, R. & Bäcklund, P. (2018). The governance of planning : flexibly networked, yet institutionally grounded. In M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, & V. Watson (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of planning theory (pp. 237-249). Routledge

Nylund, K. (2014). Conceptions of justice in the planning of the new urban landscape – Recent changes in the comprehensive planning discourse in Malmö, Sweden. Planning Theory and Practice. 15. 10.1080/14649357.2013.866263.

Oels, A. (2005). Rendering Climate Change Governable: From Biopower to Advanced Liberal Government?. Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning - J ENVIRON POL PLAN. 7. 185-207. 10.1080/15239080500339661.

Pries, J. (2020). Neoliberal Urban Planning Through Social Government: Notes on the Demographic Re-engineering of Malmö. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. 44. 10.1111/1468-2427.12870.

Palm, J., & Smedby, N. (2019). Byggherredialogen i Sege Park: –reflektioner två år in i processen.
https://malmo.se/download/18.38c6709716cae2cad39e588/1569590914687/MIA_Rapport_B yggherredialogen_1 90815.pdf

Rodenstedt, A. (2014). Living in the calm and safe part of the city. The socio-spatial reproduction of upper-middle class neighbourhoods in Malmö. Geographica 6. 270 pp. Uppsala: Department of Social and Economic Geography, Uppsala University. ISBN 978-91-506-2437-3.

Sayer, A. (2000). Realism and Social Science. London: Sage, Chapter 1 ['Introducing critical realism'], pp. 10–28. (19 pages)

Sharing cities Sweden (2021)- Slutrapport från testbädden: Sharing cities Malmö, 2017-2021
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59e86b55aeb625e2140eec1a/t/61642b8d143ad02891b8 9d27/1633954704329/Slutrapport+Malm%C3%B6.pdf

SKR (2021) – Markanvisningar- grundläggande förutsättningar. Sveriges kommuner och regioner 2/2 2021-
https://skr.se/download/18.1f376ad3177c89481f7468a1/1615373021584/Markanvisningar-grundl%C3%A4ggande-f%C3%B6ruts%C3%A4ttningar.pdf

Tran, H. & Rydin, Y. (2020). A new formula for Sustainability Planning? The Vision Programme for Norra Sorgenfri, Malmö. Scandinavica. 58. 2019.

Voytenko P, Yuliya & Mont, O. & Sulkakoski, S. (2021). Governing the sharing economy: Towards a comprehensive analytical framework of municipal governance. Cities. 108. 102994. 10.1016/j.cities.2020.102994. Spatial Development,
www.nordregio.se/Global/EJSD/Debate/debate051208.pdf

Yucel, R.(2018) Scientists' Ontological and Epistemological Views about Science from the Perspective of Critical Realism. *Sci & Educ* **27**, 407–433 (2018).

9. Appendix

9.1. Interview- guide for Planners

Introduction
- What are you building in Sege Park? And why?
- What are your ambitions/goals in Sege Park?
- How do you identify with your project?
- What is your main goal?
- How do you balance these goals with other interests?
- How have you monitored these values?
- What are you going to test? How?
- Why do you need a test bed?
- Other test beds for other objectives?

Citizens
- Who will live in Sege park?
- How are they supposed to live?
- Do you have any dialogue with citizens about the development? Will you have any? Who are they?
- How have you disseminated information about the project? Who is it aimed at? Who is showing interest?
- How do you think the development of Sege Park will affect the neighbourhood of Segevång, Kirseberg and the rest of Malmö?

Experiment/Test-bed
- What makes Sege Park a test- bed? What is being experimented with? How is it experimented with?
- Did you think about both social and ecological goals or how did you steer the development? What is the balance?
- What do you think is different in Sege Park compared to other development sites? Strategy, sustainability, governance etc.

Sustainability/Sharing
- How do you work with sustainability solutions in Sege park? What are your main ambitions? How?
- Who is responsible for ensuring that Sege park's sustainable development continues when it is populated?
- Who is disadvantaged/benefited by this?
- Have your ambitions changed during the process?
- Why developers?
- Why leave responsibility?
- Control over the process? Transparency with objectives?
- How does your role in Sege Park differ from other projects?
- What will be different about living in Sege Park?

- Are you satisfied with your results so far? Which ones? Why?
- Are there any solutions that you wanted but have not been able to implement? Why?
- Who do you think is most responsible for the sustainable development of Sege Park?
- What is your responsibility?
- How do the developers relate to the ambitions of the city? Do you think that the ambitions have benefited from IHS and BHD?
- Are there any exchanges/thoughts of exchanges with neighbouring areas?

Role of the city
- Why has the municipality chosen this process in Sege park?
- Was there a discussion about other processes for other objectives.
- In the land allocation process, how were sustainability requirements set?
- - How has the cooperation between you and the other administrations worked?
- Balancing sustainability ambitions with the need for good dialogue with developers?
- What has been the biggest challenge in this project?

Future
- What do you think the impact of this project has been from a wider perspective?
- Has the project led to any major changes in the city or in the activities you have been working on?
- What would you do if you were working on Sege Park in another district?
- Are there realistic alternatives?

9.2. Interview-guide for Developers

Introduction
- What are you building in Sege Park? And why?
- What are your ambitions/goals in Sege Park?
- How do you identify with your project?
- What is your main goal?
- How do you balance these goals with other interests?
- Do you think that the project your /interests are similar to those of the other actors or do they differ in some way, how?
- Have your ambitions influenced other actors in the project?
- How long will you be in Sege Park? Are you just here to build or also to manage?

Citizens
- Who will be living in Sege Park/in your property? How are they supposed to live?
- Do you have any dialogue with citizens about the development? Who are they?
- How are citizens involved/expected to be involved in the development?
- How have you disseminated information about the project? Is there an interest? Who is showing interest?
- Sharing for citizens, do you expect your tenants to participate and share

Experiment/Test- bed
- What makes Sege Park a test bed? What is being experimented with? How is it experimented?

- Did you think about both social and ecological goals or how have you guided the development? What is the balance?
- What do you think is different in Sege Park compared to other development sites? Strategy, sustainability, governance etc.
- How is your role in Sege Park different from other projects?
- What will be different about living in Sege park?

Sustainability/Sharing
- How do you work with sustainability/sharing in Sege park? What are your ambitions? What are the most important ones?
- What were your original ambitions in Sege Park? Have they changed, why?
- Are you satisfied with your results so far? Which ones? Why?
- Are there any solutions that you wanted but have not been able to implement? Why?
- Who do you think is most responsible for the sustainable development of Sege Park?
- What is your responsibility? How will you take social responsibility for your property?
- How do you relate to the ambitions of the city? Do you think that the ambitions have benefited from IHS and BHD?
- How do you think the development of Sege Park will affect the neighbourhood of Segevång, Kirseberg and the rest of Malmö?
- Are there any exchanges/thoughts of exchanges with neighbouring areas?

Relations/Collaboration
- How has the cooperation between you and the other actors worked?
- Have there been any conflicts or disagreements? About what?
- How have these disagreements been resolved/handled?
- How have these disagreements affected the development?
- Has your relationship with the other actors changed since the development started?
- How would you describe the roles of the other actors in the project?
- What has been the biggest challenge in this project?

Future
- What do you think the impact of this project has been from a wider perspective?
- Has the project led to any major changes in the city or in the activities you have been working on?
- How do you see the future for sharing communities?

Ref+ app+abstract+aknowl 2912
Fot 1772
4684