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Foreword

This report is the result of a research project carried out by the Department of Urban Planning and Environment at the KTH Royal Institute of Technology during the period 2012-2013. The report was commissioned by Region Skåne.

The aim was to discuss the possibilities of improving current and future exchanges and collaborations across Öresund, with a basis in a scientific frame of reference, as well as data on economics and development and interviews with a large number of respondents active in the Öresund region.

The improved accessibility facilitated by the Öresund Bridge creates potential for increased collaboration, but this potential is not automatically unlocked. Greater accessibility also leads to new and clearer manifestations of differences and previously unexplored points of conflict. Our ambition has been to study various possibilities to realise development potential in the interplay between Zealand and Skåne by means of formal or informal initiatives.

Our assessment is firstly that the collaboration across Öresund under the given circumstances has been successful, and secondly that there is good potential to develop this collaboration further. At the same time, the single most important lesson from our study is that it is crucial to adapt forms of collaboration and goals to the specific area of collaboration. Another important aspect is to be aware that it takes time to achieve more ambitious collaboration goals.

There is a tendency to overemphasise the potential for collaboration and set overly ambitious goals in various projects and activities that we have studied. Similarly, the mistake is sometimes made of not emphasising the value of collaboration between public and private actors enough. There is also considerable potential in seeing the opportunities for collaboration on markets where a number of actors are in competition with one another, and at the same time it is essential to have the insight to realise that differences between Sweden and Denmark often give rise to collaboration and exchanges.

We have had very good collaboration and exchanges with our client Region Skåne and with a number of other actors in the Öresund region. We would like to extend a special thanks to all of those who agreed to be interviewed. They gave their time and shared valuable experiences of the Öresund region. It is our hope that our report will provide new insight and be a basis for further development of the Öresund region. It is one of Sweden’s and the Nordic countries’ most exciting arenas for growth.
Malin Hansen and Maia Rostvik at KTH were responsible for gathering material and carrying out the interview study in the research report. Johannes Remmo has compiled a background report for the project. The undersigned were responsible for the final design of the report.

Stockholm, December 2013

Göran Cars
Professor

Björn Hasselgren
Research Fellow
Summary

This report looks at some of the progress made in the Öresund collaboration since the building of the Öresund Bridge. The extent of exchange and collaboration in the Öresund region has increased drastically. The long-distance, primarily passing traffic has been redirected along a new path and has grown. The Öresund Bridge is a successful project in itself, both technically and financially, with a stable economic situation which in the long term will also generate a financial surplus. The Öresund collaboration thus shows positive signs in all material respects.

At the same time, there is a common view in the Öresund region that the collaboration should have progressed further. We perceive this as widespread frustration over the situation and in the development of the collaboration in the Öresund region. There is a question of whether something has been done wrong, if it’s possible to think and act differently, and how to proceed in the future. This is the focus of the analysis of the Öresund collaboration carried out by the KTH Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) in this project for Region Skåne.

We believe the frustration and impatience of many actors in the Öresund region is a result of the sometimes very high expectations, as well as the potential for further collaboration that can be seen but not realised. The Öresund Regional Development Strategy (ÖRUS), an initiative of the Öresund Committee and in many ways relevant also for Region Skåne, is promising in many ways. However, we feel that it also risks adding to the frustration by being ambitious whilst having a relatively constrained time schedule.

One of the more significant lessons learned from the project is that the future development should be based on and surrounded by visions which are clearly formed from prevailing institutional conditions (practices, culture, laws and rules, organisational forms) and should be weighed up in terms of which forms of collaboration are appropriate and realistic in different situations. Case-specific collaboration is the way forward which we propose.

It is generally counterproductive to place excessively high requirements and expectations on collaborations in which there is no realistic basis for collaboration among the concerned actors due to a lack of commitment and ownership on their part. It is also important to remember that cooperation and collaboration (or in the most developed situations, even integration) can come in different forms; from a relatively loose coexistence to situations in which differences are evened out or of such an insignificant scope that they in no way inhibit collaboration.

Here, it is important to remember that competition is one of the more developed forms of collaboration; perhaps even the ultimate sign that integration has
come into being. Division of labour and specialisation are important elements of a region such as Öresund and perhaps primarily comes about in a truly competitive market model.

Here, the matter of differences being a better catalyst for integration and collaboration than similarities is an interesting part of understanding the dynamic process that is the Öresund collaboration. In situations whereby exchange rates, taxes, etc., deviate between Sweden and Denmark, the collaboration and exchange across Öresund increases, only to subside when the differences decrease.

The three different areas of collaboration that KTH has studied in more detail (education and research, industry collaboration and culture) demonstrate collaboration primarily in the form of loose structures. There are relatively few examples of integration in advanced stages; something which can change via a more concrete collaboration strategy, but which may also indicate that informal collaboration is a good model which partners often prefer.

We recommend a number of concrete measures that Region Skåne should be able to implement together with other actors in the Öresund region in order to develop the collaboration.

- Short term – efficiency here and now

In this timescale, efforts are primarily concentrated within the scope of the current conditions in terms of language, culture, legislation, etc. The main focus in this timescale should be the optimal use of existing resources. A great many collaborations can be considered based on these starting points, in both the public and private sectors, in order to take advantage of thus far unutilised opportunities for collaboration. This can be a matter of better planning and the utilisation of health and medical care, cultural institutions, education systems, research environments and transport infrastructure, but it may also be about improving the information provided to actors in the industry about opportunities for collaboration in the near future by e.g., helping to create social forums and networks.

We recommend as a further measure, as highlighted above, a survey of potential areas of collaboration within the areas that can be influenced in the short term. Put together a project group tasked with drawing up concrete proposals for collaboration between e.g., Copenhagen Municipality and Malmö City/Region Skåne. Collaboration in company form has proven to work in different contexts and may be worth testing in other areas.
• Medium term – creating good conditions

This level is about influencing both the formal structures in terms of legislation and formal regulations for tax, social insurance, pensions, etc. These areas have been studied in-depth by the partners of the Öresund collaboration and a number of reports have been compiled. Naturally, further investment in this area is required in order to attempt to bring about measures which facilitate collaboration and exchange across Öresund.

There is potential for this in connection with the upcoming election in Sweden, where Region Skåne should endeavour to make this a prioritised measure for improving both the growth potential and labour market conditions in the Öresund region.

Another measure would be to recommend that Sweden elect a state representative tasked with working specifically with these matters. The Swedish State should perhaps have a representation office in Malmö tasked with working towards a clear reduction of the institutional border obstacles.

A more radical measure would be for Region Skåne to issue a guarantee or “collaboration guarantee” which involves the region bearing the additional costs or covering any lost benefits in terms of the social security systems and taxes that citizens of Region Skåne can receive as a result of their choice to work in Denmark. The scope and legality of the recommendation must of course be carefully examined, as well as various aspects of legal security.

In the areas controlled by regional and local actors, the areas of education, research and transport infrastructure stand out as the most important in this timescale as well. The project “The Scandinavian 8 Million City”, which is currently underway and which is an endeavour to bring about a rail link between Oslo and Copenhagen and further connections in both directions, is a good example of this. The potential extension of the metro between Malmö and Copenhagen is another. One project that should be more clearly arranged in the regional strategy is the HH Tunnel (the plan for connecting Helsingborg and Elsinore/Helsingör with a fixed transport infrastructure link).

The two projects ESS and MAX IV provide what are probably the best opportunities for a more structurally established collaboration across Öresund within some areas of research. Here, Region Skåne should concentrate efforts on supporting and promoting different forms of collaboration. With its base in research, the project provides the opportunity for a great many associated activities within the labour market, services and accommodation.

• Long term – changing informal and cultural conditions

This is perhaps the most paradoxical of the three levels or timescales in the collaboration. On one hand, most are aware that language, culture and habits are
relatively deeply rooted in Swedish and Danish society respectively. We often come back to the differences we perceive from both sides in collaboration and competition between our countries. And in general we are clear about these being conditions that will only change in the long term. On the other hand, these conditions are often emphasised as inhibitive and limiting in the collaboration across Öresund.

Levelling out these conditions will take time. Greater understanding of the culture that we wish to work with is however generally beneficial. Our view is that this occurs primarily via the everyday individual exchange which is based on commercial and interpersonal relationships. Measures which could be tried, however, are more active investments in linguistic comprehension between Swedish and Danish in school.

However, we find other measures such as attempting to coordinate cultural life between Malmö and Copenhagen by means of government action somewhat dubious. It is probably a better and more accessible road to invest in collaboration in culture that is based on “simpler” cost minimisation/efficiency in the short-term perspective than to attempt to circumnavigate these issues and go directly to an integration model.

Once again, it is likely that the hypothesis that differences spur on collaboration is a better model than attempting to organise collaboration in which there is a lack of logic for collaboration and incentive.

The findings of the report are based on a large number of interviews with actors in the Öresund region, as well as other material. A summary of the interviews is provided in an appendix to the report, which is available in Swedish.
1. Introduction

1.1 Aim and assignment

Purpose
The aim of this research report is to discuss the possibilities of improving exchanges and collaboration across Öresund. The improved accessibility facilitated by the Öresund Bridge creates potential for increased collaboration, but this potential is not automatically unlocked. Greater accessibility also leads to new and clearer manifestations of differences and previously unexplored points of conflict. Our ambition has been to study various possibilities to realise development potential in the interplay between Zealand and Skåne by means of formal or informal initiatives.

Based on the Öresund Committee’s report ÖRUS (2010), we have surveyed and analysed the collaborations in the Öresund region. At this initial stage, we wish to point out that ÖRUS both contains many important and relevant insights and provides guidelines and visions for the future collaboration which is clearly required. We would also like to emphasise that ÖRUS is one of the documents that contributes to setting high requirements and expectations on the collaboration; expectations that can be difficult to live up to in practical terms and with various measures. We have complemented our empirical data with knowledge of theory building which is relevant to regional development and experience of development work in other regions, primarily in the area of institutional theory.

Our hope is that this report can contribute more fundamental insights into conditions for developing collaboration as well as certain recommendations for concrete measures when developing strategies for the future of the transnational collaboration in the Öresund region. As a research report, the focus is of course more on analysis and understanding than making proposals.

Background
In connection with investments in transport infrastructure across national borders, there are often expectations that collaborations will develop between regions on either side of these borders as a result of improved accessibility. In many cases the potential is assessed as great beforehand, but in practice it is often difficult to realise this potential. Put simply, transnational collaboration across national borders is easier said than done. National and local cultures, language barriers, bureaucracy and different regulations often constitute obstacles that make collaboration difficult in practice. It can be said that there is a lack of an institutional framework that can open up for further collaboration.
If we take a glance at Europe, we can see that this type of obstacle often means that collaboration in or between regions and countries never comes about, or that the potential for collaboration is not utilised, despite the fact that outside observers can see great opportunities in the form of e.g., complementary industrial structures or a coordinated infrastructure and housing supply. National borders can also constitute not only a judicial boundary but also a mental barrier over which collaboration is only established in exceptional cases.

In other cases, municipalities, companies and individual citizens in border regions benefit from one another without conducting organised collaboration for this purpose. This may for example involve a regional consumer market emerging or the development of tourism on either side of a national border, where the proximity between attractive destinations and lower “border friction” increase the attraction for visitors, without any organised collaboration between actors on either side.

The Öresund region demonstrates a number of these conditions, something which this report provides examples of. Based on different perspectives, the Öresund Bridge can be seen as a mixed success. The political expectations found to be linked to the creation of the bridge can in retrospect be seen as rather “lofty”, and ideas of a fully integrated region in the future as very ambitious.

At the same time, some maintain that the development has corresponded to or even exceeded the political visions and expectations for certain areas. The voices of criticism, however, feel that the region has not developed according to its full potential; that the regional development “has not kick-started” as expected. Criticisms put forward have included politicians being considered to believe that integration takes place of its own accord simply by the existence of the Öresund Bridge.

The report looks at experiences from a couple of areas of the collaboration that have not been highlighted from this perspective in other relevant reports on the Öresund collaboration. Conclusions are drawn as to which forms of collaboration have the greatest potential for development in the future for various areas of collaboration; it is a common hypothesis that different collaborations require different forms of collaboration.

**The assignment**

This report has been developed by the Department of Urban Planning and Environment at the KTH Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) within the scope of an assignment from Region Skåne. The project was based on the three parts of Region Skåne’s commission to KTH:
• Survey the opportunities and problems in the collaboration across Öresund.

• Analyse and conduct a discussion on competition and collaboration and define strengths, weaknesses and future courses of action.

• Sum up lessons learned and draw conclusions on the potential for development in the region, and define strategies for improving collaboration across Öresund.

Of utmost importance is the ambition in the research project to draw conclusions on which areas of collaboration have the greatest potential for development in light of the interim studies, and to show how actual collaboration in the Öresund region can be developed.

The basis of the report, including the interview study, has been compiled and carried out by Malin Hansen and Maia Rostvik. Johannes Remmo at KTH has compiled a literature study which is presented separately. Göran Cars and Björn Hasselgren were responsible for the finalisation of the report. All of the above work at the Department of Urban Planning and Environment at KTH in Stockholm.

1.2 Choice of areas to study in the project

Regions around the world strive to formulate politics and other measures to promote innovation and industrial growth and development. ÖRUS (2010) defines four central terms/areas with the aim of developing these and similar qualities in the Öresund region. Knowledge and innovation, culture and experiences, a coherent and varied labour market, and accessibility and mobility. Based on these four areas, three areas for more in-depth study have been selected in the present report. These areas are

• Culture and Events

• Industry

• Research and Education

The three areas represent different aspects of the collaboration and different strategies for collaboration. One of the main focuses of this report is investigating different collaboration models in the Öresund region, as well as the element of competition and collaboration in these. This applies both within and between the public and private sectors. A central issue is how these different collaborations are organised and what the driving forces behind them are.
1.3 **Method and materials – qualitative in-depth interviews and document studies**

The study’s empirical material is based on 75 interviews conducted with actors who in one way or another have been active in the Öresund region. In the selection process, we have also endeavoured to gain as representative a geographical spread as possible within the region. This applies to both sides of Öresund, as well as to creating a balance between a focus on the entire Öresund region and a more narrow focus on the Copenhagen-Malmö aspect. In the former aspect, the criterion is fully met, whilst the selection in the latter aspect can be said to be somewhat unbalanced as a larger proportion of those interviewed have links with Copenhagen and Malmö than with the rest of the region. At the same time, this seems reasonable as these, the two largest cities, dominate the region and are thereby particularly important parties in the future development of the region.

The selection has been largely based on the “snowball method” in which we started by interviewing a number of key persons who in turn recommended other potential interviewees. The interviewee group has consisted of both well-established actors, called “Öresund nerds” by some, who have a long history of experience with matters concerning the Öresund region, and actors whose line of argument on the Öresund collaboration can be said to be more spontaneous. The latter group includes actors who by comparison can be said to be newcomers on the Öresund region playing field, as well as those who do not necessarily define themselves as Öresund region actors.

The interview study (which is available in Swedish), which largely constitutes an independent report within the scope of KTH’s project, acts as a general premise and source of inspiration for this final report, which has also been supplemented with document studies. It has concerned published literature in the form of books, scientific articles, reports, papers, municipal and regional strategic documents, articles in the daily press and websites. There are listed in the bibliography.

1.4 **What does this report contribute?**

The decision to build the Öresund Bridge was motivated by the hope that this would contribute to economic integration in the region. Following the completion of the Öresund Bridge, a large number of reports, investigations and articles on the bridge’s effects and the development in the region have been presented. Questions which many have asked but not received a clear answer to

---

1 Of the 75 interviews, the distribution of interviewees’ main place of work is: 39 in Denmark and 36 in Sweden.
are: why is it that the integration has not come further? What factors counteract integration and what are the effective means (strategies) of realising the identified potential?

This report contributes a broad empirical base of material, in which the interviewees get to have their say. The findings of the interview studies have been compared with experiences from other regions, as well as relevant research and theory building. Supported by this knowledge base, we analyse and discuss how collaboration in the Öresund region could develop further with a starting point in e.g., institutional theory; a theoretical view which is also reflected in ÖRUS. The primary function of the report is to act as support for future strategic and practical work on the ongoing collaboration in Öresund. The more concrete proposals for plans of action and measures are only a secondary function.

1.5 Structure of the report

The next chapter of the report (2) presents the background to the Öresund collaboration, as well as indications of certain aspects of the collaboration’s development. Chapter 3 looks at the theory building which we feel is relevant to analyses of collaboration and integration in border regions and for regional formation. Chapter 4 summarises and analyses the study’s empirical investigation. The final chapter of the report (5) provides a summary report in which observations and lessons form a basis for analysis and discussion on how future collaboration in the Öresund region could develop.

Appendix 1 reports a number of indicators of the collaboration across Öresund. A more comprehensive presentation of the three areas studied in the project’s interview study is provided in Appendix 2. Both these are available in Swedish.

This report should be set in relation to the literature study and overview of current knowledge on the Öresund region compiled under the project, KTH (2012).
2. Vision and reality in the Öresund collaboration

The vision in ÖRUS, in which the Öresund region is by 2020 “Europe's most attractive and climate smart region for citizens, industry and visitors via effective utilisation of the integration and its border region dynamics” (ÖRUS, p 9), is an expression of the ambitious level that the Öresund Committee and Region Skåne has marked for collaboration. Obviously, this kind of vision requires very ambitious work if it is to be realised, not least in light of the limited timescale. Against this vision, the more everyday work with collaboration between Sweden and Denmark across Öresund is considered. The everyday reality can often be seen as far removed from the vision. This is reflected in the following quote:

“The inauguration [of the Öresund Bridge] was a culmination of many years of planning and expectations; at the same time, the ceremonies marked the sensitive transition from dreams and visions of a future Öresund region to the harsh reality.” (Berg et al 2002, p 7)

2.1 From national to local level

Once the Danish and Swedish states decided to build the Öresund Bridge, discussions surrounding the creation of a more permanent transnational collaboration started to become much clearer. The dormant and long-debated idea of creating a joint region in Öresund was re-awakened (Persson 2003, p 259).

The permanent connection is without doubt a milestone in the Öresund collaboration, the tool that would realise the dream of the Öresund region. This was when the starting pistol really went off for the endeavours to bring the two sides of Öresund closer together and create a joint region. With the establishment of the bridge, people could travel to the other side in their everyday life, for work or leisure, in a way which was not previously possible. The journey became significantly quicker and simpler, at least for the inhabitants of the region living closest to the bridge (Hansen & Serin, 2010).

The agreement between the Danish and Swedish states to build the Öresund Bridge was regulated in a contract between the two countries in 1991. The agreement had been preceded by a long period of discussion. Since the late 1960s, Copenhagen had experienced weak economic development. In the 1980s, when discussions on a permanent connection with Sweden became increasingly intense, the city had lost a great many workplaces as a result of a structural transformation in industry. The situation on the Swedish side of Öresund was simi-
lar. In Malmö, the population had decreased by 14 per cent in 14 years, from 1970 to 1984. Both Malmö and Copenhagen had been successful industrial cities, but now the knowledge society had begun to make new demands on their economy and industry. The cities were forced to reprioritise.

Anders Olshov, MD at the Öresund Institute and author of the book “Øresundsregionen - Københavns outnyttjade möjlighet” [The Öresund Region - Copenhagen's Untapped Potential] (2013), believes the decision to build the Öresund Bridge was not made a day too soon – a deep financial crisis was waiting around the corner for both Sweden and Denmark (ibid., p 74ff).

However, the primary motive from the Danish side, as Olshov sees it, could be that the bridge was part of a Danish traffic agreement which included the connection to Sweden. He feels that from the Swedish perspective, we should keep in mind the EU membership planned at the time, which contributed to the matter of better transport for Europe being of central importance, whilst at the same time Denmark was seen as a potential partner in the membership negotiations for entry into the EU. Olshov feels, however, that the ambition to change a negative development in Copenhagen and Malmö, with the bridge as a tool to meet the structural transformation, was not so clear. Perhaps the weak economic development and the pressure for change gave momentum to the actual decision to build the Öresund Bridge, rather than to its more long-term purpose.

“But it is in crises that structural transformations take place and critical questions are asked about what creates value and where investments should be made, and which actors will unite in joint action. It is clear in retrospect how local, regional and national actors during this period found solutions to problems that had been around for a long time.” (Olshov, 2013, p 80)

Christer Persson, former Strategic Manager at Malmö City, and author of “Öresundsregionen. Ett experiment i europeiskt regionbygge” [The Öresund Region: An Experiment in European Regional Formation] (2003), believes like Olshov that the biggest argument in the discussions on the need for a permanent connection was the establishment of an international transport link (ibid., p 245ff). In time, however, ideas and dreams about the building of a transnational region became even stronger, and a permanent connection was seen more and more as a link with the purpose of more closely interconnecting a new region. The goal to create a cultural and economic collaboration and a common labour and accommodation market emerged (Lyck & Nielsen, 2006). Together, the region was considered to have the potential for entirely new opportunities for competition with other metropolitan areas on a global market.
The partners in Skåne acting as the driving force behind the vision to make the Öresund Bridge a reality were local and regional politicians and actors in industry, who worked from the idea of creating one coherent region. Persson (2003) explains that interest from the Swedish side in forming an Öresund region was greatest in Skåne, whilst a national interest which emerged later came primarily from the Danish side. Persson believes that the Danish Government was quite quick to see the potential that the new region around Öresund could have for Denmark. It was primarily a matter of the view that Copenhagen needed a larger trading area so as to compete with the other strong regions of growth in Europe and on an international level. In an EU context – in a Europe composed of regions – the Öresund region became a sort of model region. It was a “full-scale laboratory experiment in regional formation” (Persson 2003, p 256). Here, Persson means that this was a stage in which “dream and reality gradually begin to come together” (ibid.). The closer the opening of the Öresund Bridge, the stronger and more optimistic the various political statements on the region’s development opportunities became.

In 2002, Wichmann Matthiessen & Andersson (2002, p 9) defined four indicators of the region’s future development; population, GDP, accessibility and scientific prowess. In a joint region across Öresund, the size of the total population rests in 24th place in relation to other equivalent regions in the rest of Europe. In terms of GDP, the Öresund region is 12th place in Europe. The region’s accessibility is determined in relation to international networks and is considered to be good; in this respect the region is in ninth place. The fourth indicator is assessed in relation to the number of published articles in the field of engineering, natural sciences and medicine, and here the region was sixth place in Europe in 2002. This type of indicator is an example of how impetus was given to visionary hope for the future and an integrated Öresund as part of the forming of the vision.

**From state to regional collaboration in Öresund**

According to Hansen & Serin (2010, p 202), a significant collaboration was formed between the national and regional actors during the period before and after the building of the Öresund Bridge, with a focus on identifying problems that were accentuated as a result of the expanded Öresund collaboration and on finding solutions to these. It was like a “laboratory for institutional change” (according to Blatter, 2003) in which various institutional solutions and temporary collaboration structures were created. Even after this, a number of state initiatives have been taken via e.g., various ministerial meetings and committees working with issues of taxation, etc. Despite extensive investigations, there is a lack of measures able to remove a number of the obstacles to collaboration that have been identified.
In 1993, the partners of the region established the Öresund Committee, consisting of 12 Swedish and Danish municipalities and regions, with the intention that it would function as a platform for the political collaboration (Persson 2003, p 259). The combined Danish-Swedish spelling “Öresundskomiteen” is intended to demonstrate affinity across Öresund. The decision-making body of this organisation consists of 32 indirectly elected politicians, as many from the Danish as from the Swedish side. There is an executive committee which consists of six Danish and six Swedish members. Beyond the political level of decision-making there is a permanent secretariat of officials taking care of the ongoing activities. The committee is financed via contributions from members, and in 2009 this amounted to DKK 2.82 per inhabitant of Öresund region; a total of over DKK 10 million for the year, which is around 90 per cent of the organisation’s total income. The remainder is obtained from the Nordic Council of Ministers, which supported the committee with over DKK 1.2 million (Nordregio 2010, p 1).

The focus of the committee lies in initiating transnational collaboration, identifying challenges and obstacles to the creation of a functional region, informing citizens and industry of e.g., various legislation via information services such as Öresunddirekt and Öresunddirektbusiness, and in various ways gathering resources for the integration process and transnational collaboration. During the initial years, the committee played an important role in Öresund collaboration. It was primarily a matter of lobbying activities and the dissemination of information. Persson (2003, p 260) puts forward three reasons for the committee becoming an important actor. Firstly, it was a matter of the political representation in the committee and the politically legitimacy that came with it. Secondly, the committee was initially the only political transnational organisation in existence. Thirdly, Persson points out that for a rather long time the Öresund Committee was the organisation in the Öresund region which decided on and distributed the EU’s Interreg funding to border region projects, which gave the committee an important role.

Persson (2003) argues that Interreg funding has played an important role as a “lubricant” in the Öresund collaboration. He establishes that “without this, the integration would have experienced much slower progress” (ibid., p 260). As a result of EU funding, the regional formation and the Öresund collaboration has “been neither a typical ‘bottom-up’ nor ‘top-down’ type of process”; it has instead “been characterised by winding back and forth through different areas of society”. Interreg funding has been important in the processes surrounding initiatives such as Medicon Valley Academy/Alliance, Öresund University and the formation of Copenhagen Malmö Port; investments which have been met with varying degrees of success.

In line with the development of the collaboration, the Öresund Committee’s role has come to change and there is now an impression that the committee’s
role needs to be reviewed. For this reason, the committee has produced the document “Action plan for 2013”, containing strategic goals and an investment in the implementation of ÖRUS (Öresund Committee, 2013a). Following a period of regional momentum in the collaboration, matters appear to have entered a review phase.

**From regional to municipal collaboration**

The two largest cities in the region – Copenhagen and Malmö – have thus far proven to have the most to gain from the building of the Öresund Bridge. It is also in these two cities that the principal advocates and bearers of the regional formation idea are found. Malmö and Copenhagen are without doubt the region’s political and economic centre and thereby also as a catalyst for regional growth. In 2012, Copenhagen municipality and Malmö City began investigating the possibility of establishing a metro system between Copenhagen and Malmö. By February 2013, the investigation had come half way and was planned to be complete by the end of the year, as Copenhagen City Council and Malmö City were to take a position on the future work.

Another clear position that demonstrates the closer links between Copenhagen and Malmö was a proposal concerning what branding they would use in international contexts. At a regional real estate exhibition in 2013, Claus Juhl – CEO of Copenhagen – presented the intention of the cities of Copenhagen and Malmö to market themselves as “Copenhagen Malmö Region”, rather than “The Öresund Region”, at the upcoming international real estate exhibition Mipim (Helsingborgs dagblad, 2013). Together with other municipalities in the region and actors such as real estate agencies, the two cities have had a joint stand at the exhibition for over fifteen years.

Ilmar Reepalu, former chairman of the municipal board in Malmö City, also says that the two municipalities will use this title more and more, especially in joint projects such as the metro, “Cleantech City” and wind power (ibid.). In the same article, Pia Kinhult, First Governor for Region Skåne, points out that the branding depends on who the target group is and emphasises that the Öresund concept is not being abandoned. The change of name may however be seen as a sign that Malmö and Copenhagen also have an increasing tendency towards direct collaboration, i.e., bypassing the regional level.

Our observations indicate that there is a certain inherent tension between the northern and southern parts of Skåne which is partly related to the perceived lack of a permanent connection in the north between Elsinore and Helsingborg. This is clarified in e.g., the distribution of the number of trips across Öresund, which has increased in the southern parts of the region – i.e., the Copenhagen - Malmö connection – since the bridge’s completion. At the same time, the number of journeys between Helsingborg and Elsinore has decreased
in terms of both passenger traffic and goods transport. The establishment of companies in Helsingborg has also decreased since 2000. However, this in itself does not mean continued imbalance in the region’s development; something which is clear from statistics which show that the number of people employed in Malmö, Lund and Helsingborg has increased quicker in relation to Skåne as a whole.

Anders Olshov (2013) points out that this can be seen as Helsingborg undergoing a transition since the arrival of the bridge; from transport node to attractive housing market. In other words, the greater accessibility provided by the Öresund connection has benefited Helsingborg in the sense that more and more are choosing to settle in the town simply because it is an accessible and attractive location in relation to Malmö and Copenhagen.

At the same time, discussions on establishing a permanent connection between Helsingborg and Elsinore continue. Recently, a new start-up has emerged in the collaboration and a new strategy for the “HH Collaboration” – “An interconnected city 2035” (Helsingborg City & Elsinore Municipality, 2013) – has been adopted on both sides of Öresund. The new start-up is a result of wishes expressed on both a political and civil servant level for the collaboration to be geared up into a more active phase. But the advocates of the HH Tunnel perhaps lack a vision possessing the same national backing as that which was able to make the Öresund Bridge a reality. Helsingborg and Elsinore quite simply lack the same national significance that Malmö and Copenhagen have in their respective countries.

### 2.2 Overview

As an overview of the Swedish situation, it can be said that commitment to the Öresund region from a national perspective has waned since the decision to build the bridge was made in the 1990s. Matters concerning the development and growth of the Öresund region are being addressed to an increasing extent on local and regional levels. This means that the conditions attributable to e.g., the tax systems, which are perceived by many as inhibitive and which need to be handled on a national level, tend not to come up on the political agenda to the extent needed to improve the conditions for collaboration. This has been highlighted in ÖRUS but will also be touched upon over the following chapters of this report.
In summary, the interest in the development of the Öresund region – which was particularly large with regard to the Öresund Bridge and its construction – can be said to have transitioned from being a matter of urgency in terms of establishing an international transport link to being the creation of collaborations between border regions – collaborations such as the Öresund Committee which was the driving force behind the development – to now being a matter of primarily the municipalities and cities of Copenhagen and Malmö driving the regional development forward (Figure 1). It could also be expressed so that the various phases represent a legitimising phase in which the nation states are active setting the framework for the collaboration, a mobilising phase in which regional actors strive to engage as many actors as possible in the active collaboration and a phase – the current one – which involves searching for concrete projects for collaboration, often on a local level (and there certainly is a need for such a search).

![Figure 1. The Öresund collaboration - from national to local interests](image-url)
3. Different views and theories on transnational collaboration and institutional formation

The literature on matters such as regional formation, globalisation, urban competitiveness, border region collaboration and other closely related concepts is extensive. Despite terms such as region and regional identity being used a great deal over the past fifteen years, both in political discourse (e.g., within the EU) and within many fields of research, their significance continues to be ambivalent (see e.g., Paasi, 2009, p 121ff). One reason for this is that the terms are often taken for granted, i.e., they are often said without any in-depth reflection on the significance or context. In the same way, the meaning of regional collaboration, and moreover of the term “integration”, is often unclear and undefined, though it is surrounded by positive values where areas such as the Öresund region are concerned.

This chapter looks at a number of important views and a theoretical basis for discussion and the presentation of empirical evidence in the report. This review of theories gives a lot of space to institutional theory. This theory building picks up many of the important aspects of cooperation in Öresund, both in the short and long term. Additional dimensions are then added to the analytical framework, such as the degree of coordination or collaboration and the matter of what type of incentive we have chosen to use in various collaborations; regulation/governance or promotion. For an overview of the development of this theoretical area, see e.g., Klein (1999).

We have previously established that the Öresund Committee’s development strategy ÖRUS is based partly on an institutional perspective. Measures which aim to provide good conditions for development and collaboration are in focus for this document.

3.1 Collaboration in various forms - the institutional framework

When studying collaboration between actors in Sweden and Denmark, on both sides of Öresund (as in this report, for example), it is important to use a clear classification framework and conceptual apparatus. Our view is that this should focus on both the significance of the collaboration and its timescale. There is otherwise a risk that different terms and phenomena such as language, organisational forms, legislation and purely organisational matters will be mixed up with no further specification of what they stand for or how they differ from one another.
A clear model which distinguishes these different types of phenomena in society or in organisations has been presented within the scope of the field of New Institutional Economics, developed by Nobel Laureate Oliver Williamson, who largely has worked with “transaction cost theory”. In this, there is an attempt to understand and explain the choice of different organisational models based on the degree of uncertainty in the market situation and the frequency with which the transactions have been carried out, among other things. The theory has also been applied to operations in the public sector (Williamson, 1999). In the scope of a broader institutional approach, Williamson (2000) presents a model which describes different institutional conditions and phenomena on four different “levels”. Williamson’s model has been translated into Swedish in a paper by Bjuggren & Ekelund (2012). It is shown in Figure 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pace of institutional change</th>
<th>Purpose of institutional formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>100 – 1000 years</td>
<td>Non-calculated, spontaneous order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>10 – 100 years</td>
<td>Find the right design for the institutional level. 1st degree of economic optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>1 – 10 years</td>
<td>Find the right design for the governance structures. 2nd degree of economic optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Fulfil marginal conditions for optimisation. 3rd degree of economic optimisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Institutional level and change (Williamson 2000)

The model contains four “levels” of institutional conditions which in various ways affect how collaboration is formed. The “uppermost” level (level 1) handles aspects of culture and values. Here, in an Öresund perspective, we find the differences in language, culture and practice that are often experienced in the collaboration across Öresund. These factors or conditions change at a slow rate;
a matter of hundreds of years. Perhaps the “Swedification” since the 17th century of the previously Danish County of Skåne can be seen as an example of such a process, which has defined cultural conditions for future social development with long-term consequences.

The forms of organisation and collaboration which are generally formed based on these factors are generally informal in character, and as this occurs without intentions or goals, they are thereby also spontaneous. Here we find conditions that mean we (often) experience a spontaneous affinity with other people from our own linguistic and cultural circle (with a perspective which is wider than a narrow, national definition), an affinity which goes beyond organisations, laws and more current ways of organising collaboration. In the same way, conditions based in other cultural contexts can often be perceived as uneven, even though there is often a fine line between what is perceived as strange and what is more common.

At the next level (level 2), large parts of the institutional environment, which works and creates in the long term, are situated. Here we find legislation, formal long-term regulations of different types, perhaps in contractual form, but also our political and bureaucratic systems. Compared with level 1, they are more consciously created in interpersonal interactions, although with different degrees of conscious coordination. At the same time, certain parts of such structures can be seen as more “grown” over time than purposefully created on one occasion. Legislation which is active in the long-term, e.g., constitutional laws, can be seen as examples on this level, as well as rules and contracts that seem somewhat more short-term than the constitutional laws, in the perspective of decades.

Here we speak about institutional conditions that we often try to influence via various forms of political decision. It can be a matter of political measures intended to increase innovative capacity and to promote the emergence of effective forms of production and collaboration models, both in industry and in the public sector. Economic policy on a national or regional level which aims to promote growth is an example of this. There are of course several examples in the Öresund collaboration, for example, in terms of the work to tackle and reduce various border obstacles between Denmark and Sweden.

When we move “down” to levels three and four of the model, the focus is more on the various organisational issues and production models that we relate to on a daily basis and (normally) continuously seek to improve. Level 3 looks at how we choose to organise various processes in the corporate sector and in the public sector. Forms of ownership for different operations and issues concerning the relationship between owner and company/organisation management are a complex of problems on this level. This may for example be a matter of how to demand liability at the political level in terms of administrative management, but questions on how to effectively organise activities also come
in here. Should we for example rely on a model with competition between different activities in a market model or on collaboration in a more regulated and planned environment?

On this level (3), there are of course many questions on the Öresund collaboration’s institutional and organisational framework. Should more fixed forms of collaboration such as the Öresund Committee be organised and “filled” with resources and ambitions? Or should we invest in more loose forms of collaboration in projects for different issues at hand? Should culture and education be developed across Öresund within the scope of a model involving competition between different cultural institutions and universities or the coordination of these? Naturally, there is a long line of such questions on this level. They include ownership-related decisions on organisational form, governance and accountability that have an effect in the perspective for up to a decade, or perhaps longer.

On the closest level (4), from a time perspective, the model finally looks at matters of how we can find the most effective forms of activity based on a given organisational framework. In a market situation, questions of the pricing of individual goods and services will gain an important role here, as well as matters of more local management of resources, such as the staffing of a shop in a commercial centre or attempts to optimise the use of commercial property space or the given capacity of the transport system. In a public sector perspective, there are a number of similar matters concerning more local optimisation of resources in different activities. One aspect in an Öresund perspective could be to continuously attempt to move various activities in the public sector to the organisational unit with the best conditions to carry out the task in a resource-efficient manner. However, this in itself is a type of measure that requires a relatively well-developed coordination and collaboration on several of the other levels in the model, in terms of regulations, practice, etc.

In this way, the interdependence between the “levels” of the model is explained. The different levels continuously influence one another via interdependencies. Decisions and attitudes on higher levels, or the emergence of new practices or cultural phenomena, set boundary conditions for processes on lower levels. Inversely of course, experiences from processes and activities on lower levels of the model affect how actors on higher levels choose to decide on and formulate institutional frameworks. This is an expression of various forms of institutional and organisational learning, which can both promote and inhibit the development.

Alongside the direct connection to Williamson’s model, we can also assume that there may be direct connections and direct influence between factors and conditions on different levels without them needing to be “channelled” through all levels. Cultural phenomena such as language, for example, may well influence the resource allocation process on levels three and four of the model.
Would we for example choose to staff various operations with individuals who speak the “right” language just to avoid undesirable signal effects, despite the fact that this perhaps conflicts with the desire for good resource management?

There are a great many examples of analyses which apply an institutional perspective of organisational formation and collaboration. Classic examples apart from Williamson include North (2005) and Ostrom (2005). Applications of institutional theory which concern border region collaboration and transport systems can be found in Rietveld (2012), Rietveld & Stough (1997) and Bjuggren & Ekelund (2012). Some of the aforementioned academic articles discuss border region aspects, Öresund issues and transport infrastructure more specifically. Institutional theory is thus a well-used analytical model.

### 3.2 Various forms of collaboration in a transnational region

This report discusses and analyses several different types of collaboration across Öresund. The institutional framework above is used throughout as a basis for sorting different types of collaboration projects and different forms of collaboration. It is important to clearly distinguish between different types of collaboration with their varying degrees of complexity. One observation is that the actors in the Öresund region, and especially where actors in the public sector are concerned, often speak about “integration” in the Öresund region, when in fact what they are really referring to is different forms of collaboration and cooperation developed over a long period of time. We believe it is important to adopt a more dynamic approach and a more precise language than normal when speaking about collaboration in the Öresund region. The figure below describes this type of more dynamic view of collaboration models. This model has been used in the project in order to describe and analyse the various areas of collaboration studied in the report.
In one dimension, the model covers the extremes of “coexistence” over different degrees of more developed collaboration and an “integration” which is formed in an completely formal manner. In another dimension, the model further describes the designations of the collaborative relationships, their formal status and their character/content. The model includes both collaboration between actors in the public sector and actors who are active in market situations. A form of integration is thus by definition an increasingly developed market on which a great many actors are active, though this is in different constellations and often in competition with one another. Collaboration and integration do not eliminate competition. On the contrary, markets characterised by competition are one of the more common and effective forms of collaboration and integration.

Here, the EU internal market or the situation of a country with a common institutional framework are seen as good examples. The coordination and checking of the institutional framework has facilitated a reduction of the transactions costs by such a margin that it has been possible to establish an active market with small or insignificant obstacles. This in itself is a central aspect of collaboration across Öresund. It is easy to talk about collaboration and “integration” in terms of the need to build joint organisations and institutions. It is however important, alongside such permanent structures that can be developed both
under public management and on markets, to keep alive the vision of a functioning marketplace characterised by competition as a model for integration.

What characterises an informal coexistence is that the collaborative units are independent in their relation to one another, which is a situation that can be said to be akin to the collaboration between independent nations. The closer we get to an integration in the model, the more joint structures we find which denote collaboration, e.g., between Sweden and Denmark. Examples of such well-developed collaborations or integration in the Nordic countries include the Öresund Bridge Consortium, SAS (Scandinavian Airline Systems), companies in the financial sector such as Nordea or energy companies such as Fortum, and the EU. In the most integrated organisations, many processes have also gone from being carried out in collaboration or cooperation between different parties to being carried out internally or within the given public sector collaboration.

In relation to the institutional model above, it can be noted that forms of collaboration without well-developed integration maybe more often arise due to a lack of cultural or political institution frameworks. At the same time, more fully developed integration may only be expected to arise once there has also been a levelling of conditions on higher levels of the institutional model. In organisations created via the integration model without the coordination of institutional conditions on higher levels, we can therefore expect what we “manage” to coordinate to be primarily more short-term resource distribution aspects. SAS’s longstanding problems with various labour market legislation and contractual relationships between the company and the trade unions could perhaps be seen as an example of this. In the scope of a formally integrated organisation, a large number of conflicts have remained which by all accounts have limited the company’s competitiveness in relation to a number of competing companies. Only under the protection of regulation and state ownership has this structure, which is ineffective on deregulated markets, been able to survive.

The model in Figure 3 is not intended to allocate different values to different forms of collaboration. One thing that is established though is that a fully developed integration is a collaboration model which is very demanding and which is perhaps not always necessary. Various forms of collaboration can be appropriate in different areas. In order to achieve more integrated solutions, however, institutional conditions on a higher level must be sufficiently levelled out, or strong owners must be able to provide a solution with protection, e.g., via financial sustainability. In the case of the Öresund collaboration, these may be matters such as legislation, tax regulations, social insurance and political forms of decisions, as well as language and culture. By weighing in these aspects, a more realistic picture of expectations from different areas of collaboration can be created and frustration avoided. One piece of advice based on the model is thus to compare goals and collaboration strategies with conditions and needs.
3.3 Competition, complementation and collaboration

A third central dimension when analysing the transnational collaboration in the Öresund region, and which is partly discussed above, is the matter of whether collaboration or possibly integration arises as a result of or via spontaneous coordination built on competition between several independent actors, or on formal coordination built on a more planned collaboration. Here too, we often feel the discussion in relation to the Öresund collaboration is unreflecting. As per the examples in the report, there seems to be a tendency in political contexts to work on the assumption that it is via the creation of formal collaboration, collaborative projects and formal planning that optimal “integration” comes about. This is exemplified in several of the political visions developed for the area of culture or for higher education, for example. More on this below.

We wish to point out, however, that a potential collaboration strategy can also be based on a competition perspective. Via the existence of established units in both the competitive sector and the public sector, pressure for development is created, as well as a good breeding ground for effective resource consumption, diversity and innovation. A collaboration model which covers competition and market forms is thus an important part of an overall view of future collaboration in the Öresund region.

At the same time, it should be mentioned that what often characterises the interaction between “public and private” or “collaboration and competition” is that the two models blend over time and between different sectors. Actors in the public sector thus collaborate with actors in the private sector and collaboration is substituted by competition in several different dimensions. Actors can also complement one another in various ways in a competitive market or via an integration, either in a company or in the public sector. Here, we are back at the “transaction cost theory”, which is intended to define when we can expect an integration of complementary activities on a market to take place, and when a spontaneous coordination via competitive markets can work. Over time, we can maintain that learning in organisations and on markets leads to specific knowledge that has been developed or is available in individual organisations becoming general knowledge among many actors. This in itself supports the idea that integration based on large, formal organisational units can lose strength over time. This is perhaps one explanation for SAS’s difficulties over the past ten years. Nokia’s difficulties in the mobile telephony segment may perhaps also be explained by this phenomenon.
The figure above illustrates three ideal types of competition and specialisation on markets with varying degrees of competition and integration. In the competition example, there are a number of different actors in two separate markets or geographical areas which have no extensive exchange or interaction, e.g., Skåne and Zealand. In the specialisation example, this original picture has changed by means of the actors developing a specialisation, which may be a result of trade. In the third example, the boundary between the geographical areas or markets has been levelled. The creation of an internal market in the EU or the uniting of geographical areas in the public sector may be examples of this. In practice, it is often the case that the three different models work side by side at every step. Some segments of a marketplace are integrated, whilst others are more separate.

By being more aware of which model we are working with in different cases, a more appropriate form of collaboration can often be chosen. Perhaps for the cultural sector, for example, a competition model can be chosen in which pluralism and a high level of mobility are important in order to offer a broad range of products and services, whilst integration may be necessary in order to solve large common investment needs, such as infrastructure.

3.4 Incentive – stick or carrot?

A fourth dimension which we wish to put forward in this context is which model of governance is used to influence collaboration. Here, we can find two basic views in the literature and in practical politics and in companies/organisations.

One model is based on the fact that collaboration is most successful when done via a “top-down” oriented management of organisational forms, etc. This is also a view of collaboration which is linked to management based on a philosophy of regulations and control. Via reorganisation and building new organisational forms and connection, owners in the public and private sectors expect to be able to create a collaboration via organisation and governance which perhaps did not exist previously. This is a form of management which perhaps works best on levels 3 and 4 in the institutional model, and which can often be effective within the scope of the given starting points in terms of the institutional environment.
Another model is based on the idea that it is the individual actors’ actions that are crucial to achieving efficient resource consumption and good coordination. This model also tends to highlight innovation, dynamism and development as important characteristics of a successful management philosophy. Here we also look for the incentives – often economic instruments – which mean that spontaneously decentralised action among many actors leads to effective resource consumption and good coordination of various aspects. Here we can act within the context of the existing institutional frameworks, but this type of measure is often linked to an attempt to create the desired incentives by means of e.g., changing tax regulations or other legislation (which is of course not ruled out in the other management model).

One observation is that there is perhaps a tendency in the Öresund collaboration to choose political “top-down” management by means of regulation (“stick”) over instruments which open up for spontaneous aspects (“carrot”). This is an aspect which is linked to the three other dimensions in this chapter and which we intend to return to in the report.

Another observation, which comes up during the interviews we have conducted, is that Danish leadership is often perceived by a number of actors to be more hierarchical than Swedish. This may indicate that there is more management by incentives in Sweden and more management by hierarchy in Denmark.

### 3.5 Differences – catalysts for collaboration

A summary of several of the views and theoretical starting points in this chapter could also be the spontaneous and somewhat paradoxical circumstance that there is a force which drives integration in situations where there are differences between bordering regions. Differences are not solely obstacles. In the Öresund collaboration, it can therefore be noted that differences in exchange rate, fiscal policy, sectoral distribution, immigration policy and several such conditions tend to provide incentive to look to “the other side” of Öresund. We can thus note that the exchange in travel across the Öresund Bridge has increased where there are larger differences in exchange rate, and that it has decreased when the rate has levelled out. The notion that differences give rise to trade and specialisation, which in turn drives efficiency in the economy, is also the basis of general trade theory.

This is an additional sign that collaboration and integration are multifaceted terms. Models which at first seem to reduce the possibility of collaboration and integration may in fact be the best thing for increasing collaboration and integration. In the various case studies we have carried out, we will be able to see more examples of this.
4. Collaborations – hopes and reality

This chapter provides a brief summary of the observations from the three areas we studied: Culture and Events, Industry and Research and Education. For each of the three areas, an initial presentation of observations is made, which are then summarised and discussed in terms of whether they can be seen as more general conclusions.

The ambition is to show how the Öresund collaboration has been organised and which forms of management and which incentives have been used to promote collaboration.

4.1 Observations from the area of Culture and Events

The empirical material in this area raises the question of whether collaboration and competition can coexist and characterise the interplay of actors active in the sector. The Öresund region-related work in this sector is taking place on several levels at once, involving everything from the development of political visions and strategies to the actions of individuals and the utilisation of offerings and opportunities in the region. From the interview material, we can see that it is often on an individual level, in everyday life, that integration has actually developed.

In the interviews conducted, we see a clear ambition from the political side to integrate the cultural sector, as many believe there is great potential value in heightened collaboration and coordination. In reality, however, greater collaboration across Öresund appears to be the result of an organic process in which collaboration has emerged as the outcome of interaction between individual actors. The work to implement the Öresund Committee’s strategic document Eventstrategien (“the Event Strategy”) has been named by a number of interviewees as an example of this. The strategy works on the assumption that it is via the creation of collaboration, collaborative projects and planning that “integration” is best fostered. Several interviewees are however doubtful of the benefits of the Event Strategy, and say that it is more of a “grandiose political vision” than a document that leads to actual action.

The focus of the strategy on “large-scale events” is questioned, and the question arises as to whether other, more small-scale investments could be of greater benefit to the collaboration. The discrepancy between the vision of the Event Strategy and the actual relationship between the actors is illustrated in Figure 5 below. The Event Strategy aims to promote coordination between actors in the sector. However, our interviews reveal that the actors within a sector have seldom used formalised channels for interaction; it is instead informal networks and contacts that created the grounds for collaboration.
Collaboration – Complementation - Competition

One question which comes up in a number of interviews is whether the two markets, cultural life on Zealand and the cultural life in Skåne, should be developed so as to complement or compete with one another. There is no clear answer to this question. In some contexts competition is perceived as positive, and in others as unproductive. Based on practical experiences, successful development strategies can be built on competition perspectives such as collaboration and complementation. The overall impression is also that it is possible to unify collaboration and competition strategies.

Malmö Opera and the Royal Danish Theatre in Copenhagen are two actors in the region which for a certain period saw the advantage in communicating with the customers and collaborating on common interests so as to reap maximal benefit from the demand for culture. These institutions have to some extent specialised their respective offerings.

For a period, Malmö Opera has targeted more of a popular culture audience, whilst the Royal Danish Theatre has had a more classical repertoire. We can either interpret this as a successful collaboration or as a competition strategy on a market. It is normally the observer’s perspective that determines how different initiatives are to be interpreted. In recent years, we have seen a transition to a situation in which both opera houses offer a broader repertoire. These switches between different competition strategies take place over time.

But the relationship between collaboration and competition can also be seen from other perspectives. One perspective that can be put forward concerns local and regional benefits. From a local perspective, the establishment of the new arena in Copenhagen for example is seen as a valuable asset, as Copenhagen has never had an arena with such great capacity before. From a regional perspective, there is already an arena with almost the same capacity in Hyllie, 15 minutes away by train from the site of the new Copenhagen arena. There are fears that the two arenas will “compete to the death” by competing for the same audience, neither of them generating the revenues necessary for profitability. Keeping this view in mind, it would perhaps have been better to prioritise one of the arenas.

But it is possible the competition between the two arenas could also generate values. The competition between the arenas can provide tangible incentive for customer orientation and quality awareness, and the resulting competitive situation could of course give rise to collaboration on the premise of e.g., establishing Öresund as an “arena region” in which there is “always something happening”, and we can of course envision a collaboration similar to that periodically established between Malmö Opera and the Royal Danish Theatre. One reason for facilitating collaboration is that the establishment of such collaboration provides the opportunity to coordinate the two arenas’ activities with
the purpose of jointly attracting larger events and becoming competitive on the international market.

The latter reasoning is entirely in line with the agenda of the Event Strategy, which is based on the fact that coordination in the region contributes to greater international competitiveness. As mentioned above, the interviews show that many actors in the region have doubts about the Event Strategy and its possibilities in terms of leading a process of change. It is also clear from the interviews that the officials and politicians interviews have shown greater faith in the Event Strategy than actors active in the sector.

Based on current observations, it seems the empirical material can be summarised quite well in relation to the three types of market presented in chapter three of this report.

• A competitive market: the arenas in Copenhagen and Hyllie should be able to develop this kind of relationship. The arenas are independent units and the relationship between them can be defined as informal.

• A complementing market. The collaboration between Malmö Opera and the Royal Danish Theatre in Copenhagen can be seen here as an example of such a strategy. In this example too, the collaboration is characterised by its informality.

• An integrated market. One example of striving for such an ideal type of market is the Event Strategy and its ambitions for coordination. At the same time, it should be noted that a common market with low institutional borders provides for collaboration characterised by competition.

In all material aspects, there is a lack of evidence to suggest that any one of these three market types should be superior to the others in terms of achieving synergies. Our conclusion is rather than success lies in understanding where and under what circumstances a certain model can produce the greatest dividends.

Our point is that the choice of collaboration model and position on whether collaboration should be based on e.g., informal (voluntary) relationships or formalised (binding) depends on the situation. There is no “one method fits all”, which our case studies highlight rather well. In the choice between informal and formal processes, it is crucial to understand what interests drive a certain actor’s behaviour and what incentives could lead to collaboration with other actors. There is reason to believe that incentives for collaboration can be created in two ways; either by means of collaboration offering advantages (carrot) or the lack of collaboration resulting in penalties (stick). We discuss the opportunities for creating incentives for collaboration in the next section.
In the figure below, we show the examples of collaboration that we have studied and which are presented in greater detail in Appendix 2 (available in Swedish). The Event Strategy’s more far-reaching coordination ambitions are contrasted with the relatively spontaneous and non-coordinated examples of collaboration and competition.

**Figure 5. Examples of collaboration in the area of Culture and Events**

**Incentive – stick or carrot**

The empirical material reveals that collaborative projects in the sector have been run with both “stick” and “carrot” management models.

The Event Strategy aims to achieve coordination between the regions cultural institutions. The incentive for this form of collaboration is to increase the region’s total competitiveness on the international market. The strategy maintains that innovation, dynamism and development are goals worth striving towards; an approach which reflects an entrepreneurial attitude. At the same time, several of those interviewed believe that a number of projects have been managed “top-down” and they convey the idea that these lack incentive for collaboration.

One example in which the vision is not in line with the outcome is Öresundsfestivalen (a yearly cross-Öresund culture festival). Though the event is based on benevolent incentives and ideas, it was not the great success the organisers had hoped for, as the number of festival goers (in 2012) was fewer than expected. Apart from functioning as a cultural venue, the premise of the Öresundsfestiva-
len is that actors in the region’s cultural scene should be able to use the festival as a social forum for creating networks and collaborations. The questioning of Öresundsfestivalen is not a unique example; a number of the actors interviewed witness to difficulties getting initiatives integrated in their normal activities.

Many projects were managed “top-down”, lacked grounding and seldom proved to have achieved any great success and become anything other than a one-time event. Some events are perceived by several of the interviewees to be “grandstanding”. One such event was Öresundsfestivalen. From a political level, projects such as Oresund Event Center and Eventstrategin are started up, but there is seldom any platform for these in a broader context. One reason for this is that there is a discrepancy between the actual cultural scene and the conception of the ongoing Öresund collaboration.

An additional problem which arises is what happens with projects once funding runs out. It has proven difficult to keep projects going in the long term. At the same time, the importance of short-term projects for establishing contacts across Öresund should not be underestimated. Without project funding, many projects would not have come about. This would mean missing out on the opportunities for meetings and networking which normally follow each individual project.

With support from interviews in the area of culture, there is thus cause to carefully consider whether formal strategies should be used, and if so, in what way. Two key issues have been identified in the interviews. The first is a matter of anchoring strategies with concerned actors. Obviously, cultural entrepreneurs have other interests and priorities than those formalised “top-down”. Secondly, the matter of incentives must be discussed - what is needed for the actors who are to implement the strategy to actually do so. There may be a number of conditions here that must be taken into consideration before a formal strategy is launched, such as knowledge, resources, expected dividends and last but not least, whether or not the cultural entrepreneurs “believe in” the strategy.

At the same time, the interviews reveal that actors collaborate where they themselves feel there is incentive for this. From this perspective, the specialisation and diversification of actors’ activities drives collaboration. Through specialisation, each individual actor/institution gains access to a larger market. In this case, the incentives for collaboration have been financial profitability and development, examples of which are Malmö Opera and the Royal Danish Theatre.

One project in which the actor perceives clear incentives and sees the potential for heightened collaboration is the activities at Moriska Paviljongen (a cultural scene in Malmö). Here, the potential for exchange across national borders has been identified, in a region characterised by a multicultural population. A multicultural population possesses a linguistic and cultural currency that mean that national borders and language barriers are not relevant in the
same way as for inhabitants with a long history in the region. In many cases, people have friends and relatives on both sides of Öresund, which is also a clear incentive for more frequent travel in the region.

One example of where this can work in practice is Moriska Paviljongen’s bookings of popular artists from the Middle East and the Balkans, which are events that require a larger audience base than that available locally in Skåne. It has therefore been necessary to situate the event on the Danish side. The audience from Skåne has been offered transport by bus, and at the same time the event has attracted an audience from countries outside of Sweden and Denmark. This indicates an untapped potential which could provide incentive for a future project for promoting cultural exchange in Öresund.

It is also important to keep in mind that transnational collaboration projects have not existed for a particularly long time in the culture/events sector. It was proven that the region’s actors are unaccustomed to handling the type of collaboration issues that arise in such situations. The Handball World Championship 2011 and the Eurovision Song Contest 2013 are examples of this. One interesting aspect is that it is precisely this type of event that is intended to contribute to greater cooperation and collaboration in accordance with the Event Strategy.

During the Handball World Championship 2011, communication with the Danish side was limited. In connection with the Eurovision Song Contest 2013, the empirical material reveals that communication had improved and that a certain amount of collaboration had begun to take shape on certain issues. It takes time to establish contacts and create procedures for collaboration. However, it is important in this respect to point out that each new project has entailed a challenge and provided new experience and contributed to the establishment of new contacts. This entails a great potential for future collaboration in the region and shows that the type of collaboration/cooperation desired is a time-consuming process. Öresundsfestivalen, which took place for the first time in 2012, should be seen primarily as a new project with potential for development. In relation to Williamson’s model, which contains four “levels” of institutional conditions which in various ways affect how collaborations are formed, we can establish that this type of collaboration – which is about language, cultural circles and practices – takes a long time to change.

### 4.2 Observations from the area of Industry

The Öresund Bridge has been of great significance for the development of industry in the area. New companies have become established and many previously established companies have grown. The exchange across Öresund has been significant. Öresund has become an increasingly competitive and accessible region of northern Europe. The Danish international airport Kastrup has
been of considerable importance in the development; not least on the Swedish side, which thanks to the bridge has gained much better access to Scandinavia’s largest international airport.

The analysis of the interview material reveals that collaboration in the industrial sector is not as developed as in the area of Culture and Events, for example. This may explain why many of the interviewees believe that more should have been done on the political level. Established networks and social forums for the region’s entrepreneurs and actors in industry, for example, are in demand. There appears to be a general faith in the sector’s development and integration taking place all by itself. At the same time, many interviewees refer to institutional problems such as the legal regulatory framework for taxes and population registry which they feel complicate the development of collaboration in industry. As these problems are well known and well documented, we have chosen not to discuss them in detail in this report, which is in no way an indication that we see them as less important – on the contrary, they constitute a great burden for companies that wish to develop across Öresund.

At the same time, when we discuss industrial collaboration, it is important to keep in mind the meaning of the competition regulations and the EU state aid rules. Industrial collaboration can turn into unlawful restrictions of competition and public aid initiatives may be at risk of being classified as unlawful state aid. Of course, these regulations place (entirely necessary) limitations on collaboration in this area.

Collaboration – Complementation – Competition

In addition to providing a general picture of the industrial collaboration in Öresund, we have chosen to describe and analyse a couple of specific examples; Medicon Valley Alliance (MVA), Copenhagen Malmö Port (CMP) and the two commercial centres Fields (Copenhagen) and Emporia (Malmö). Observations of these actors’ actions in the arena of the Öresund region lead to a discussion on how each views their relationship.

The initiative to form MVA began with the view that the region had potential for development in the area of Life Science. The aim was to create a transnational Triple Helix Collaboration. The collaboration was established by means of forming a formal partnership, working with a common goal and creating common policies. The ambition was to tap the collective potential of the entire region. This was done with the hope that an increasingly integrated market would increase the region’s chances to be competitive on the international market.

Some of the actors interviewed feel that MVA is a successful collaborative project. The collaboration occurred between actors that are accustomed to collaborating. This means there was knowledge, funding and commitment; three factors which can be defined as significant in order to achieve good collabora-
tion. Over time, however, the activities and opportunities for collaboration have changed, the academic contribution has become weaker with the years and companies in the field of Life Science have had to endure increased competition and pressure on profitability.

This may be a contributory factor to the view of some that MVA has not developed in the desired direction. There are also other reasons, however, which may explain why the collaboration has not developed in the desired manner. Amidst hardened competition, the Danish companies have managed better than companies on the Swedish side. Furthermore, certain actors feel the reason for the dubious development of MVA is to be found in its organisation, which has lacked transparency. It is not entirely clear who is responsible or how defined the collaboration is. MVA is also to some extent considered to have had inadequate marketing, which may also have contributed to the collaboration project not meeting expectations.

With reference to the above discussion on “formal” and “informal” strategies, there is cause to consider whether the focus on overall strategies and formalised goals and policies have been the most successful way of stimulating collaboration across Öresund. Several interviewees express more or less openly that there have been informal agendas and mistrust of the formalised collaboration. A lack of clarity regarding the delegation of roles and responsibilities and the perceived lack of transparency are manifestations of this. The interviewees wish for a strengthening of informal forums (networks and meeting places) so as to discuss development strategies, both general and specific to the problem or matter at hand. One natural conclusion from the interviews is that the interaction – as well as the delegation of roles between political and market actors – between the formal and the informal should be reconsidered. Representatives in industry demand strong political leadership which can develop the framework and playing field by means of goals and comprehensive strategies, but which is also accepting and is based on active interaction with industry.

Another example highlighted in the empirical part of the study is CMP Malmö and Copenhagen’s joint port authority. CMP is highlighted as a good example of a functioning formal, joint organisation. The primary reason for this is that there was clear incentive and a defined need for structured collaboration in harbour operations on both sides of Öresund. The permanent connection placed demands on change and entailed both a challenge and an opportunity for development. The structured collaboration made the opportunities for exchanging services and increasing economic efficiency more concrete. In other words, as there was incentive for collaboration there was also a willingness to collaborate. A joint port authority meant the creation of an integrated organisation, which entailed advantages for both parties Copenhagen had access to land for property development and Malmö could develop old industrial areas for the new harbour operations. In this case, the collaboration was based on
the opportunity for the two harbours to develop specialisations for their operations; Copenhagen Harbour began specialising in cruise liners and the Port of Malmö in the imports of goods. In this way, it was possible to create a rational organisation and conditions for economic efficiency.

The road to forming a joint company was not entirely simple. Without a good deal of faith in and willingness for collaboration, it is reasonable to believe that the collaboration would not have come about. Politically speaking, the project was highly desirable. There was a vision that coordination could lead to great advantages for both Copenhagen and Malmö. At the same time, it can be noted that this political vision ultimately did not steer the practical implementation of the project. The creation of a joint, integrated company is characterised by its motives being commercial rather than political.

The CMP project is interesting from a number of perspectives; aside from the fact that it points out concrete roads for creating integration and mutual values, it also provides insight into the interaction between politics and markets. At the same time, the success of CMP may be explained by the fact that both the Öresund region and the two cities (Malmö and Copenhagen) clearly benefitted from the new organisation of harbour operations. From the regional development perspective, it is interesting to ask how we should handle a situation which clearly offers great regional benefits but in which the local benefits are marginal or perhaps even negative. What would happen if CMP’s operations also included Helsingborg and Trelleborg? It may be that the possibility of regional benefits and the creation of value would drastically increase, but this could be at the expense of local value in both cities. In the final chapter, we return to a discussion on how a project that would create great regional benefits as well as new local “problems” could be handled. This analysis will focus on matters of political leadership and compensation via structured negotiations.

The third example highlighted in the material gathered for the report is the relationship between the two commercial centres Fields (Copenhagen) and Emporia (Malmö). The interviews reveal that the two commercial centres, which are part of the same group, seem to each have their own geographical market. At the same time, it is evident that the two operations enjoy a formal exchange of information and coordinate activities in relation to large-scale international operations or big retail chains. The market-driven processes have also proven to have an impact on these operations. The differences in exchange rate, for example, mean that many Danes go to Emporia to shop, whilst Swedes travel across Öresund to Fields for the same purpose.

It is also evident from the empirical material that Fields on the Danish side feels that Emporia’s more suitable and modern premises are a competitive advantage, to such an extent that Fields is now planning to develop its own premises so as to better compete with Emporia. In this respect, it can be established that competition between the two shopping centres will lead to development.
Without the shopping centre on the Swedish side, there is reason to expect that Fields would not have felt the need to develop its operations to the same extent. In the relationship between Fields and Emporia, there is a coexistence; i.e., the two centres are independent units which enjoy a certain exchange of experiences. A collaboration strategy can be based on a competitive perspective, whilst a certain degree of communication and dialogue is conducted with the competitor, which this is a good example of.

Based on these observations, the empirical material from this area – in relation to the three ideal types of market presented in chapter three – indicates a market with competition. Emporia and Fields are a good example of this. But at the same time, CMP and the coordination of harbour operations in Malmö and Copenhagen show the potential in collaboration and cooperation. In the case of CMP, profits for both the region and the two cities and their harbour operations have been obtainable. The example thus shows that operations competing on a joint market can benefit from collaboration.

The examples in this section are summarised in Figure 6. Fields and Emporia are an example of collaboration with a loose form. This can perhaps be seen as a natural consequence of the two being competitors, despite being part of the same operation. MVA and CMP are two examples of more in-depth collaboration, though they differ in terms of content and are positioned on the right side in the figure.
Handling institutional obstacles and cultural differences

The empirical material in the area of industry shows that it is important to take advantage of the creative environment that transnational collaboration affords. Several actors state that in the initial stage they perceived differences between the Danish and Swedish management and company cultures. Several of the actors interviewed feel that the right attitude to the meeting of cultures is a positive driving force. The differences between the Swedish, consensus-driven style of leadership and the more operative Danish style have necessitated compromise. When comparing with the four levels of Williamson’s model (see chapter 3), it is important to keep in mind that collaboration which is based on the meeting of the Swedish and Danish cultures can be very time consuming.

All actors witness to coming across institutional obstacles every day which are based on the Danish and Swedish systems; for example the labour market and social security systems not synchronising with one another, which complicates the transnational exchange. This is a comprehensive problem for all actors in the region, but to what extent and in what way this is expressed depends on the sector and the conditions of each individual company. Information is a significant factor, where Öresunddirekt conducts important work which could be developed further. There is a demand for networks, social forums where entrepreneurs/actors can meet and discuss these issues, exchange experiences and thereby raise matters with a unified voice.

There are different forms of collaboration in the region’s industry. It has in places been rooted in and built upon the activities of individual actors and companies. The empirical material shows that economic efficiency and profitability have been necessary incentives for collaboration to come about. This clear focus on profitability, however, is in no way inconsistent with the notion of local and regional benefit, which CMP is a clear example of. The challenge here obviously lies in developing forms of collaboration between politics and market.

There is a clear demand for creating more contacts between the region’s actors, social forums and networks, whereby actors can come together with the purpose of exchanging experiences and defining a concrete picture of the company’s situation and its role in the regional development. It is a matter of facilitating collaboration on a level which affects individuals actually working/living “transnationally”. Language, which is often perceived as an obstacle to collaboration across national borders, has proven to be a problem, which gives cause to reconsider the current view, i.e., that it is something that will be overcome with time. In the final chapter we return to matters of political leadership and the delegation of roles between politics and markets.
4.3 Observations from the area of Research and Education

Work to promote a closer and more systematic collaboration between the various actors of the region in the field of research and education has been underway both before and after the Öresund Bridge was completed. From this perspective, the empirical part of the report presents the collaboration within the initiatives Öresund University, Öresund Science Region, ESS and MAX IV, as well as in the recently started dialogue between the regional Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). MVA as an example of collaboration is also an industry initiative with significant bearing on collaboration around research issues. Today, both Öresund University and Öresund Science Region have been discontinued, and there are to some extent great hopes that the facilities ESS and MAX IV will in future take on the role of becoming a unified project which contributes to an increase in collaboration between the Danish and Swedish actors in the areas of research, education and industry.

ESS and MAX IV contain unique potential for development of education and research on several levels in an Öresund region perspective. There are fears that national considerations and agendas combined with institutional obstacles will result in the potential to function as an important collaboration hub not being fully taken advantage of. It is important to define a regional ownership role for projects of this type so as to optimise their contribution to regional collaboration.

There can be said to be great potential in research and education in the Öresund region, though there are clear indications despite this that it has not been entirely simple to mobilise a more extensive and comprehensive collaboration between the region’s institutions and HEIs with the purpose of promoting development in education, research and industry. On the other hand, a number of interviewees vouch for the existence of a significant academic collaboration of a more informal character. It involves individual researcher who developed collaborations in terms of both co-publishing academic articles and student-teacher exchanges. These collaborations, however, are not the result of formalised and institutional collaborations; they are instead based in informal networks between researchers and institutions at various universities. The same applies, if to a somewhat lesser extent, to the area of education, where HEIs collaborate on joint study/doctoral programmes.

Several actors state that the largest challenges are on the education side, where several large and small collaboration initiatives have had to be discontinued despite interest from both the actors in the field of education and the students. A significant obstacle for collaboration can be related to level 2 in Williamson’s model; the national political, legal and bureaucratic systems are a spanner in the works for both “top-down” planned and spontaneous, “grown”
collaboration projects. Where the collaboration examples of Öresund University and Öresund Science Region are concerned, there are according to interviewees a number of concurrent reasons for these not working. It is a matter of rivalry between the HEIs and general, system-based reasons such as barriers to student mobility and imbalances in the range of study fields, as well as more specific, individual-related reasons such as personal chemistry between participating actors which is dependent on visionaries, which explains why these initiatives were ultimately discontinued. The picture of why collaboration has not developed as intended varies depending on who is telling the story.

Below, the presented examples of collaboration are discussed in light of the institutional model. This involves first of all an analysis of how the examples relate to the terms competition, complementation and collaboration, and secondly highlighting the incentive behind this. After this, the institutional obstacles important to this area are dealt with. The section is concluded with reflections on valuable experiences which can be highlighted as a contribution to the future regional development work in the Öresund region.

**Collaboration – Complementation – Competition**

The empirical material for the area of research and education shows that there are a great many different collaborative initiatives of a more formal character in the Öresund region, where the actors meet on a more or less regular basis and work together on joint projects (Figure 7). The cases of the Öresund University, MVA and ESS have been a matter of work in the form of a real partnership, where the idea is for the parties to have a joint policy and work together towards common goals. The case of MAX IV is a matter of somewhat looser collaboration – though in the form of a more regular exchange of information and experiences – that can be said to have formed around joint projects. Danish actors have a strong position in research linked to MAX IV, and the Technical University of Denmark (DTU) has a great deal of collaboration with the facility in that researchers carry out some of their activities there.
One observation based on the empirical material is that in the Öresund University initiative, there was a troubling discrepancy between the way in which the project was run – “top-down” – and how the actors involved in this wanted it to be run – more “bottom-up” and based on needs related to specific issues. The figure above illustrates this discrepancy between the vision and a more formalised collaboration with the actual forms of collaboration, as per the arrow pointing to the left in the figure. The individual regional HEIs are independent units, where in some cases there is an element of competition between the actors and in other cases a complementing action.

According to the interviewees, the Öresund University initiative gained overly fixed and formal forms all too quickly. A superstructural organisation was created which was to gather all of the region’s HEIs under one umbrella, which was actually perceived by some as a potential rival to their own activities. The name Öresund University entailed the risk of confusion with another competing university actor alongside the existing HEIs in the region, rather than being a combining force. It is thus interesting to note that the Öresund University was run as a “top-down” initiative, but when it met opposition from individuals and HEIs, there was no central or superordinate actor with the power to realise the intentions that were the basis of the initiative.

In the region, there were a number of larger universities that in themselves are known on a European and international level. In the interviews, there is a scepticism which speaks against the idea that a HEI should have to market
itself under any name other than its own. A HEI’s name is an established brand which plays an important role in attracting both students and research resources. Universities today are to a greater extent than before run in accordance with almost business principles, and for this reason there is a desire to safeguard the individual brand whilst at the same time remaining sceptical of investing in activities that do not directly contribute to increasing the profitability and competitiveness of the operations. This can create overly closed university environments which entail a risk of leading to a decrease in the area of research and education in the Öresund region. It can thereby be established that there is a clear element of competition which to a certain extent inhibits a wider transnational, regional collaboration.

Whilst the interviewees see obvious reasons why the collaboration did not develop between different educational institutions, there are regrets that these obstacles could not be overcome as there was clear potential in the notion of developed collaboration and coordination. Several interviewees believe there is a lot to gain both for the region as a whole and for the individual HEIs from the development of a more structured collaboration. There is an untapped potential in the area of research and education today. Several interviewees feel that in the Öresund region, a constructive collaboration in the research and education sector could improve the region’s capacity to compete on the global market. The general trend is to collaborate with the most suitable partners, regardless of where in the world they are situated, and not primarily those in the immediate geographical area. The empirical material indicates, however, that many direct their searchlights towards the most successful international environments in the first instance. One of the risks with this behaviour is that other HEIs and institutions that could provide as-good collaboration environments, such as those in the Öresund region, are not really in the picture where collaboration is concerned.

**Incentive – stick or carrot**

An important incentive for increasing collaboration in the area of research and education has been to tap the potential found in the region. Both on Zealand and in Skåne, there are strong research, education and industrial environments, for example in the field of Life Science, in the form of medical faculties and large pharmaceutical companies. There are also a number of large hospitals with a high level of medical expertise. Besides this, there are strong environments related to nano and material sciences which have been driving forces in the development of the MAX IV and ESS initiatives. It can thus be established that the driving force in the majority of collaboration initiatives discussed in this report in terms of research and education are the regional positions of strength in this area, which have historical roots on both sides of Öresund.
On the education side, one clear incentive for collaboration has been to develop more attractive and cost-effective study programmes. This applies not least to the programmes that did not attract enough students to offer courses with a good budget. Attempts have been made, for example, to establish a joint metrology programme. Despite barriers that put a stop to much of this type of activity, the initiative to collaborate is still taken, though in a somewhat smaller scale. The actors find ways of handling the system, but this cannot be done on a more systematic or larger scale due to current border obstacles. The Danish State has for example introduced general regulations that mean that student fees are charged to Swedish students wanting to study in Denmark.

There is a lot to suggest that one important ingredient in the future, in an expanded Öresund region collaboration in the area of research and education, is linked to industry participation in the collaboration initiative. Three current initiatives in which there is a clear industrial element are MVA, ESS and MAX IV. One of the most important criticisms directed at the Öresund University was that it was a form of constructed collaboration, forced from higher up the chain, whilst HEI actors and other important actors have worked from existing needs and interests; i.e., the collaborations have been allowed to grow more organically over time on a form of grass-roots level. This needs-based collaboration strategy is in line with how industry works by and large. Herein lies the potential for common incentives, which can mean expanded transnational collaboration.

Handling institutional obstacles

One conclusion from the empirical material of the study is that the institutional border obstacles have grown since the completion of the bridge. Normally, initiatives such as the construction of the Öresund Bridge, which over time bring two markets closer together, are conducive to greater exchange between these markets. But in the case of the area of education in the Öresund region, new regulations controlled by a sub-national and more protectionist discourse have contributed over the course of the years to building new border obstacles.

In order to see a development in the long term towards a more interwoven Öresund region, it is important that the perceived differences in language, culture and practices - level one in Williamson's institutional model - are reduced where these constitute an obstacle for integration and development. Strategies for handling language, culture and practices must be formulated in a well thought-out manner and with great care. On the one hand, there are clear problems with these differences; e.g., cultural meetings which give rise to conflicts or language problems which create barriers. On the other, the differences can be an asset to a multinational region. Meetings between people with different cultures, varied perspectives and different experiences may be the key to creativity and innovative solutions.
An important driving force in this context may be greater student mobility. If the younger generation is given the opportunity to travel freely in the region and take advantage of the entire range of education, these institutional conditions will likely change. Over time, there will be a gradual harmonisation of language (improved linguistic comprehension and language skills), culture and practices. But these processes take a long time. This makes it into an important matter to (as soon as possible) attempt to find constructive solutions to. Imbalances in student exchanges, for example, in relation to certain study programmes, are evened out by means of a better planned range of education on each side of Öresund.

There are signs of both “top-down” and “bottom-up” processes in relation to the research and education side. Overall, the collaboration projects “forced” from above, such as Öresund University and Öresund Science Region, did not work and were eventually discontinued. Here, there was a discrepancy between the vision for collaboration and the actors’ incentives for collaboration. The parties felt that they did not gain enough from the collaboration in Öresund University. In relation to future collaboration initiatives, it is important that all parties see an advantage in collaborating. The new initiative for dialogue between the HEIs has done exactly this; i.e., the decision has been made to start a dialogue on what needs and interests there are as a basis for the collaboration.

This form of dialogue for collaboration is characterised in Figure 7 as a form of collaboration just left of where the individual regional HEIs are today; i.e., a more informal collaboration strategy. There is however an ambition to potentially move towards more formal forms, if the regional HEIs feel this is a desirable development. This is the start of a collaboration that is in the opposite position of Öresund University, which had a more formal basis that did not match the regional actors’ perception of the desired direction of the collaboration. Today, work is in some respects “uphill”, as collaboration in this area is sensitive as a result of the negative experiences with Öresund University. This shows that different types of collaborative relationships are optimal in different situations and in different areas, and that it is therefore important to be flexible and choose a collaboration strategy based on the specific conditions of each situation.

The interviews confirm that at present there are a great number of informal collaborations, which over time have grown from a more interest and needs-based collaboration strategy. The primary reason for this having developed is that there is a need for coordination and thereby incentive for collaboration. This is a spontaneous environment. Needs and interest in relevant issues are positive driving forces that must be nurtured. It may be necessary to support these processes in some way in order to provide an extra boost for these more organisational processes.
There is by all accounts an untapped potential on the education side in the Öresund region. It seems urgent to convey to those on the national level the image of the negative impact that the new border obstacles on the education side have on the collaboration in the Öresund region. In this respect, the regional HEIs also have an important role to play. There are challenges linked to the realisation of the potential behind ESS and MAX IV. A great many researchers from across the world will come to these facilities. Expectations have perhaps been rather high at times. Experience gained from a project carried out in the region under the name “ESS MAX IV in Southern Sweden - TITA”, has revealed that it is necessary for the region's actors to collaborate in order to obtain optimal local and regional benefits from these establishments. It has also revealed that in certain respects, there are benefits to be had from collaborating and complementing on another's activities instead of competing.

Some municipalities, for example, will primarily act as “residential areas”, whereas others will benefit from investing in a profile geared towards tourism – all parties work from a model of distributed, complementing roles. Denmark now has a similar project underway, entitled “ESS og MAX IV som vækstmotorer i hovedstadsregionen” [“ESS and MAX IV as engines of growth in the capital city region”] (Vækstmotorprojektet, i.e., “the growth-engine project”). In a third phase, actors on the Danish and Swedish side of Öresund plan to expand the dialogue to encompass the entire region. These processes are important from a regional learning perspective and show the significance of actors meeting in discussion on concrete projects in order for the region's development potential to be utilised. This also shows that different forms of collaboration are appropriate in different situations.

In relation to the research side too, there are problematic issues for border commuters, such as legal obstacles that as per current systems make it fundamentally impossible for researchers from outside of Europe who are to work at ESS to settle in Copenhagen. A varied offering – which the Öresund region as a whole can offer – in the form of residential environment, nature and cultural scene is an important competitive advantage in the battle for various investments and attracting e.g., the most reputable researchers. This opportunity for researchers to live on one side of Öresund and work on the other is an additional dimension of the potential collaboration in the Öresund region. It is important to work to remove troublesome border obstacles which can have a negative impact on the opportunities for the region and its actors to gain the best effects from the upcoming research facilities ESS and MAX IV.
5. Summary of experiences and lessons for the future of the Öresund collaboration

There is an impression which runs through the studies we made by reading and listening to the Öresund region debates and discussions. This is frustration over the fact that collaboration in the Öresund region has not progressed further than it has. Our assessment is that this frustration can be reduced to the extent the actors in the region, with Region Skåne as one of the most important of these, take on board the need to more clearly adapt the forms of collaboration to the situation. This can be achieved by basing the choice of organisational solutions and management models on different timescales and the circumstances of the individual collaboration situation. We feel that one source of frustration is the discrepancy between ambitious visions – for example, in ÖRUS – and the reality the actors have to work with. KTH’s view is that the expectations of the collaboration should be better adapted to the circumstances than has thus far been the case. Lofty goals must be surrounded by realistic notions of the possibility to attain these goals within a reasonable time frame. There should probably be greater focus on areas and points of collaboration where results can also be achieved within a reasonable time frame. It is important to present the citizens of the Öresund region with results.

The difference between the view surrounding parts of the discussion and the expectations of the Öresund collaboration, and the view of the real potential in the short and long term that KTH stands for, is schematically illustrated in the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>ÖRUS</th>
<th>KTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture, practices, language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules, laws, bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, organization and structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation and incentives in everyday business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8. The vision for the Öresund collaboration (ÖRUS) and KTH’s analysis of on what levels concrete results can be achieved from the collaboration in the short and medium term.*
A re-orientation towards more concrete collaboration, which is in line with KTH’s view, does not necessarily mean that the actors in the Öresund region should give up on ambitions to address institutional obstacles on a higher level and institutional preconditions which are more difficult to change. What we mean is that Region Skåne should better clarify that visions concerning culture and legislation, for example, are simply visions, and ones which cannot become reality until much further down the line. We feel that the fact that change takes place slowly here, and perhaps in some cases purely as a spontaneous outcome rather than via political measures, is a central insight for successful work with these issues.

5.1 “Case-specific collaboration”

We feel that the empirical examples in our study show that it is generally counterproductive to place excessively high requirements and expectations on collaboration in which there is no realistic basis for collaboration among the concerned actors due to a lack of commitment and ownership on their part. It is also important to remember that cooperation and collaboration (or in the most developed situations, even integration) can come in different forms; from a relatively loose coexistence based on different institutional conditions to situations in which differences are evened out or of such an insignificant scope that they are in no way inhibitive.

Here, it is important to remember that competition is one of the more developed forms of collaboration and growth; perhaps even the ultimate sign that integration has come into being. Only once various border obstacles, in this report exemplified by the “four-level model” which we worked with, have been sufficiently reduced can any real competition come about. Division of labour and specialisation are also important elements in a region such as Öresund. Via specialisation and division of labour, efficiency is achieved in production processes, as well as good overall resource utilisation. Here, the matter of differences being a better catalyst for integration and collaboration than similarities is an interesting part of understanding the dynamic reality that is the Öresund collaboration. In situations whereby exchange rates, taxes, etc., deviate between Sweden and Denmark, the collaboration and exchange across Öresund increases, only to subside when the differences decrease.

The study of three different areas of collaboration which is summarised in chapter four and which is presented in greater detail in Appendix 1 (available in Swedish) is summarised in Figure 9 below. The figure shows that the majority of interaction in the region takes the form of collaboration, communication and coexistence, with fewer to the “right” side of the diagram. There are few of examples of well-developed integration. The main examples are perhaps the
harbour operations and of course the Öresund Bridge itself. The new research environments ESS and MAX IV may develop into such areas, where more extensive collaborations come into being. At the same time, there are a number of conditions surrounding the projects – where ownership and incentives are concerned – which can lead to a worse outcome than what is expected among a number of the actors in the Öresund region. Above all, we can perhaps see a risk that the project will be dominated by national rather than regional agendas.

For integration to come about, strong owners, strong support and clear goal orientation are often required. This applies to the harbour operations and to the Öresund Bridge, but perhaps not for so many more areas than this, where various types of projects with limited term financing often dominate the collaborations. Where jointly owned activities in industry are concerned, it can also be established that a collaboration which is too well developed may be in conflict with the competition protection legislation, or be a less successful business strategy, which is why completely coordinated actions are not always to be expected in these contexts.

One important conclusion is thus that the actors in the Öresund collaboration, and in this case those closest to Region Skåne, need to have a strategy for future Öresund collaboration that is balanced with the insights from the figure above and from the institutional perspective. Among the more important are perhaps pointing out the successes won over the years and adapting upcoming projects.
to a reasonable level of collaboration; a level which does not exceed the needs and incentives found in different contexts.

If the institutional conditions required for extensive collaboration with an integrated structure do not exist, it is probably best to aim for less ambitious forms of collaboration which can provide large collaborative gains without being surrounded by excessively lofty visions. A number of such “case-specific” collaborations already exist today and characterise the collaboration across Öresund. Here, a great deal of the exchanges take place spontaneously between individuals or directly between collaborating organisations.

5.2 Reflections and recommendations

In virtually all interviews conducted in the project, the matter of the formal versus the informal is addressed. The interviews provide no unified picture of what is best in terms of effective forms of promoting integration across Öresund. On the one hand, the need for a clear, guiding political vision and concrete action plans with clearly prioritised investments is highlighted. The construction of the Öresund Bridge and collaboration on the harbour operations in Copenhagen and Malmö are brought up here as examples of how political visions can create incentive for concrete development measures.

On the other hand, doubts have been expressed over investments in development which are managed “top-down”. Overall strategies that have been formulated have in many cases been met with scepticism or opposition from the actors concerned and have thereby become more paper products than catalysts for development, as illustrated above with examples from the areas of culture and education. The situation is similar for informal forms of collaboration. Sometimes, there are functioning networks and social forums in place, which means that the actors concerned can enjoy smooth and effective forms of collaboration. In other situations, it is the opposite; despite an insight that collaboration could create mutual gains, it is difficult to find forms of and conditions for agreements on collaboration.

Our conclusion based on the research literature and this project is that neither “top-down” nor “bottom-up” strategies can by their definition be obvious choices for creating effective conditions for regional integration. Under certain conditions, a “top-down” approach with a clear political vision can be successful. One example of this could be the vision of an integrated Öresund region in which the infrastructure is intended to be the catalytic factor which provided a boost for development in various areas of society. The creation of the Öresund Bridge and the development that came about as a result of this are an example of how institutional and formalised visions of development can be successful.

In other situations, however, this type of “top-down” approach would be less effective or even counterproductive. Here, we can take the cultural sector as an
example. In our empirical work, we have studied various cultural activities and can hereby establish that much of the positive development that has taken place has come about as a result of “bottom-up” approaches, i.e., different local actors have seen the benefit of a collaboration, they have been involved in informal networks and have developed social forums and relations in order to consider opportunities for collaboration that would be mutually beneficial. One example of how this type of informal collaboration produces benefits and generates value is the collaboration between Malmö Opera and the Royal Danish Theatre in Copenhagen.

Based on this, we draw two conclusions.

- First of all, a “top-down”-oriented approach with politically decisive visions can be an effective means of promoting regional development and integration on a general level. This vision can be a picture that unifies in relation to the desired development. This may thus also become a unifying force which means that different actors and activities move in the same direction. An additional advantage of such a comprehensive vision is that it can look at the whole in a way which is entirely different from that of individual actors or activities. It may be a matter of seeing the region as a geographical whole but also about how different activities need to interact in order for a desirable future for the region to be possible.

- Secondly, political visions, goals and action plans can at the same time be at risk of becoming excessively detailed and overly prescriptive, and therefore being disregarded, rejected or opposed by the actors who possess the necessary resources for realising visions and concrete projects.

These latter problems should give rise to two considerations; on the one hand, careful consideration must be given to what should be included in an overall institutional strategy. The key question is what needs to be formulated in order to provide the region with a common vision and a path to achieving these goals, and what should not be regulated in the vision and instead transferred to individual private and public sector actors to handle themselves.

On the other hand, and this is substantiated by our empirical studies, it is important that the forms of collaboration between public and private actors are developed. The interviews show more clearly that there is a discrepancy between public goals and strategies and the interests and desires of private actors and various activities. A clear conclusion from the interviews is that attempts to manage various private and public activities with the support of visions and other general documentation concerning goals is difficult and often counter-productive.
Our conclusion is that a vision for development should not have the role of managing and regulating individual actors’ actions in detail. It should rather have the purpose of facilitating other actors’ attempts to launch projects and ideas that can contribute to concretisation and realisation of the vision. This means in turn that the interaction between private and public sector must be developed. In the interviews, arenas and social forums are called for, firstly for a dialogue between the political community and industry, and secondly so that different actors with related activities can meet in order to informally consider collaboration. We thus essentially advocate more of a “carrot” (incentives) than a “stick” (regulations) approach.

5.3 Timescale of integration

As previously established, KTH’s view is that it is important for measures to strengthen the Öresund collaboration to be based on the possibility to achieve results within a reasonable time frame and with good results so as to avoid frustration. Measures whereby it is possible to achieve results in the short, medium and long term can be considered here. It is reasonable to assume that there is an inverse relationship between the “efficiency” of the implementation and the timescale. Short-term measures often have clearer “problem ownership” than long-term ones, and can often produce concrete results. Long-term measures can often have unclear “ownership”. Measures with this timescale entail the risk of unclear outcomes and frustration.

Short term

In this timescale, efforts are primarily concentrated within the scope of the regional conditions in terms of language, culture, legislation, etc. The main focus in this timescale should be the optimal use of existing resources. A great many collaborations can be considered based on these starting points, in both the public and private sectors, in order to take advantage of thus far unutilised opportunities for collaboration. This can be a matter of better planning and the utilisation of health and medical care, cultural institutions, education systems, research environments and transport infrastructure, but it may also be about improving the information provided to actors in the industry about opportunities for collaboration in the near future by e.g., helping to create social forums and networks.

Several of these collaborations, which involve incentives to achieve better cost effectiveness in the short term, have of course already begun or are under development. Our recommendation is to immediately start working more clearly on facilitating a number of these by focusing on the short to medium
term perspective and on achieving coordination benefits in the present. A more well-developed collaboration may be the result of successful measures in these areas, but we do not think this should be too much of an express goal. This often leads to false expectations, perhaps often with overly ambitious forms of organisation and a high risk of frustration and disappointment among the parties involved.

One recommendation is that Region Skåne, together with other parties in Öresund, take the initiative to perform a systematic survey of the potential areas of collaboration and what could be built up in the short term in terms of concrete collaborations. KTH’s interview study in Appendix 1 (available in Swedish) has provided examples of a number of conceivable areas of collaboration, but there are of course additional areas that need to be surveyed, which may include healthcare services, education and infrastructure/transport. What is important, however, is that both parties in an overall Öresund perspective see the direct benefits of the collaboration, often in the form of lower costs, and that there is a clear ownership of/responsibility for the analysed activities.

**Medium term**

With this timescale it may be possible to influence both the formal structures in terms of legislation and formal regulations for tax, social insurance, pensions, etc. These areas have been studied in-depth by the partners of the Öresund collaboration and a number of reports have been compiled on both a national and regional level. Our recommendation is to once more highlight the need for these measures. A list of measures that is as concrete as possible should be developed and demands made on the national level, both in Sweden and Denmark, for measures to be taken.

There is of course an opportunity for these issues to gain visibility in connection with the upcoming general election in Sweden, where Region Skåne should endeavour to make this a prioritised measure for improving growth potential and labour market conditions in the Öresund region. Region Skåne has in recent years taken such initiatives, which is a very positive development. Election years tend to be good years to bring about changes of the state prioritisations.

A measure to test so as to have an impact on the imbalance between organisational levels which is from time to time highlighted as an obstacle in the collaboration between Malmö and Copenhagen is that Sweden appoints a state representative tasked with working on reducing institutional border obstacles. The Swedish State should perhaps have a representation office in Malmö tasked with working towards a clear reduction of the institutional border obstacles. One form is to appoint a state negotiator, a model which has been used in other areas with some success. Another possibility would of course be to delegate this task to the County Administrative Board of Skåne (in Malmö) in a clear way as
a previously established regional representative of the Government. One argument against this is that the final decisions are still made in Stockholm, or that decisions are more and more commonly being made in the EU/Brussels. We feel this is an unnecessarily pessimistic view. New approaches need to be tested so as to gain a fresh start in the work to counteract border obstacles, whereby unorthodox methods may also be needed. Concrete measures are required in order to produce results. Further investigation is not what is needed here.

If there is an inclination to try more unusual and divergent paths, Region Skåne and other collaborative partners could of course offer to cover the costs and risks entailed in the inadequate coordination of the current regulatory system in the areas of pensions, taxes and social insurances between Sweden and Denmark, even if these matters naturally belong to the national undertaking.

Region Skåne could for example offer a “collaboration guarantee” which involves guaranteeing that citizens registered in the population registry of Region Skåne who wish to work in Denmark are insured against economic loss due to this in terms of the social security systems and taxation issues. Region Skåne could simply intervene and cover the risk that the individual must currently bear in such situations. Whether a guarantee such as this can be provided by Region Skåne, within the scope of the provisions of the Local Government Act relating to municipal competence, is of course something which needs to be studied. This would however be an example of an innovative solution to one of the more important inhibitive factors in the Öresund collaboration.

In the areas controlled by regional and local actors, the areas of education, research and transport infrastructure stand out as the most important in this timescale as well. The project “The Scandinavian 8 Million City”, which is currently underway and which is an endeavour to bring about a rail link between Oslo and Copenhagen and further connections in both directions, is a good example of this. The potential extension of the metro between Malmö and Copenhagen is another. One example of a project that should be more clearly arranged in the regional strategy is the HH Tunnel. Our view is that it is important that Region Skåne and actors in Skåne attempt to develop a joint strategy for this project, which at present appears to be something which Helsingborg is the most involved in on the Swedish side and which perhaps has the greatest potential when seen as part of a regional public transport system rather than a competitor to the Öresund Bridge. This standpoint should presumably also include the view on the Danish side.

In the area of education and research, we have seen both good and less successful examples of collaboration. A considerable part of the collaboration is probably best realised in a shorter timescale, when it comes to optimal use of existing resources. The two programmes ESS and MAX IV have previously been highlighted in the report as central parts of a concrete collaboration programme. It is important that Region Skåne focuses on getting the best possible collaborative effects out of these projects.
The matter of finding alternative political forms of collaboration across Öresund is discussed from time to time. Here, we see no clear-cut alternatives to recommend. Over time, the initiative in the political collaboration seems to have been moved from national to regional level, and now mainly to various local initiatives. This is probably in many ways an indication that over time collaborations are becoming simpler to establish and more successful in the more bilateral and local forms than in the formal structures. It is of course important to have good personal relationships and forums on regional and local levels across Öresund.

When so many of the collaborations will still likely encompass more short-term aspects than long-term ones and only under exceptional circumstances require joint ownership in the public sector (but often in the private sector), it is not a given that more resources shall be invested in this form of political collaboration. Our view is rather that the Öresund Committee should be able to continue to function as the collaborative body on the public sector side. Investment should instead be made in information and opening up collaboration to the citizens rather than building up political and formal structures.

**Long term**

This is perhaps the most paradoxical of the three levels or timescales in the collaboration. On one hand, most people are aware that these conditions are relatively deeply rooted in Swedish and Danish culture and society respectively. We often come back to the differences we perceive from both sides in collaboration and competition between our countries. And in general we are clear about these being conditions that will only change in the long term.

On the other hand, these conditions are often emphasised as inhibitive and limiting in the collaboration across Öresund. A fairly large amount of space is given to reflections on the inhibitive role of differences and how they have hindered collaboration, from the Swedish side perhaps often as a way of pointing out how different (and nationally oriented) the Danish side is and how differently it acts. Naturally, there are similar viewpoints on the Swedish side in Denmark. If we could simply rectify these issues, many actors tend to say, many collaborations would work better.

Our view is that it is beneficial for the collaboration if we attempt to see these differences as a given factor. Denmark and Sweden have two clear and relatively similar cultures with distinct characteristics. The differences enrich the collaboration between our countries in all material aspects, and are a source of both inspiration and frustration. The increased exchange between the cultures in Öresund leads to more points of conflict but also learning over time. The differences will in all likelihood even out over time, both via increasing similarities between the cultures of Öresund and as part of the creation of a “pan-Europe-
“An” cultural affiliation in northern Europe, often with English as an important base for communication in more and more areas of society.

Levelling out these conditions will however take time. Greater understanding of the culture that we wish to work with is however generally beneficial. Our view is that this occurs primarily via the everyday individual exchange which is based on commercial and interpersonal relationships. Measures which should be pursued more actively, however, are investments in linguistic comprehension between Swedish and Danish in school. On the Swedish side, for example, it is perhaps a good idea to introduce the reading of Danish books as a larger part of the language tuition.

Other measures such as attempting to directly coordinate cultural life between Malmö and Copenhagen by means of government action, however, appear dubious. It is likely that the institutional obstacles entail overly difficult challenges in this respect. It is probably a better and more accessible road to invest in collaboration in culture that is based on “simpler” cost minimisation/efficiency in the short-term perspective than to attempt to circumnavigate these issues and go directly to an integration model. The integration of organisations with no clear logic entails a general risk of failure.

Projects such as Öresundsfestivalen provide indications that the later overall Öresund strategy will be difficult to realise, considering the lack of basic demand. Once again, it is likely that the hypothesis that differences spur on collaboration is a better model than attempting to organise collaboration in which there is a lack of incentive. Interestingly enough, perhaps the clearest example of success in this context is experience from collaboration across Öresund from certain cultural events targeting groups in the region in which traditional cultures do not play the same role. Parts of the population that have a non-traditional background likely have good potential to become the real torchbearers in the building of an “Öresund culture”.
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This report is the result of a research project carried out by the Department of Urban Planning and Environment at the KTH Royal Institute of Technology during the period 2012-2013. The report was commissioned by Region Skåne.

The aim was to discuss the possibilities of improving current and future exchanges and collaborations across Öresund, with a basis in a scientific frame of reference, as well as data on economics and development and interviews with a large number of respondents active in the Öresund region.

The improved accessibility facilitated by the Öresund Bridge creates potential for increased collaboration, but this potential is not automatically unlocked. Greater accessibility also leads to new and clearer manifestations of differences and previously unexplored points of conflict. Our ambition has been to study various possibilities to realise development potential in the interplay between Zealand and Skåne by means of formal or informal initiatives.

Our assessment is firstly that the collaboration across Öresund under the given circumstances has been successful, and secondly that there is good potential to develop this collaboration further. At the same time, the single most important lesson from our study is that it is crucial to adapt forms of collaboration and goals to the specific area of collaboration. Another important aspect is to be aware that it takes time to achieve more ambitious collaboration goals.