

Justyna Danielewicz

University of Lodz

e-mail: justyna.danielewicz@uni.lodz.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-8599-7054

GOVERNANCE IN CROSS-BORDER METROPOLITAN REGIONS. THE CASE OF GREATER COPENHAGEN

WSPÓLRZĄDZENIE W TRANSGRANICZNYCH REGIONACH METROPOLITALNYCH NA PRZYKŁADZIE WIELKIEJ KOPENHAGI

DOI: 10.15611/pn.2020.2.11

JEL Classification: R10, R58

Summary: Cross-border cooperation in Europe has intensified in recent years. Organizations with varying institutional characteristics have emerged in urban areas that cross national borders to address the issues of the cross-border situation. This article sets out to analyse the collaboration in metropolitan region of Greater Copenhagen. The research review method was used in the literature review of cross-border regions and governance, and the descriptive-analytical research method was employed to explore the governance system of the metropolitan region of Greater Copenhagen. The research method was based on the analysis of secondary data and the related formal documents on Greater Copenhagen's government system. The analysis showed that the regional collaboration among different actors is a well-established practice. The concept of multi-level governance is implemented in Greater Copenhagen and brings measurable effects, but there are still barriers and new challenges to deeper integration.

Keywords: cross-border regions, multi-level governance, cooperation, Greater Copenhagen, metropolitan areas.

Streszczenie: Współpraca transgraniczna w Europie nasiliła się w ostatnich latach. Na obszarach miejskich przekraczających granice państw powstały instytucje mające na celu rozwiązywanie transgranicznych problemów. Celem artykułu jest analiza współpracy transgranicznej w regionie Wielkiej Kopenhagi. Zastosowano metodę przeglądu literatury poświęconej regionom transgranicznym i współzarządzaniu. Aby zbadać system zarządzania regionem metropolitalnym, zastosowano metodę opisowo-analityczną opartą na analizie danych wtórnych i dokumentów formalnych dotyczących systemu współzrządzenia wielopoziomowego w Wielkiej Kopenhadze. Wyniki analizy pozwalają stwierdzić, iż współpraca w regionie między różnymi podmiotami ma długą tradycję. Koncepcja współzrządzenia wielopoziomowego jest wdrażana w Wielkiej Kopenhadze i przynosi wymierne efekty, niemniej cały czas pojawiają się bariery i nowe wyzwania na drodze głębszej integracji.

Słowa kluczowe: regiony transgraniczne, współzrządzenie wielopoziomowe, współpraca, Wielka Kopenhaga, obszary metropolitalne.

1. Introduction

Among the key factors that shape large urban agglomerations are globalisation and, as a consequence, metropolisation. Nowadays, globalisation is perceived as a general economic, social, cultural and political paradigm, and is followed by the broadening, deepening and acceleration of global connectivity in all aspects of life [Oner et al. 2010]. Due to this connectivity, globalisation is a multi-faceted process of networking among various actors on a multi-continental scale [Keohane, Nye 2000].

The answer of the settlement system to globalisation is the process of metropolisation. Metropolisation encompasses systems that strengthen large urban structures by changing their production systems to those analysed on a global level with the view to reorganise and restructure territories and, consequently, affect the territories' internal and external relations [Gaussier, Latour, Puissant 2003].

As a result of the modern technological revolution, cities' traditional roles have been restored – they are the global flows networks whose development relies on the accumulation and effectiveness of capital [Bendyk 2010].

The globalisation of economic and cultural exchange, the reduction of the relative role of nation states and the processes of regional integration have led to profound political and economic territorial reorganisation [Brenner 2004], especially within the European border regions [Scott (ed.) 2006; Perkmann 2007]. As a result, the level of integration between urban regions and the cross-border systems may be viewed as a key development factor – thus integration has become the main goal of urban policies [Tölle 2014]. Some studies have shown that cross-border integration is not limited to the economy in general or to cross-border work in particular, but rather includes other political, cultural, social and spatial dimensions [Scott 2005; Brunet-Jailly 2006]. This kind of integration requires a targeted approach to governing cross-border regions. Metropolitan strategies depend on applying a broader spatial perspective on a territorial level greater than the administrative boundaries would suggest. Numerous challenges require finding solutions in collaboration with not only the local authorities, but also the central government and actors in the non-public sector. It seems logical then that the most expedient approach is the participatory concept of management – governance.

This article sets out to analyse the collaboration in the cross-border metropolitan region of Greater Copenhagen and seeks answers to the following questions:

- Is the concept of governance applied in the metropolitan development of Greater Copenhagen?
- What areas of cooperation does it apply to?

Later, the paper discusses the concept of governance in cross-border metropolitan regions. Section 3 analyses the evolution of the cooperation in the regions of Greater Copenhagen. It provides an overview of their institutional development, the challenges the partnerships have faced and the actors that are driving the process.

The conclusion reflects on the relevance of these findings for European cross-border regions in more general way, it also finds that even long-standing partnerships are in a period of exploration and constant reinvention.

2. Governance in cross-border metropolitan regions

The simplest definition of a cross-border region (CBR) is a territorial unit that is made up of contiguous sub-national units from at least two nation states [Perkmann, Sum 2002]. However this definition is very simplistic since, according to the territorial approach to local development, a delineated territorial unit should be characterized by a number of functional connections. These functional connections may be economic [Nelles, Walther 2011; Petrakos, Topaloglou 2008; van Houtum 2000], social and cultural [Brunet-Jailly 2006; Scott 2005] or spatial and environmental.

In other words, a cross-border region has a development potential based on one or more of the aforementioned factors but is “disrupted by the sovereignty of the governments ruling on each side of the frontier” [Council of Europe 1995]. CBRs may also cover metropolitan areas. These cross-border metropolitan regions are defined as functional urban regions which cross one or more international borders [Herzog 1990; Decoville et al. 2010]. ESPON identified 11 CBRs in the European Union [ESPON 2007].

The development of metropolitan regions in Europe is accelerated by globalisation and metropolisation, but also by the change in perception of the role urban areas play in the development of the EU countries and by the ‘territorialised’ intervention in accord with the cohesion policy. This requires a departure from the balancing approach, focusing instead on the increasing competitive potential in the functional regions on a national and European scale [Noworól 2014].

The metropolitan areas of today constitute networks of connections (exchange of information, goods and services, investment, people-to-people contacts, financial relations etc.) which makes governing these complex spatial organisms with multiple interdependencies and varied conditions particularly difficult. The close cooperation between all public and private entities and society is crucial to prevent harmful competition within the metropolitan region, and is key to achieving its international competitiveness and success [Mossberger, Stoker 2001]. This requires a new governing approach to the ever larger and more complex metropolitan organisms and their ever increasing resources [Smełkowski, Jałowicki, Gorzelak 2009], which implies a departure from the top down or command and control management models in favour of governance. Governance is the ability of the authorities and other stakeholders in public, private and social sectors to meet the challenges of a modern society [Kooiman, Jentoft 2009].

In metropolitan areas, multilevel governance is particularly important: it enforces cooperation and the creation of hybrid systems among interdependent partners on various territorial levels (international, national, regional and local) and leads to

a consensus on the priorities in the development of the whole territory [Jessop 1999]. These functional and territorial partners negotiate the desired vision of the future in the process of strategic planning [Albrechts 2011]. According to Bruszt, multilevel governance can be perceived as a way of organising diversity that includes the interests, values and expectations of public and non-public actors in the development programmes [Bruszt 2008]. Metropolitan regions consist of a number of territorial units and each of them should function on the basis of its own local governance system, but should also recognise the crucial role of the regional authorities and the central government which, together with the local authorities, create a system of multilevel governance. In the case of cross-border regions, multilevel governance also includes the various levels of authorities from the neighbouring countries.

3. Forms and effects of cooperation in Greater Copenhagen

Greater Copenhagen is a metropolitan region that spans Eastern Denmark and Southern Sweden. It includes 85 municipalities (46 in Denmark and 39 in Sweden) and 4 regions (The Capital Region of Denmark and Region Zealand in Denmark, Region Skåne and Region Halland in Sweden). Centred around the Öresund strait and the two cities which lie on either side, Copenhagen in Denmark and Malmö in Sweden, the region is connected by the Öresund Bridge. The area comprises 26 322 km² inhabited by 4.3 million people (2018). The Danish part of the region is more densely populated than the Swedish one (respectively 725 and 277 inhabitants/km² in 2018) [<https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>]. “The two sides make a good fit. Denmark’s capital is overcrowded, corporate and expensive, while Malmö, Sweden’s third city across the water, has spare capacity, is relatively cheap, and has more of an enterprise economy” [<https://www.theguardian.com>]. Greater Copenhagen represents a wealth of knowledge expertise with its 17 universities, 14,000 researchers, 190,000 students, 10,000 PhD students and 19 science parks and innovation incubators. It offers leading-edge research facilities and a creative business environment with access to markets in the two countries [<https://www.copenhagencvb.com>]. It is clean, environment-friendly and a frontrunner in innovation and green investment. Its leadership on the climate change and liveability agendas has made it a recognised international brand. Greater Copenhagen has easy access to 100 million consumers. With its sizeable population, it is the largest recruitment base for highly qualified employees in Scandinavia. The region has excellent infrastructure, including Copenhagen Airport. Greater Copenhagen is also famous for its high standard of living and unique work-life balance [<https://www.regionh.dk>].

According to the Globalization and World Cities Research Network, which conducted research on the internal relations between cities, Copenhagen is among the top 25 European cities with the highest networking indicator [<https://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/data.html>]. The region accounts for over a quarter of the combined GDP of Sweden and Denmark.

Cross-border cooperation in the Greater Region dates back to 1989 when the Danish Prime Minister set up an ‘initiative group’ with, among others, Copenhagen’s Chief Burgomaster and county mayor, to put forward ideas and suggestions for a new strategy concerning the city and business community development in Copenhagen. The strategy devised by the group placed particular emphasis on the plans for a combined road and railway connection across the Sound. One of the arguments advocating this investment was the prospective advent of the EU’s single market in 1992. Copenhagen was to be prepared for the competition from other big cities – not Danish but from such metropolises as Stockholm, Hamburg and Berlin [<http://www.oresundstid.dk>]. The decision to build the bridge was finally made in the autumn of 1993. Construction began in 1995, with the bridge opening to traffic on 1 July 2000. The traffic between Denmark and Sweden increased rapidly, which may have been caused by increasing numbers of Danes buying homes in Sweden to take advantage of the lower housing prices in Malmö, and then having to commute to work in Denmark [<https://www.oresundsbron.com/en/start>]. The existing road and rail connections via the Öresund Bridge enable a maximum of 1.3 million to cross the strait within an hour. There are also plans for a metro connection between Copenhagen and Malmö to be built, according to the current time scale, by 2035. That would raise the traffic capacity to around 2.3 million travellers per hour [<https://www.thelocal.com/20180528/tale-of-two-cities-copenhagen-and-malm-plan-international-metro>].

The decision to build the fixed link had a profound impact on the conditions for institutionalizing the Öresund region [Valdaliso, Wilson (eds.) 2015]. The Öresund Committee was created in 1993 to coordinate the development of the Öresund region. The organisation described itself as a platform for regional political collaboration in the Öresund region, lobbying for Öresund’s interests at national and European level. The Committee worked across party lines in an effort to solve the important questions of infrastructure, labour market, culture and popular support and served as an ‘ambassador’ for the Öresund region. Politicians on both sides of the Sound met at least twice a year to discuss cross-border development issues [Schmitt, Harbo, Lehto 2011]. The Committee was made up of 36 politicians (18 from either country) and represented 11 members: the Capital Region and Region Zealand, the municipalities of Bornholm, Copenhagen, and Frederiksberg, Greater Copenhagen Forum for Local Municipalities in Denmark; and Region Skåne, the municipalities of Landskrona, Lund, Helsingborg, and Malmö in Sweden. Regional and municipal organisations represented by the Committee constituted The Executive Committee, comprising eight civil servants and four (two from either country) officials nominated by the governments of Sweden and Denmark. This was an executive organ of the Committee and convened four times a year. The Öresund Committee and the Executive Committee were headed by a president and deputy president (the same for both organs) elected for one year. The Committee was financed by contributions from regions and municipalities, proportionately to the size of their population, and by the

funds of The Nordic Council of Ministers granted for particular projects. In 2007 the institutional structure of the Öresund Committee was revamped and an emphasis was placed on the formulation of new policies. In 2009-2010 the Committee focused on the following four areas:

1. Dismantling cross-border obstacles that inhibit the labour market.
2. Investing in a new infrastructure for the region and analysing the importance of tolls for the bridge across Öresund and transport costs for integration.
3. Strengthening good relations at the grassroots level, promoting social and formal contacts and cooperating across Öresund to thereby establish a cultural metropolis.
4. A new vision and strategy for the Öresund Region 2025.

As a result, in 2010 a strategy was adopted to map out the development of the region by the year 2025 [<http://www.oresundskomiteen.org/en/>].

In 2016, Öresund Region changed its name to Greater Copenhagen. This rebranding was to raise the profile of the region internationally. The strategy was built on the belief that partners are stronger together than as individual regions and municipalities, and that by uniting their efforts, mobilising their assets, populations and amenities they can market the metropolis to achieve a greater international impact. The goal of this collaboration was to generate growth and employment in the whole metropolitan region and, first and foremost, to guarantee that companies and investors perceive the area as one united Greater Copenhagen. The mayors and regional chairpersons of Eastern Denmark and Southern Sweden lead the collaboration. The Greater Copenhagen Committee continues the work of the Öresund Committee and focuses on these four areas:

- Better infrastructure and mobility.
- Attracting talent, tourists and investment.
- International marketing.
- Creation of an increasingly integrated growth in the region [<https://www.regionhalland.se/>].

The vision for Greater Copenhagen is to transform the area into a centre of sustainable growth and good living conditions offered by an agile, collaborative and accessible metropolis – where people and business can unleash their potential [<https://www.greatercph.com/about>]. One of its chief goals is to build a region of international importance.

Since 2016 the Committee has yearly adapted action plans that determine the direction of regional activities for the next 12 months. In 2016 it initiated cross-border projects to support infrastructure and tourism, to create an investor website and a single approach to foreign delegations, to integrate the labour market and to remove border barriers, to unify international branding, to support the common food initiative and the Lighting Metropolis project. These projects were continued in 2017 but the Committee focused also on involving the business community into a close cooperation on the Greater Copenhagen initiatives [The Greater Copenhagen & Skåne

Committee 2017]. Together, the various parties are working to increase growth, expand the labour market and provide a good quality of life for the region's inhabitants. During 2018 and 2019, Greater Copenhagen has worked to strengthen its boundary-free public transport that will make traveling within Greater Copenhagen easier. Greater Copenhagen aspires to have become by 2020 an international hub for investment and knowledge, capable of competing against the most successful metropolises in Europe [<https://lightingmetropolis.com/se/greater-copenhagen-info/>]. On 1 January 2019 the Greater Copenhagen Committee was joined by the Swedish Halland region and its six constituent municipalities.

The extensive network of stakeholders in the region and the fact that Greater Copenhagen is solely a business-political partnership, with no competences of its own that would allow the implementation of its ideas, makes cooperation with multiple entities such as local and regional authorities from both countries, businesses and NGOs mandatory to realise its vision. The close collaboration between regional municipalities, research centres and enterprises allows for the efficient use of the regional strengths. One of the key stakeholders is the Capital Region of Denmark, a regional level of Danish administration. It was created as a result of the 2007 reform; it covers 29 municipalities and is governed by the Regional Council of 41 elected councillors. The Capital Region is responsible for healthcare and regional development. As a result of the collaboration between the City Council and the regional municipalities, in 2015 the region adopted the Regional Growth and Development Strategy based on a participatory approach to development. The involvement of local municipal governments is vital for the implementation of the Strategy. Its vision and goals coincide with the strategic goals of Greater Copenhagen, which declared its support for the initiative [The Capital... 2015].

Public transport is an important area of collaboration. Its main operator on the Danish side is MOVIA which provides bus and local railway transport. MOVIA is financed by the Capital Region, Region Zealand and their 45 municipalities [<https://www.regionh.dk>]. The underground system is run by a separate company – The Copenhagen Metro. It is owned by the state and the cities of Copenhagen and Frederiksberg. The regional and national railways are the property of the state [OECD 2009]. This shows that the management of public transportation is dispersed among a number of stakeholders. Nevertheless, when it comes to transport, the cross-border region is often presented as a role model for sustainable urban development [Gössling 2013; Larsen 2017].

Copenhagen Capacity is another partner and facilitator of the Greater Copenhagen project. It is an investment promotion agency responsible for attracting international investors and companies. Before the creation of Copenhagen Capacity, each of the 85 municipalities had their separate systems and services for companies and entrepreneurs. With Copenhagen Capacity, companies and citizens find support in the utilization of the recruitment and employment opportunities throughout the region [<https://www.gretercophjournals.com>].

An important Greater Copenhagen stakeholder is Wonderful Copenhagen – the official tourism organization for The Capital Region of Denmark, working to promote and develop both business and leisure tourism in The Capital Region of Denmark on a non-profit basis. It is also a commercial foundation, funded by a mix of contributions from private businesses, organizations, and public institutions, including perennial financing agreements with The Capital Region of Denmark. Furthermore, Wonderful Copenhagen is a network organization with more than 300 commercial partners, working to generate business for the tourism industry and the experience economy in Greater Copenhagen [<https://www.visitcopenhagen.dk>].

The above examples show the stakeholders from the Danish part of the region since they are the chief partners of the Greater Copenhagen Committee in promoting the region internationally. However, on the Swedish side there are also a number of organisations the Committee collaborates with to integrate the whole region.

4. Conclusions

Cross-border partnerships are instruments at the service of regional governance. They allow to curtail the uncertainty that a globalized economy brings to local spaces. They constitute information-giving and decision-making platforms by means of which bonds of trust can be forged between actors who do not all possess the same centrality with which to tackle local and global economic challenges. Multi-level governance seems best adapted to managing cross-border cooperation, given the involvement of numerous actors and the differences in power distribution on either side of the border.

The cooperation between the Danish and Swedish parts of the functional metropolitan region has a long tradition and has led to a deepening of cross-border policy coordination. It functions primarily as a forum for discussion and consensus building. Both sides lack the fiscal and jurisdictional capacities and the institutional competencies to defend their interests in the arena of multilevel policy. The main focus of the Greater Copenhagen Committee is on the outward perspective offered by cooperative initiatives, namely the expansion of the space of reference for competitiveness in Europe.

These business-political collaborative structures have resulted in international marketing to increase global visibility and the attractiveness of the region; creating a common attractive environment for investors, companies and talents; starting a number of projects involving local and regional authorities, companies, research institutions and universities in both countries.

Concerning the vertical linkages, essential to coordinate policies between tiers of government, neither of the national authorities directly participates in cross-border governance. However, although this absence offers local and regional actors greater room to manoeuvre, it may also constitute a weakness in terms of implementing policies that influence economic competitiveness (e.g. labour policies, tax and fiscal

regulations) and coordinating actions at the cross-border level. For instance, in the case of public transport vital for transborder integration, the partnership configurations are not the same as those in territorial marketing. The central states are key actors in the governance network in charge of transport. In the case of Greater Copenhagen, central governments are the owners and main stakeholders of public transport companies and it is the respective states who finance or guarantee the largest infrastructure projects that determine the connectivity and accessibility of the whole cross-border region. Investments supported by the region show that even if not initiated by members of the Committee, their goals still converge with the vision of partnership.

To sum up, the Scandinavian cooperation in Greater Copenhagen is well established. The cooperation is facilitated by similar language, culture, the presence of a civil society and a deeply rooted tradition of participation. The proof of its effectiveness is the progressive enlargement of Greater Copenhagen by the successive municipalities and regions that join it. Greater Copenhagen has a strong international brand and a strong identity as a region [Valdalisio, Wilson (eds.) 2015]. Although much has been achieved in the process of integration: the border has become less noticeable, the labour market restrictions have been eliminated and the number of daily commuters has increased, there still remain a number of challenges to address, such as the differing tax and fiscal systems in the two countries, the internal interests of local and regional authorities that may not be aligned with the interests of the whole region, and the growing number of immigrants.

References

- Albrechts L., 2011, *Strategic Planning and Regional Governance in Europe: Recent Trend and Policy Responses*, [in:] Yeh J., Yeh A., Xu J. (ed.), *Governance and Planning of Mega-City Regions: An International Comparative Perspective*, Routledge, London, pp. 75-98.
- Bendyk E., 2010, *Metropolia w sieci*, Samorząd Terytorialny, no. 6.
- Brenner N., 2004, *New State Spaces. Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York.
- Brunet-Jailly E., 2006, *NAFTA and cross-border relations in Niagara, Detroit and Vancouver*, *Journal of Borderland Studies*, no. 21(2), pp. 1-19.
- Bruszt L., 2008, *Wielopoziomowe zarządzanie – warianty wschodnie. Wylaniające się wzorce zarządzania rozwojem regionalnym w nowych państwach członkowskich*, *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, no. 1(3), pp. 5-22.
- Council of Europe, 1995, *Manuel de coopération transfrontalière à l'usage des collectivités locales et régionales en Europe*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.
- Decoville A., Durand F., Sohn C., Walther O., 2010, *Spatial integration in European cross-border metropolitan regions: A comparative approach*, CEPS Instead, Working Paper, no. 2010-40.
- ESPON, 2007, *Study on Urban Functions. 1.4.3. Final Report*, Luxembourg, http://www.espon.eu/mmp/online/website/content/projects/261/420/file_2420/fr-1.4.3_April2007-final.pdf.
- European Commission, 2009, *Scientific Report on the Mobility of Cross-Border Workers within the EU-27/EEA/EFTA Countries. Final Report*.

- Gaussier N., Lacour C., Puissant S., 2003, *Metropolitanization and territorial scales*, *Cities*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 253-263.
- Gössling S., 2013, *Urban transport transitions: Copenhagen, City of Cyclists*, *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 33, pp. 196-206.
- Harrison J., 2008, *Stating the Production of Scales: Centrally Orchestrated Regionalism, Regionally Orchestrated Centralism*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, no. 32(4), pp. 922-941.
- Herzog L.A., 1990, *Where North Meets South. Cities, Space and Politics on the U.S.-Mexico Border*. Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas, Austin.
- van Houtum H., 2000, *An overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions*, *Journal of Borderland Studies*, no. 15(1), pp. 57-83. <http://www.oresundskomiteen.org/en/> (access: 9.09.2015).
- <http://www.oresundstid.dk> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/> (access: 9.08.2019).
- <https://lightingmetropolis.com/se/greater-copenhagen-info/> (access: 1.08.2019).
- <https://www.copenhagencvb.com/> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.greatercph.com/about> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.greatercphjournals.com> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/data.html> (access: 1.08.2019).
- <https://www.oresundsbron.com/en/start> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.regionh.dk> (access: 7.09.2019).
- <https://www.regionhalland.se/> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.theguardian.com> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.thelocal.com/20180528/tale-of-two-cities-copenhagen-and-malm-plan-international-metro> (access: 9.09.2019).
- <https://www.visitcopenhagen.dk/> (access: 9.09.2019).
- Jessop B., 1999, *Narrating the Future of the National Economy and the National State? Remarks On Remapping Regulation and Reinventing Governance*, [in:] Steinmetz G. (ed.), *State/Culture: State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp. 378-406.
- Keohane R.O., Nye J.S., 2000, *Introduction*, [in:] Nye J.S.Jr., Donahue J.D. (ed.), *Governance in a Globalizing World*, Brookings Institutional Press, Washington.
- Kooiman J., Jentoft S., 2009, *Metagovernance: Values, norms and principles, and the making of hard choices*, *Public Administration*, vol. 7, issue 4, pp. 818-836.
- Larsen J., 2017, *The making of a pro-cycling city: Social practices and bicycle mobilities*, *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 49(4), pp. 876-892.
- Mikołajczyk A., 2005, *Współpraca transgraniczna w ujęciu podmiotowym*, [in:] Brodecki Z. (ed.), *Regiony*, Wydawnictwo Prawnicze LexisNexis, Warszawa, pp. 254-255.
- Mossberger K., Stoker G., 2001, *The evolution of urban regime theory: The challenge of conceptualization*, *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 810-835.
- Nelles J., Walther O., 2011, *Changing European borders: From separation to interface?*, *Articulo. Journal of Urban Research*, no. 6.
- Noworól A., 2014, *Territorial partnerships as an instrument of urban policy*, *Biuletyn KPZK*, no. 253, pp. 11-28.
- OECD, 2009, *OECD Territorial Reviews: Copenhagen*, Copenhagen.
- Ohmae K., 1995, *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, Free Press, New York.
- Oner A.C., Mitsova D., Prospero D., Vos J., 2010, *Knowledge globalization in urban studies and planning: A network analysis of international co-authorships*, *Journal of Knowledge Globalization*, vol. 3(1), pp. 2-30.
- Otgaar A., van den Berg L., van der Meer J., Speller C. (eds.), 2008, *Empowering Metropolitan Regions Through New Forms of Cooperation*, EURICUR, Rotterdam.

- Perkmann M., 2007, *Policy entrepreneurship and multilevel governance: A comparative study of european cross-border regions*, Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, no. 25, pp. 861-879.
- Perkmann M., Sum N.L., 2002, *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions: Scales, Discourses and Governance*, [in:] M. Perkmann, N.L. Sum (eds.), *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions*, Palgrave, Houndsmills, pp. 3-21.
- Petrakos G., Topaloglou L., 2008, *Economic geography and European integration: The effects on the EU's external border regions*, International Journal of Public Policy, no. 3(3-4), pp. 146-162.
- Scott J.W., 2005, *The EU and 'Wider Europe': Towards an Alternative Geopolitics of Region Cooperation?*, Geopolitics, no. 10(3), pp. 429-454.
- Scott J.W. (ed.), 2006, *EU Enlargement, Region Building and Shifting Borders of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Schmitt P., Harbo L.G., Lehto V., 2011, *An actor-oriented survey of territorial governance systems in the Nordic capital regions*, Nordregio Working Paper, no. 6.
- Smętkowski M., Jałowicki B., Gorzelak G., 2009, *Obszary metropolitalne w Polsce: problemy rozwojowe i delimitacja*, Raporty i Analizy EUROREG, no. 1.
- The Capital Region of Denmark, 2015, *Greater Copenhagen – Regional Growth and development Strategy*, Copenhagen.
- The Greater Copenhagen & Skåne Committee, 2017, *Greater Copenhagen Action Plan*, Copenhagen.
- Tölle A., 2014, *Transnational metropolitan development strategies and governance in a post-socialist setting: The case of Szczecin*, Quaestiones Geographicae, no. 33(4), pp. 43-56.
- Valdaliso J.M., Wilson J.R. (eds.), 2015, *Strategies for Shaping Territorial Competitiveness*, Routledge, New York.