

The International Summer School in Karelia 2009

Environmental Politics in the Eurasian North

Petrozavodsk, Republic of Karelia, Russia

April 17th - 22nd, 2009

Final Report

By Lassi Heininen (University of Lapland)

Eeva Korteniemi (Aleksanteri Institute)

Gleb Yarovoy (Petrozavodsk State University)



The 6th International Summer School in Karelia 2009, ISSK'09 took place in Petrozavodsk, Republic of Karelia, Russia hosted by the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences at Petrozavodsk State University during April 17th - 22nd, 2009.

The theme of the ISSK'09 was "*Environmental Politics in the Eurasian North*". All together, there were 40 Finnish and Russian students from several Finnish and Russian universities.

Environmental Politics in the Eurasian North

The natural environment has become highly politicized in recent decades. Subsequently, public concern about the state of the environment and increased demand for enhanced environmental protection is influencing both domestic and international environmental policies and politics, not the least in the Eurasian North. Environmental "awakening" started in the 1960s in many parts of the globe. This global environmental awareness and public concern for the environment has since been targeting uncontrolled industrialization and urbanization, degradation and pollution of the environment, increased vulnerability to natural and technological hazards, unsustainable natural resource extraction, as well as related political instability and social unrest.

Despite past academic, political and public debates on a state of the environment, there is however still need for further debates and interdisciplinary dialogue on societal and political aspects of the environment and environmental security. Consequently, ISSK'09 was such a platform bringing together scholars from the Nordic countries and Russia.

Programme

The ISSK'09 was a one week intensive course with studies on environmental politics of the Eurasian North in a comprehensive and interdisciplinary manner. By bringing together recognised Nordic and Russian experts, ISSK'09 provided students with an overview of environmental politics and governance in the North and highlighted some current research projects being conducted at some of the region's foremost educational institutions.

Daily schedule at ISSK'09 consisted of lectures by Finnish and Russian lecturers followed by student workshop in three groups in the late afternoon, supervised by the experts. The Summer School in Karelia did not only provide scheduled lectures but also made possible for students to be active both in open discussions after each lecture and in daily workshops through lively discussion, and oral and written reports, which each student did. The ISSK'09 was also a forum for academics and other experts, and students to discuss various environmental policies and governance structures from their own perspectives and thus, increase their understanding of various environmental policy issues in the North. Additionally, students participated in a full-day excursion to Kivach waterfall within Karelia. There was no registration fee for the ISSK'09, and the costs of accommodation and coffees / teas were covered by the organizers.

The International Summer School in Karelia in 2010

The International Summer School in Karelia 2010 will be organized in Petrozavodsk, Republic of Karelia in May 10th – 16th 2010 as a joint summer school in cooperation with the Finnish-Russian Cross-Border University, CBU. The main theme will be "Changing Geopolitics and International Relations in the North".

**"Politicization of the Environment, and International Environmental Politics
as a part of IR and Foreign Policy"**

by Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland

Abstract

Environmental "awakening" started in the 1960s in many parts of the globe as a moral protest against belief in progress based on economic growth and modernisation. One of the outcomes was that the term, "the environment" was born. Since that time the environment has meant "the material basis for human existence, which is in a danger to be destroyed as a result of human activities". On the other hand, it has been 'politicized' with the main idea that "the very different factors, which include the human environment and determine its quality, have become as targets of political disagreements and conflicts". The environment has also become into International Relations (IR). The "politicization" of the environment is much a process, or a chain reaction with cumulative effects, and therefore it needs, even requires, actors, either individuals together or communities or lobbies, who are conscious, concern and will act and convince the others. Consequently, there were more public – local, domestic, regional, international and global - concern about a state of the environment and increased demands for enhanced environmental protection. This environmental awareness and public concern for the environment has been targeting uncontrolled industrialization and urbanization, degradation and pollution of the environment, increased vulnerability to natural and technological hazards, unsustainable natural resource extraction, as well as related political instability and social unrest. All in all, the environment has become highly politicized, environmental politics has become a field of activity by public authorities and foreign policy of states, and there are more environmental laws and comprehensive collections of laws dealing with the environment.

The main aim of this lecture is to introduce student to the main subject matters and the main current discourses of (international) environmental politics. First, the lecture gives on one hand, a brief overview on "environmental awakening" and 'politicization' of the environment. Second, it discusses on the (inter)relations between the environment and security, environmental security, and ecology a new discipline for 'disciplining'. Third, it describes how environmental protection became on the political agenda of the state and how environmental politics became a field of foreign policy. Final, the lecture defines and lists global (environmental / security) problems and discusses on climate change as a (new) factor of environmental politics.

Course Disposition

1. "Politicization" of the Environment => Environmental Politics
 - 1.1. "Environmental awakening" and rise of (international and global) environment movements
 - 1.2. The Environment – a Nature
 - 1.3. The environment in main theories of IR
2. The Environment and Security: Environmental Politics and Environmental Security
 - 2.1. Discourses on the environment, (sustainable) development and security / the military
 - 2.2. The Environment and geopolitics / ecology and security: discourses on 'green / ecological security', counter-arguments and 'militarized environment'
 - 2.3. Ecology – a new discipline for disciplining, and an importance of a change in a problem definition
3. International Environmental Politics and Environmental Protection
 - 3.1. Environmental politics as a field of foreign policy

- 3.2. Environmental protection as an issue of “low politics” in Northern cooperation
- 4. Global (environmental / security) Problems – definitions, implications and examples
- 4.1. The twelve “most serious environmental problems facing past and futures societies”
- 4.2. Climate change as a new factor in environmental politics, and causing a change in a problem definition on security discourse(s), premises and paradigm(s)

Suggested Readings

Haila, Yrjö and Heininen, Lassi. "Ecology: A New Discipline for Disciplining?" *Social Text* 42 - Spring 1995. Duke University Press. p. 153-171;
 Heininen, Lassi. “Security in the North, and Globalization and Global Problems”. In: *Globalization and the Circumpolar North*, eds. by Lassi Heininen and Chris Southcott. University of Alaska Press. Manuscript of 26 p. Forth-coming: will come out in autumn 2009;
 Nilsson, Annika E. A Changing Arctic Climate. Linköping: Linköping University, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science No. 386, 2007 - pp. 13-22 and 80-93.

Questions / Tasks for Working Groups

- 1) How would you see the role and importance of “environmental awakening” in how the environment was (re)defined and became ‘politicized’ (mostly) by non-state actors? Please, make a case study on why it is said that ‘politicization’ of the environment is a process, or a chain reaction;
- 2) Give an example on environmental politics as a field of foreign policy on one hand, and on the other, environmental protection as an issue of “low politics” in international (Nortwhern) cooperation.

"European Environmental Politics"

by Dmitri Lanko, St. Petersburg State University

Abstract

The lecture is aimed at both the evolution of the environmental politics within the European Communities since the Single European Act, and contemporary guidelines and challenges to European Union's action in the field of environment and sustainable development. The Single European Act has provided the European Communities with an opportunity to take environmental issues into consideration when making policies on the community level; further legal acts significantly improved that opportunity. The lecture will evaluate on the concept of sustainable development, including its environmental aspects. A special focus will be given to the issue of climate change, for climate change is the area, where the European Union is acting most coherently. The aspect is especially important at the moment due to the upcoming round of negotiations in Copenhagen later this year. Another focus will be given to the politics in water protection, for incompatibility between the EU and Russian environmental standards are most visible in that area. The lecturer will share personal experience of several years participating in the work of the Russian ? Estonian Commission on Trans-Boundary Water Resources and the impact of Estonia's accession to the EU to Russian ? Estonian relations in the field. Finally, the challenges to European Union's action in the field of environment and sustainable development emerging thanks to the enlargement and neighborhood policy will be discussed due to importance of this aspect to Russian ? EU relations in the field of the environment. It will be underlined that environmental conditions are included in the roadmap towards four common spaces between the Russian Federation and the European Union.

Suggested Readings

Vogler, J. (2005) The European contribution to global environmental governance // International Affairs, Vol. 81, Issue 4. P. 835 ? 850;
Holzinger K., Knill C., Schäfer A. (2003) Rhetoric or Reality? 'New Governance' in EU Environmental Policy // European Law Journal, Vol. 12, Issue 3. P. 403 ? 420;
Kellow A., Zito, A.R. (2002) Steering through Complexity: EU Environmental Regulation in the International Context // Political Studies, Vol. 50. P. 43 ? 60.

Questions for Working Groups

What is new about the 6th Environment Action Programme of the European Community?

What are the fundamental guidelines of the European Community's programme of policy and action in relation to the environment and sustainable development?

1st Day: GROUP REPORTS

Report # 1 of the Group № 1 by Pieta Hyvärinen

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

The main points of discussion on politicization of environmental problems:

1. EU so as to gain influence in the world tries to use "soft-power" instead of "hard security". The EU has succeeded in it, as it is now considered to be a leader in tackling environmental issues.
2. Even if we are not 100% sure about the results of global warming and things like that, in any case we should act – we should take precautionary measures.
3. Politicians have environmental issues on their political agendas – so as to form a positive image, so as to be elected – but it doesn't necessarily mean that they will act and do something concrete in addressing environmental problems. That is why it is important to know whom these politicians present, who is behind them.
4. Lots of information on global climate change -> difficult to understand the real level of danger. For this reason, scientists should be more accessible, should have chance and right to criticize Mass Media. Promotion of free science is needed, it should not be made commercial.
5. Developed countries rather often exercise policy of doubled standards – they take care of environment inside, but not outside – in the developing countries, in particular – in Africa, China and India, there production is chipper and there one is not oppressed by strict norms and standards.
6. People are tired with talks on environment – that's why some kind of new incentive. Maybe the USA and China signing Kyoto protocol may serve as a boost to a new era of environmental discussions
7. The last point is that each state in the world should have a chance to take part in discussing environmental problems and creating new standards and norms. The EU or the USA should not impose their own on the rest of the world! Equality doesn't mean that everyone has the same standards.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 1 by Pieta Hyvärinen

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

My group discussed about the 6th Environmental Action Programme of the European Community. First we concentrated on the existing four priority areas of the programme: climate change, nature and biodiversity, environment and health, and natural resources and waste. We noticed the interconnectedness of the areas: for example climate change affects biodiversity, and waste considerably influences human health. Due to these connections we decided that the priority areas could not be set in a hierarchical order.

All the priority areas are very broad and abstract, and that is why we could not come up with a common goal for the Environmental Action Programme. However, we did manage to divide the priority areas into two sections: climate change and nature and biodiversity are certainly more global issues, whereas environment and health, and natural resources and waste seemed more local. Consequently, the first two priority areas require different measures than the following two. Nevertheless, there are significant local aspects to the more global issues and vice versa.

For the 7th Environmental Action Programme of the European Community we suggest that ecological literacy should be included in the list of priority areas. Education on environmental issues is an important tool in raising public awareness of the environment. People who are environmentally aware are more capable of making conscious decisions in many areas: consumption, waste, travelling etc. Putting forward environmentally friendly consumerism is also a way to make consumer-dependent companies pay more attention to the environment: when consumers demand environmentally friendly products, the "greener" companies benefit and thus encourage other companies to protect the environment, too. Even if part of the greening was just greenwash, there must also be some real affects.

According to our suggestion, another new priority area for the 7th Environmental Action Programme is environmental equality. We are concerned about the fact that individuals are invisible in the current priority area listing: even though all of the areas have significant effects on the lives of individuals, it is not written down. In addition, demand for environmental equality would be a step forward from European-centered environmental thinking and towards a world where good environment would be a basic human right.

Report # 1 of the Group No. 2 by Anton Chuvstvin

Tutor: Anton Lapshin

We believe the main goal of this policy is to raise the awareness of people and prompt them to develop an eco-friendly lifestyle. The means to implement this are the mass-media and renewable resources. And the approach should be balanced, because nowadays more emphasis is put on preventing climate change and the other aspects are neglected.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 2 by Anton Chuvstvin

Tutor: Anton Lapshin

Task: The role and importance of the environmental awakening and the politicization process. Case study: politicization – a process or a chain reaction?

The environmental awakening starts at a grass-root level with ad-hoc organizations and non-state actors drawing peoples' attention to the environmental problems using the mass-media, while exerting pressure on politicians to spur the discussions. This is very significant, because it allowed working out a feasible solution to the problems of the environment. It also raised the awareness of people about what's going on around them and made them start thinking and be responsible for their actions. Politicization brought about the emergence of eco-friendly lifestyle, patterns of consumption and production.

The main role as we think: raised the awareness of the population

Case study: We thought about the Lake of Koijärvi in Finland. When 50 protesters tried to prevent the drain of the lake, lots of people supported them in their struggle. As a result the matter became politicized and this case spurred many debates at the top level. And we think it's been a chain reaction. But it can be a process as well.

Reports # 1 & 2 of the Group No. 3 by Alina Savolainen

Tutor: Nina Tynkkynen

Task: 1) The issue of "environmental awakening" is sensitive, but not yet politicized enough. The term "politicization" may be understood as becoming important in political circles. It is not bad as public gets to know about it. "Environmental awakening" became politicized by non-state actors in the 1970's.

If we speak about a chain reaction, then it could be seen as follows: non-state actors → the governments; clients → companies → states; Media → policy-makers → authorities react. However the last ones are not working that effectively.

If "environmental awakening" is politicized by military and police, then it may lead to the feeling of a dictatorship in the public. On the other hand not always but there're good experts in environmental issues within the military circles. Plus, we came to a conclusion that the problem of "environmental awakening" could not be really politicized by the military as there're no environmentally-friendly weapons. Otherwise the military becomes some sort of "GREEN ARMY". Therefore the problems in definitions arise: "if they're just cleaning, then is it still an army?"

Examples of politization of the "environmental awakening":

- selling of wood between Russia and Finland
- construction of the Nordstream pipeline (the Baltic states, Finland, Sweden – chemical weapons in the sea after the WWII that may in the long run influence sea-life)
- GM Organisms (rather in Europe than in Russia – not yet that important)
- nuclear waste imports – highly protested in Russia (West pays to Russia for having its nuclear waste dumped on the RF territory)

Main conclusion: "environmental awakening" hasn't started yet in Russia.

2) Give an example on environmental politics as a field of foreign policy on one hand, and on the other, environmental protection as an issue of “low politics” in international (Northern) cooperation.

EP as a field of foreign policy:

- common economic space between Russia and the EU (environment and ecology issues),
- pollution of the Baltic sea and climate change as the top-topics on the Finnish Foreign Policy agenda (according to the last annual survey among population)

Environmental protection as an issue of “low politics”:

- introduction of fishing regulations,
- Polar bear conference (Norway) – how to prevent Polar bears from becoming extinct

Reports # 1 of the Group No. 4 by Mikhail Kuznetsov

Tutor: Eeva Kortenienmi

Our group discussed the importance of “environmental awakening” and the situation, that environment became “politicized” by non-state actors.

We agreed on the topic that nowadays lots of environmental issues are becoming more and more politicized in order to influence the governments somehow. As we remember several examples of such politicization- for example the lake in Finland, or the lake Baikal.

Non-state actors use these topics in order to lobby their interests and prevent some political actions. Non-state actors also attract attention to itself by politicizing environmental issues.

In the framework of the question regarding the “environmental awakening” we have been discussing Russian problems and the lack of understanding and awareness of environmental importance and impact on our life. Russian people need to change their mentality (we called that the revolution in understanding), as sometimes we (Russians) do not even consider some problems as problems/ issues, but regard it as normal situation.

In that topic we discussed the policy of the Finnish Government and business towards the litter bins and the exchange of used plastic bottles. In Russia we don't have such a system because of: lack of technology, lack of cooperation between the government, business and environment organizations, and the lack of people's will to change the situation somehow.

To make a conclusion, I should say, that Russia needs to copy the policy of Finland and participate in the modern environmental friendly strategies of development. But without the will of the nation everything will collapse and not change the situation.

The questions that were treated during our group discussion regarding the subject of the EU environmental politics, as presented by Mr Dmitry Lanko:

- 1. What's new about the 6th Environment Action Program of the European Community compared to the previous ones?*
- 2. In your opinion, what things are not given sufficient attention to in the 6th Program? What would you like to add to the current four priority areas?*
- 3. What are the fundamental guidelines of the European Community's program of policy and action in relation to the environment and to sustainable development?*

In addition to these questions provided by the lecturer, our discussions took other interesting routes, too. One subject that proved to be particularly stimulating was:

4. Russia-EU relations - in general, and especially in relation to environmental issues.

In the following I will briefly present the thoughts and ideas that arose in our discussion in relation to all of the four major questions presented above, as well as some of my own thoughts that emerged during later reflexion.

What's new?

One thing that our group considered new in the 6th program, as compared to the previous ones, is the division of the vast task of environmental issues into four distinct priority areas: (1) Climate change, (2) Nature and biodiversity, (3) Environment and health, (4) Natural resources and waste. As far as we knew, this type of division of the task was not done in the previous programs. However, since none of us had much previous knowledge of any of these programs prior to Dmitry's presentation, any definitive evaluations of the true innovations of the 6th program were impossible to make.

What should be added / corrected?

The lack of previous knowledge of the subject also hindered us somewhat from answering profoundly to the question of what is not given sufficient attention to in the 6th program, and what should be added to the list of priority areas. All of the four priority areas listed in the program are such vast entities that not knowing what specific actions and procedures are implied by each priority area, we could not come to any clear conclusion about what should be added.

There was one thing, however, that was mentioned by another group in their report in the final session, and which would most surely have been added to the list by our group too, had we just come to think of it. This was the concept of Environmental equality. The priority area of Environmental equality would comprise of all the regulations that need to be made, and of the actions that need to be undertaken in order to ensure a more equal distribution of the means by which countries and areas can respond to future environmental problems and threats, which are by nature so unequally distributed. In other words, the inherent disparity between countries, worsened by the unequally spread environmental threats, should be attenuated by specific action, specified under the priority area of Environmental equality.

In spite of (or perhaps *due to*?) not being able to totally determine its contents, or to name any specific things that should be added to it, there were two things about the European Community's 6th Environment Action Program that our group regarded unanimously as possible weaknesses. These were, first of all, the very vastness and vagueness of all of the four priority areas (a trait very common to all this type of high-level institutional statements, it would seem), which make their actual realization really hard to conceive; and secondly, the lack of an instance or institution that

would survey and assess the countries' performance in carrying out the required actions, and possibly have the mandate to give penalties to those countries who fail to reach the goals.

To begin with the first one of the weaknesses, we were yet again not sure whether the vagueness and vastness that we observed was actually an existent feature of the program and/or of its four priority areas, or just a consequence of our own lack of sufficiently detailed knowledge. Most certainly each one of the mentioned priority areas contains a vast set of statements, action programs, regulations, initiatives, etc. of a more precise and detailed nature, the knowledge of which would have relieved the program's apparent opaqueness. However, even if we'd had more detailed knowledge of the concrete plans contained under these abstract words, this might not necessarily reduce the problem of their implementation in real-life. When far-reaching decisions are made on a high, centralized level, the problem is always present of how to pass these abstract concepts down the hierarchical structure of administration, and to ensure their effective implementation in the various local contexts. After all, it's in the heterogeneous localities and communities where changes have to be made to happen in order to make any overarching policy a reality.

To consider the priority area of Climate change, for instance: the EU climate and energy package, approved in December 2008, presents real, concrete goals to attain, and some large-scale actions by which these goals are to be reached. These goals and actions are agreed upon by the member states. However, already there are differences to be seen in the overall performance of different countries in sticking to their goals. The overall goals of the EU have already been distributed among countries in proportion to their assessed capacity to take action, and yet some countries seem to lag behind in their implementation.

This leads us to the second issue that was considered as a possible weakness of the 6th program: the lack of supervision and penalty. Even if countries more or less eagerly accept to adhere to the goals and measures agreed upon in the EU, what is the guarantee that they'll actually carry out the needed actions to reach these goals? This is a problem especially in environmental politics, where economical considerations and interests often counteract the ecological ones. If the implementation of accepted environmental regulations is seen by a country as a possible serious economical disadvantage, especially in relation to some outside EU actors who apply much looser regulations, then how to ensure that the EU member countries who adhere to the common policies and regulations on paper, won't dodge their responsibilities in real life?

To our knowledge at least, there is no international or EU "Environmental Police" to ensure that countries keep their promises, and to punish them if not. But how can you even make an institution agree to punish itself for not fulfilling its own goals? Besides, historically punishment has never been a method favored by the EU – the European Union's attraction lies fundamentally on its beneficial and productive qualities – doling out more “carrots” than “lash”, as we'd say in Finland.

This issue is perfectly illustrated by the example of national climate laws, as proposed by the European Big Ask -campaign. The goal of this voluntary-based environmental campaign, that has already spread to 18 countries of the EU, is to make countries adopt climate policies that would be in accordance with the latest scientific knowledge provided by the IPCC. As it happens, in order to adhere to the IPCC recommendations, the requested policies would have to be much stricter than those proposed by the European Union: the minimum reduction of 40% of CO₂ emission (as compared to the levels of the year 1990) in all developed countries by the year 2020, and -80% by the year 2050. One major problem in the application of these laws is of course to decide what kind of sanctions could be imposed and to whom if the law is not obeyed? One solution proposed in the UK, where such a law has already been adopted, was to tie the salary of the Prime Minister to the achieved adherence to this law. This, however, was not adopted as part of the law, for obvious reasons.

This is an important problem that needs to be discussed: if the imminent threat of a climate chaos and its direct consequences on humankind is not a big enough punishment to threat countries to take the necessary actions, then what would be? *Loosing money*, perhaps? The reactions

provoked by the "Stern-report", measuring the possible economical impacts of climate change, is one thing that would definitely hint to this direction, as sad it sounds.

Fundamental guidelines & EU-Russian relations

Maybe again due to our lack of knowledge regarding the EU Environment programs, the second relatively vast question about the EU's fundamental guidelines of policy and action never really received an answer. Rather, we got to discussing the fundamental ideological guidelines of the EU as such.

We concluded that there are two major driving factors behind all EU action: maintaining *unity* and striving for *extension*. In order to be able to maintain its own existence as a union, the EU has to constantly seek for and promote a sense of unity among its often disagreeing member countries. A good understanding of the common good that the existence of the Union provides to its members promotes a certain unselfishness and obedience in their part, and a will to at least try and seek for consensus, even though this may in many cases prove rather difficult. As to the second driving concern, in order to continue providing all sorts of benefits (economical, security-related, environmental, etc.) to its members, the EU has to be able to communicate and cooperate efficiently with outside parties, to spread its ideological values and policies, and to keep its doors open to new members whenever a country successfully adheres to its principles and expresses the will to become a part of it.

From the EU's fundamental guidelines, we quickly got to reflecting upon EU-Russian relations. This was perhaps the most interesting and fruitful part of our discussion: both the Russians and the Finns in our group were very much interested in each other's points of views and perspectives on the common situation, and of the image that each party had of the other.

Both the parties agreed that EU and Russia are and continue to be very much dependent on each other. This mutual dependence is not restricted to energy and economical issues alone, as is seen with the global threat of climate change for instance. However, a certain ambivalence in the attitudes on both sides would seem to persist, and several problems continue to trouble the cooperation. One of these, in our opinion, is a problem of communication.

The image that the Russian students had of the EU seemed to be somewhat simplified, as they often referred to the EU as one agreeing entity. This would easily lead one to wonder whether the disparities and disagreements between the member countries, so visible in the Western media, would not be that apparent from the Eastern point of view. If on the Russian individuals' level the heterogeneous whole of the European Union can be seen as a one single entity, a coherent international actor comparable to Russia itself, or to the USA, could this be the case on the governance level too? And also, isn't this "consistent, mutually agreeing entity, with one mutual policy" just the type of image that the EU would like to promote of itself? It has to be noted that the view that many of us Finns had of Russia must have seemed at least as simplified and stereotypical as the one the Russians had of the EU.

According to the Russian students, the prevalent attitude towards the EU in Russia would seem to be somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, it is seen as a very important and promising partner of cooperation, with some very good policies and initiatives. On the other hand, the EU's growing economical role, its possible energy-independence, as well as some of its policies and regulations (regarding international trade, human rights, or the environment, for example) can also be seen as possible problems for Russia.

As for the communication problem, our common view was that Russia, as a former superpower with a long and rich cultural history, would like to continue to be addressed as such. It should be treated as the powerful international actor that it is, with respect to its cultural specificity, and to its "Russian way of thinking". The way that the EU promotes its own values and actions, more or less forcing outside EU countries to adapt to them as well if they wish to continue cooperation, can easily seem as slightly threatening, or at least disrespectful, from the Russian point of view. The type of "teacher-pupil" attitude, that the Union is so inclined to take in relation to outside EU actors,

especially in issues related to the environment, to human rights, or to other such areas of interest in which we Europeans tend to regard ourselves as so advanced compared to others, is not well seen by such a mighty country as Russia. What Russia would like, it seems, is to be addressed to as an equal partner whose different type of approach to key issues should be respected. From the EU point of view, on the other hand, one could be inclined to think that some problems in Russia (that aren't sometimes even recognized as problems from the Russian perspective, as is the case with some environmental issues for instance) could be easily relieved by just "taking our advice".

So, the basic problem remains: How to open up such a dialogue that all the best existent knowledge could be used and spread efficiently, taking all the parties views and differing approaches into consideration, and without damaging anybody's well justified cultural pride? We found no answer to this persistent problem.

Due to the vastness of the issues discussed, as well as to the tight time-frame, most of the thoughts developed had to remain on a somewhat superficial level. However, from my personal point of view the discussion was very instructive and fruitful, opening up new perspectives to a multitude of things. Even though discursive problems between the West and East do remain, the type of dialogue and interaction that took place during this summer school can be a part of the possible solution.

2nd Day: "Climate Change and Energy Redefining / Challenging International Environmental Politics"

"Energy and Climate Change"

by Björn Gunnarsson, School on Renewable Energy Science

Questions / Tasks for Working Groups

What type of "energy revolution" is needed in your opinion to address the two central energy challenges facing us today, in example securing the supply of reliable and affordable energy, and effecting a rapid transformation to low carbon, efficient and environmentally benign system of energy supply?

"Climate Change in the North"

by Vladimir Lukanin, Petrozavodsk State University

2nd Day: GROUP REPORTS

Report of the Group No. 1 by Tatyana Ilina

Tutor: Andrey Demidov

In order to cause environmental revolution something that will provoke public reaction should happen. May be it can be some kind of a catastrophe. This situation will put people in the real need of solving the problems of environment. The environmental revolution can't start when everything is ok.

The second point is that of course today a lot of new technologies and devices appear, but to buy them and to use them or not to do this is the option of every state. For example some countries are not interested in using these technologies, they are not profitable for them. For example the Saudi Arabia (though they are actively developing renewable resources of energy).

The problem today is that our society is running out of some resources, for ex. – oil. But companies in the today society are not ready to invest huge amounts of money into new technologies – it's not beneficial for them

Of course today there are alternative sources of energy- but there is no strong incentive to put them into use.

What about the fact by whom the revolution can be provoked – from above or below? We can say that there is practically no political will to solve the problem (the lack of resources)

Report of the Group No. 2 by Mari Ryömä

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

Our group discussed Björn Gunnarsson's question *"what type of 'energy revolution' is needed in your opinion to address the two central energy challenges facing us today, i.e. securing the supply of reliable and affordable energy, and effecting a rapid transition to a low-carbon, efficient and environmentally benign system of energy supply?"* Our discussion began by noting that currently the world in which we live leans heavily on the consumption of fossil fuels: oil, gas and coal. However, as discussed by lecturers Björn Gunnarsson and Vladimir Lukanin, the fossil fuels are both non-renewable and already scarce, and the use of them is also the main reason for the notable growth in the greenhouse gases (mostly carbon dioxide CO₂), and thus climate change.

We were asked to discuss the nature of "energy revolution" needed to solve these problems. Our group understood energy revolution in a rather holistic way: in our view, a considerable change is needed, indeed, in longer time period, pretty much everything needs to be changed. As the consequences of the continuous use of fossil fuels have proved to be severe, neither is there time to wait until we run out of them entirely – something that according to Gunnarsson will not take more than 100 years most.

In our discussion we wanted to emphasize the question *why energy is used*. For instance, we considered the hypothetical situation of what if there was an infinite amount of energy to be used. Although the idea of cheap and unlimited energy resources might sound tempting, we thought that it would probably lead to even worse consumption habits and recklessness of environment and thus cause more environmental problems. In our view the "why" question should always be asked when discussing the use of energy: is energy being used for improving human well-being, for benefit of all, or perhaps for narrow self-interests? We called for rational way of using energy (as any other) resources that benefits everyone.

Energy revolution is not only about what resources we should use and how to produce energy although obviously these are very significant questions. To a great extent, energy revolution would signify learning to think and live differently. This would mean growing consciousness and questioning of environmentally problematic aspects of the modern way of life such as consumerism, competition and the idea that the value of nature can be counted purely in money. We acknowledged that changing values is difficult and slow and that no such changes are likely to take place in day or two. However, we consider such changes necessary for truly 'revolutionizing' the use of energy instead of just making few improvements to the currently existing system.

We discussed the relation of cutting down energy consumption and of creating new forms of energy production. In our view both are needed. The holistic understanding of energy revolution endorses 'cutting down' by emphasizing alternative ways of life (eg. food production, living habits, immanent instead of material values), realization that human activities have consequences on environment, and minimizing careless use of energy. However, new innovations have also significant role to play in energy revolution. Although current forms of producing renewable energy are good and necessary first step, they are still only a temporary solution. They need to be improved – and we as citizens need to demand better technologies that are available to all.

Finally, we discussed the role of government and governance in energy revolution. Local and national governments need to be involved in making energy revolution reality by enabling people to turn into more ecologically sustainable and energy-efficient direction (consider eg. city planning, building standards, public transportation, changes in legislation and taxation, more efficient regulations on business). However, we also noted that trust in government is significant factor, as well as general social and political situation in a society because environment is not the first thing

people tend to think about when facing other severe problems such as poverty and inequality. Thus the questions of development and democracy are in our view also connected to the possibility of a energy revolution.

Report of the Group No. 3 by Alina Mostovaya

Tutor: Eeva Kortenieniemi

1. What type of «energy revolution» is needed in your opinion to address the two central energy challenges facing us today, i.e. securing the supply of reliable and affordable energy, and effecting a rapid transformation to a low carbon, efficient and environmentally benign system of energy supply?

We proposed several solutions that we found useful:

- 1) Education. We mean spreading of knowledge and increasing environmental consciousness and responsibility on each level of society.
- 2) Cooperation and doing more research in this field. For example, if one country has scientists and progressive ideas and other country has money they can work together to develop new sources of energy.
- 3) Localizing. It means that we should create as more energy as possible locally. In this case we can also pay more attention to alternative sources of energy.
- 4) Efficient use of energy, optimization of its use. For example insulation allows us to use less heat in the houses.
- 5) Higher taxation on environmentally unfriendly energy production and support of new resources use.

2. Do we know that global warming is caused by human activity? What kind of environmental politics we should have since it's uncertain?

That is true that we can not say strictly that global warming is a consequence of human activity. But we can waste much time thinking whether it is caused by harmful emission or not. In any case global warming takes place and it is necessary to reduce air pollution at least because pollution depress environment and nature becomes less resistant to global warming. Cooperation between policymakers and researchers is a first step to solution of problem of global warming. Very often policymakers do not listen to researchers' advice. That is why people should be active and demand actions from government. At present time we can not stop technological progress but negotiations between policymakers and researchers should be continued in order to prevent grave consequences of industrial development.

Report of the Group No. 4 by Niina Pehkonen

Tutor: Nina Tynkkynen

Our group started to think, what is really the challenge in energy politicks, and divided soon in two. Others thought that the main challenge is to cut down our energy consumption and the others claimed it is to gain new technologies. Russian students took the opinion how there should be alternative energy sources before strict regulation in energy consumption. Finnish in opposite wanted more regulation to cut down unnecessary consumption.

We found kind of a consensus when we started to talk about energy efficiency and how for example Finland and Russia in different situation. The trends of live “simple” life and not to own a car are growing in Finland, but not yet in Russia. Discussion of a simple lifestyle led us also to the consensus that cutting down the consumption does not mean, that we need to stop using energy totally and immediately.

To gain some results in energy politics there should be actions likewise top-down and bottom-up. With top-down actions I mean actions from state, like regulation and taxes. Bottom-up actions are more like trends, movements and actions in grassroots, which could lead people to change their lifestyle voluntarily.

Our group also pointed out some problems in both actions. Top- down regulation can lead towards easy solutions, which are made in the current situation and without long range scale. One member of the group pointed, how Hobbes way of thinking among politicks could reduce the willingness to set up new regulation, if other people, states and unions don’t do it. Bottom-up actions our group found more sustainable way to affect in people, but it is not effective enough to achieve rapid changes among people in society when the change is bind to peoples own will.

Report # 2 of the Group 4 by Leea Parhiala, University of Tampere

Tutor: Nina Tynkkynen

Task: Scientific Uncertainty and Decision making - What to do with Climate Change?

The mainstream view about climate change is that it is taking place, but we can not say exactly how it is going to change our environment and to what extent peoples’ behavior play a role in the process. This creates uncertainty among policy-makers. They can’t be sure what reliable information is.

In our group the discussion started with a view, that it is impossible to answer to this question: How to handle with uncertainty. Who can tell us what is the “right” information? Possibly it could be the most current information? But still there is no way to justify the latest information to be the most correct information. All knowledge is provided by people, and their experiences, values, interests, cultural background and other things modify the provided information by them. As constructivists put it, socially constructed identities of human beings define their interests, and consequently modify their knowledge and provided information. In the group discussion we were not talking about constructivism as such, but still the talk was about how identities alter provided information. During the discussion we simply could not answer to the posed question.

In my presentation of the group discussion I wanted to relate this issue with the concept of power. From my point of view, only attractive information for the policy-makers is transferred from scientific field to the policy arena. I did not make it very clear during the presentation, but as I see it only that kind of information is accepted which corresponds to the prevailing political discourses. For example, environmental problems need to be resolved by economic means, as we live in a world of market economy. Diverse political interests also harm the climate change policy. In order to handle with this issue, the decision makers would need new kind of policy. There should be a move from “our own policy” to “common policy”. When the interest is common the policy would also become common and there would be fewer conflicts in the discussion. This would demand promoting world citizenship thinking. Policy makers would act for common good of all people, not only for the good of one nation state. This is very idealistic view, but in order to solve global environmental problems, I think it is the only possible way to handle with the global problems.

At the end of the presentation (or after the presentation) Lassi Heininen clarified his point related to the posed question. He argued that the information about climate change exists, but there is no coordination between decision makers and researchers. And the scientific information needs to be simplified for the policy-makers. But once again, I see that policy makers choose the information that correspond their interests. Consequently, people should move towards common policy where researchers are also included. The issue would demand much deeper discussion, but here due to the scope limitations, it is presented in a very simply way.

"Finnish/EU-Russian Environmental Cooperation and ND Environmental Partnership"

by Nina Tynkkynen, University of Tampere

Abstract

The environment is one of the key areas of cooperation between the European Union and the Russian Federation. The environmental dialogue between the EU and Russia is now beginning as part of the work to establish a Common Economic Space, and the new Northern Dimension, which with the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP), established in 2001, will be implementing the specified objectives within its geographical boundaries. In the environmental dialogue between the EU and Russia it is underlined that experience gained from previous and existing forms of cooperation at the regional, sub-regional and local levels should be utilized in the Northern Dimension. This experience is rich: many European governments and other actors in the region have since the early 1990s had bilateral and regional environmental cooperation with Russia. Although there are some success stories among cooperation projects, the cooperation has had its moments of intricacy, too.

The lecture presents an overview of the evolution of environmental cooperation between European actors and Russia, and introduces the main actors and activities of that cooperation. It also sheds light on the drivers and barriers of success in environmental cooperation with Russia. The lecture has two basic aims: a practical one and a methodological one. Practically speaking, the lecture aims to elucidate experiences of environmental cooperation, and to draw "lessons learnt" to be considered in future cooperation. Methodologically, the lecture gives an overview on how issues related to international environmental cooperation can be approached in research.

Disposition of the Lecture

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Background
 - 1.2. Main concepts
2. The evolution of the environmental cooperation between Europe and Russia/the SU
 - 2.1. The Soviet Period
 - 2.2. Early 1990s
 - 2.3. 1995-2000
 - 2.4. After 2000
3. Main actors, policies and other activities at the moment
4. Barriers and drivers of success in environmental cooperation – "Lessons learnt"
5. Future challenges?
6. Methodological and theoretical implications for research
 - 6.1. Traditional approaches
 - 6.2. A bottom-up approach

Suggested Readings

Tynkkynen, Nina (2009), Experiences of environmental cooperation between the Nordic Countries and Russia – lessons learnt and the way forward. In Aalto, Pami; Blakkisrud Helge & Hanna Smith (eds.), *The new Northern dimension of European neighbourhood*. Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS): Brussels. 71-90.

(the book can be downloaded for free at

http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1772);

Tennberg, Monica (2007), International Environmental Cooperation in Northwest Russia: An Assessment of Performance, *Polar Record* 43 (3): 231-238.

Questions / Tasks for Working Groups

- 1) Deliberate/consider different dimensions of EU-Russian environmental cooperation on nuclear safety issues. Why it has been difficult/almost nonexistent? How come is it now becoming more and more widespread? Etc.;
- 2) Elaborate a number of interesting research questions for the study of international environmental cooperation/EU-Russian environmental cooperation.

"Finnish-Russian Neighbouring Area Cooperation - Cooperation with Russian Environmental NGOs"

by Anna Kuhmonen, Aleksanteri Institute

Abstract

Environmental NGO's (non-governmental organizations) have an active role in environmental politics. In their nature, NGO's are ideological, and their work is based on their values and goals, in the different fields of environment. The activities of the NGO's include usually lobbying, rising environmental awareness (environmental education) and realizing co-operation projects with other NGO's. Environmental NGO's in different countries often have same kind of goals and that's why networking and international co-operation play a really important role for NGO's. For the NGO's that work in global questions, it is really important to know what is happening in the world in general, but also if the local questions and problems they are working with can be similar in other countries. Cross-border co-operation is important, as the nature questions are often similar in the both sides of the border, especially around the border of Russia and Finland. Russian NGO's are active members of international NGO networks, for example the Coalition Clean Baltic (with 7 Russian NGO members) and Taiga Rescue Network (with 57 Russian NGO members). These networks are good forums for discussing and networking with other NGO's in several countries. The international co-operation of the NGO's with each others is usually based on common projects. There are different kinds of possibilities for project funding for the NGO's; either for certain campaigns or happenings, like camps; or for a longer term co-operation for few years. Usually funding programmes have different themes for which it's possible to apply for funding. Environment is usually one of these themes.

The main aim of this lecture is to give examples how Russian and Finnish environmental NGO's realize cross-border co-operation at the grass root level. The Finnish Association for Nature Conservation and SPOK from Petrozavodsk have run projects about the issues of nature conservation and the sustainable use of forests already for years. SPOK has specialized only to this issue, as The Finnish Association for Nature Conservation works with other issues as well. The activities of the co-operation include delivering nature surveys in the old-growth forests (e.g. about values of the unprotected forests, finding ways to use nature for ecotourism and reveal illegal cuttings), informing local authorities and Finnish wood industry about the results of surveys,

making structures for nature paths for ecotourism with local ecotourism firms, arranging trips for the public to the valuable nature sites and arranging educational camps for NGO-activists.

Course Disposition

1. Environmental NGO's as actors in environmental politics
 - 1.1. What does the concept of the environmental NGO mean? How and why do NGO's act?
 - 1.2. International cooperation of the environmental NGO's (networks and projects)
 - 1.3. Russian NGO's as active actors in international co-operation
2. Co-operation of SPOK and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation
 - 2.1. Description of the NGO's
 - 2.2. Why co-operation? Common interests. Mission and goals of the co-operation
 - 2.3. Activities and results of the co-operation
3. Co-operation of the Friends of the Baltic and the Finnish Nature League
 - 3.1. Description of the NGO's
 - 3.2. Why co-operation? Common interests. Mission and goals of the co-operation
 - 3.3. Activities and results of the co-operation

Questions / Task for Working Groups

How do you see possibilities of environmental NGO's in the cross-border cooperation?

4th Day: GROUP REPORTS

Report # 1 of the Group No. 1 by Alina Savolainen

Tutor: Gleb Yarovoy

*Finnish-Russian neighbouring area cooperation – cooperation with Russian environmental NGO's
Plan a concrete idea for the environmental neighbouring area cooperation project*

In the group we planned a idea of a forest station. In practice that would mean planning trees to Karelian forests with the help of local NGO's and voluntary work volunteers. Our project would help the problem in Karelia, that almost half of the trees in Karelia has been cutted down.

The idea in this forest station would be in actual to help the forest in Karelia to survive from cutting down all the trees. Project would also give environmental education for example to school kids in the area about forests and how to treat them. Project would also give attention and publicity to this urgent problem.

The project would be put into action with the help of Finnish wood companies which have also been buying wood from the Karelian's forests. This project could also get financial support from companies and associations. Project would be done in cooperation with NGO's. Important would be the help from girl/boyscout, students, volunteers and so on.

In the end our group came to a conclusion that International Summer school in Karelia could actually be held next year as an afforestation camp in the woods of Karelia.

Report # 2 by the Group No. 1 by Sami Koivuniemi

Tutor: Gleb Yarovoy

Deliberate/consider different dimensions of EU-Russian environmental cooperation on nuclear safety issues. Why it has been difficult/almost nonexistent? How come is it now becoming more and more widespread? Etc.

Nuclear safety is not only about waste, but also about technologies, energy, politics and security. The notion of nuclear safety can include weapons and nuclear power plants. During the period of “cold war” there was difficult to find a particular approach to the issue, because it was the issue of national security. The Soviet Union was a closed society, it was not transparent. At that period the nuclear technologies were kept in secret by both sides – the Soviet Union and the European Union. There was no willingness to share the knowledge about such issues. The nuclear safety was not a topic of normal negotiations and discussions as it’s now. So there were no substantial relations between the SU and the EU, their relations were very complicated.

Moreover, at that time cooperation wasn’t concrete. Such themes as air pollution, water pollution were very broad, so the cooperation in the sphere of nuclear safety had to be narrowed, but it wasn’t. So, it was hard to make any precise or concrete decisions – it was a problem. More than there were no common standards and regulations in the sphere of nuclear safety. And all in all there wasn’t deep knowledge about nuclear power, and its strength. Finally we can say that during the period of “cold war” many countries tried to cooperate only in “simple” fields, they didn’t try to help each other in such a secret, difficult and poorly investigated sphere of nuclear relations.

The problem of nuclear safety became urgent and international after the catastrophe in Chernobyl in 1986. The world community saw the real consequences of the tragedy caused by inefficient use of nuclear power.

The Occident thought that the catastrophe was caused by “bad” soviet technologies, but now there are many proves that it was only the result of the test. So it was the common practice at that time to blame the USSR for everything.

Another crucial point was that the information chain was very bad. Even the Kremlin knew about the tragedy many days later. So the incident showed how it’s important to know the quick and necessary information. And it is the achievement of our century that we are able to get crucial information in time and very quickly.

Since the time of Perestroika the situation has changed, and the ecological questions were taken into consideration. After the collapse of the USSR the European Union was a donator, and Russia just received money, but then they came to the mutual cooperation and partnership. Russia became transparent state, and due to that fact the intensive cooperation in science started. Furthermore, the rise in the number of NGOs should be mentioned. International NGOs came to Russia to share their experience. So Russian NGOs also started to react on the issue of nuclear safety. And now almost everybody has the access to the information concerning nuclear issues. Moreover the whole atmosphere of relations between the EU and Russia became tolerant. And it is up to the countries to develop mutually beneficial cooperation in the sphere of nuclear safety.

Report of the Group No. 2 by Ilona Vihonen

Tutor: Anton Lapshin

1. Why has the cooperation on nuclear safety been almost non-existent and difficult for a long time between Russia and European Union?

Our group came to a conclusion that an obstacle for cooperation has been a lack of trust between EU and Russia, since nuclear technology can also be used for developing of weapons of mass destruction. Hence, nuclear safety is also a military issue and therefore there has been little willingness to share information with others. This was the case especially before perestroika. And when there is no information, or it is classified, it is hard to cooperate.

In addition, when it comes to transportation or selling of nuclear waste, the countries or companies involved have been unwilling to see it as an environmental issue. Instead, it has been treated as an economic or energy issue. In our group's opinion it definitely is an environmental issue. It was also mentioned, that this is a question where EU can be blamed for so called "double standards" for accusing Russia for not closing its old nuclear power plants while it is itself building more and more nuclear power.

2. Why has the issue become so widespread now?

Our group came up with an answer that the main reason for this is the technology and nuclear reactors which are getting old at the moment. What I added before reporting our conclusions to the others (and after quickly discussing it with a couple of our group members) was the fact that while running out of oil the world is looking for new energy sources and this is why nuclear power has entered the agenda again. In addition, the European union is seeking for new energy sources simply to get rid of the energy dependence in its relations to Russia.

We also thought about what kind of forms of cooperation could there be between EU and Russia on nuclear safety and came to the conclusion that, first of all, there should be a common research initiative to improve the technology of nuclear safety. In addition, there should be cooperation in recycling the waste so that it can be done in a secure and a proper way. Most importantly, the cooperation should be based on equal partnership and everyone who this issue concerns should be involved in the process.

Report # 1 of the Group No. 3 by Päivi Arkko, Aleksanteri Institute

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

The question that our group discussed was the possibilities of environmental NGO's in the cross-border cooperation.

The fundamental difference on environment politics between Russia and Finland (or Europe) is how the partners environment protection. Russians see the nature more as an asset. Because Russia is a large country and has a lot of natural resources, from Russian point of view, it is hard to see what is there to protect. In addition as mentioned in almost every discussion, Russians see that there are more important problems, like poverty, that has to be prioritized before protecting environment. But there is not always a trade off between doing things environment friendly and money, which can be allocated for example to social needs. In Western countries environment protection is defined more wide. Environment protection is not seen just as saving natural resources. It means saving the environment clean and healthy for further generations as it is. Europeans take scientists

warnings more seriously than Russians. Maybe that is because the consequences for Europeans are more visible and worse than for Russians. There is so much land and nature in Russia, that people don't see pollution and other environment problems so harmful. In Russia as many other countries the environmental awakening has happened later than in Europe. On recent years the rest of the world has awoken because of the increasing number of nature disasters.

The field where environmental actions are taken is different between Russia and Nordic countries. The relative number of NGO:s and the structure of financing is entirely different between Russia and Nordic countries. As an example in Finland 80 percent of the people take part in some NGO, as in Russia the figure is 8 percent. Though in Finland most of the members are passive members, who just register to the NGO and pay a membership fee to support the organisation. In Russia NGO:s are usually poor and quite dependent on the financing of municipal or state, or private financing of a firm or a fund. NGO:s in Finland are usually supported by state or municipal. Sometimes in concrete way as an aid or just moral support. In Russia it is not so simple. Governments (state, regional or municipal) support some NGO:s, usually the ones which serve social help. Political NGO:s are not supported, especially if they criticize government. Their actions are so restricted, that they can't really be heard. In general civil society is not so active in Russia. People have enough to do with their everyday life and they are not so interested of NGO:s. In addition the Soviet compulsory membership does not conduct to take part on NGO:s even nowadays. This passiveness and lack of governmental support make NGO:s feel powerless.

Nordic countries and especially Finland has many environment projects in South West Russia. Russians don't feel the projects, which Nordic countries or EU is financing, their own. Russia often feels that Scandinavia again tries to solve their problems. Many times the money that is given by EU is not very effectively used due to Russian partners lack of commitment or local governments lack of support. Free money, which can be applied, but which is not well controlled and supervised, affects moral hazard.

As a result we had following proposals for environmental cooperation between Finland and Russia. A pilot project in a Karelian village. The aim is to make village independent with its energy resources by burning shells of grains and other biologic resources of energy. The another proposal is to learn from Russian babushkas. Russians have been good in using things for a longer time. It is not necessary to buy new furniture from IKEA every few years. We call this know-how "Babushka acknowledge". Babushka –acknowledge can be used for example in conservation of food, shutting down the electric equipment when they are not needed and the knowledge of herbs etc. We think enhancing of Babushka-acknowledge is very important, because we should focus on how much we consume in addition to how to produce goods environment friendly. The fundamental thing is to share knowledge and scientific research about environmental issues. That means to truly cooperate, so that the both partners are committed and feel the project of their own.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 3 by Ksenia Medvedeva

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

Task: Plan a concrete idea of the environmental neighboring cooperation project.

Our group worked out a project aimed at developing sustainable energy resources for small communities (e.g. remote villages). The key point of this project is the idea that remote villages in Finland and Karelia may use different kinds of renewable energy sources (e.g. water, wind, solar energy, earth energy, biofuels, etc. – in every case the energy source may vary according to the conditions).

It is acknowledged, that building electricity networks for remote villages (that also tend to be really small) is expensive and thus does not attract local authorities. As a result, the citizens of these small villages (at least in Russia) tend to live without any energy supply that obviously does not fit in the framework of modern society and innovative development. I should say that our group was quite resolute to change the situation.

We suggest, that the first step of the project is to find small communities in Finland that already have some knowledge and experience of using RES. Thus, we may have an opportunity to transfer know-how from Finland to Karelia and, after a while, this sphere may become a good basis for cooperation. We hope, that the two countries may be interested in developing local energy systems, that may create a good ground for further cooperation in this field. Moreover, creating local energy systems is, in the end, undoubtedly beneficial, as they are energy efficient and environmentally friendly.

Nordic countries are working hard at this today, and have already made such practices fruitful. There is a vivid example of one bakery that uses shells of the grains (which before that it just threw away) as a vital source of energy and thus it managed to become self-sustainable.

Thus, we suggest, that sharing such know-how is quite likely to become a good basis for fruitful cooperation between the two countries. Moreover, there is a great need of such practices in Karelia, and in this case implementing this know-how in the Valaam and Kizhi islands can be the first step in this direction.

Report # 1 of the Group No. 4 by Dmitry Nechiporuk

Tutor: Eeva Kortenien

Deliberate / consider different dimensions of EU-Russian environmental cooperation on nuclear safety issues. Why it has been difficult/almost nonexistent? How come is it now becoming more and more widespread?

Nowadays, we see that the nuclear energy is a quite political thing. On the one hand, it's the important part of foreign politics and national security. On the other hand, the problem of utility of nuclear energy is a part of environmental cooperation between EU countries.

In order to estimate the future perspectives of the cooperation between EU and Russia we should look back. From the Russian side, we could see that the nuclear problems are connected with military defense and national security. It means that Russian government has some secrets from Western Friends. From this point of view Cold War is still going on...

We don't forget also that the production of nuclear energy is also a usual business. And Russian state corporation "ROSATOM" is interested in the cooperation with western partners.

So we could see collaborative projects concerning technological innovation on Russian nuclear station. We need modern nuclear technology elaborating in EU countries and Russian officials on the high level understand it.

The second problem is that from the EU side we could see the lack of political will especially from the nuclear powers.

The third aspect of problem is that within EU there is no definite view about nuclear strategy, but we reveal there the different views and approaches to the nuclear problems.

The fourth issue reminds us that EU and Russia pay attention the various aspects of the nuclear safety problems. For example, the neighborhoods of Russia know little about nuclear station on the North-West of Russia. And this lack of information leads to the various misunderstood between Northern Countries and Russia. In Russia, we could see not long ago the discussion about the consequences of the import of nuclear wastes.

At last? But not the least, in the mid-term perspective we expect the growth of awareness these problems. But we forecast that nothing will be done. Russia is not willing cooperate actively, but EU can not offer a clear solution of the problem.

Of course, we want to be the cautious optimists. We hope will see in long-term run cooperation on nuclear problems between Nordic country and Russia.

In order to solve our mutual problems we should locate them at the Nordic level with the participation of the USA. We think, at the first stage it will be the only way to begin the dialogue.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 4 by Riikka Yliluoma

Tutor: Eeva Korteniemi

Task: Plan a concrete idea for the environmental neighbouring area cooperation projects?

- NGOs aren't efficient in Russia
 - o We need also authorities and government, at least in the local / municipal level
- Cooperation project: recycling project called Friendly Bin
 - o Takes place in the Petrozavodsk
 - o Cooperation between finnish and russian NGOs, Petrozavodsk State University and the local government
 - o Finnish NGO can provide information and help and Petrozavodsk State University can do some research
 - o At first we should have young people with the project. We could start from the university. Later the project could expand.
 - o Information, lectures, education to students
 - o A proper infrastructure for recycling. We should proceed step by step: at first paper bins, then glas bins etc.
 - o The local government should provide the bins
 - o Bins at first at the university, then spread around the city
 - o We need some publicity: radio, screen in the city center etc.
 - o Petrozavodsk state committee of youth affairs could promote our project

* * *

Bioenergy from Forest: a Wicked Case of Environmental Policy?

by Taru Peltola, Finnish Environmental Centre

Abstract

Tackling climate change has put renewable energy production in the forefront of (global) environmental policy. For example, EU has set bioenergy targets for the year 2020 as a means to reduce its carbon emissions: the goal is to increase the use of bioenergy up to 20 % of primary energy consumption, and the use of traffic biofuels up to 10 %. Implementation of the policy has tremendous environmental impacts – the effect is not, however, only positive. Increasing use of biomass in energy production requires changes in agricultural and forestry practices, causes land use changes and biodiversity loss, and influences nutrient cycles, just to mention a few risks anticipated by the scientists. Ecological changes are intertwined with socio-economic changes. EU bioenergy policies may cause subsistence problems beyond Europe in local communities vulnerable to changing land use patterns or decreasing productivity of ecosystems (e.g. food crops replaced by energy crops, erosion, loss of valuable species). Recently, the environmental impacts of bioenergy have led to the politicization of bioenergy policy. For example, Greenpeace launched a campaign against the Finnish oil company Neste in Nordic countries to draw attention to the impacts of utilization of palm oil as a raw material for biodiesel. The recent developments make bioenergy a wicked game: it is meant to be a solution for one of the most pressing global environmental problems but it has produced new problems. The rise of public concern addressing these impacts shows that environmental policy (that is: tools and means to solve problems) can become contested and thus return to the realm of politics (that is: debate on what are the specific problems that should be resolved). Bioenergy policy/politics thus presents a complex environmental governance problem with no easy solutions.

The lecture gives an overview of the complexities of bioenergy policies and discusses possibilities for sustainable bioenergy paths. First, EU bioenergy policies are reviewed as an example of a global driving force to various environmental and social vulnerabilities. Second, a case of good practices is presented: Finnish small scale bioenergy businesses are presented as an example of a grassroots innovation in energy sector which supports bioenergy policy but also improves local capacities to act in the forestry sector. Third, the lecture discusses the role of grassroots innovations in environmental policy: possibilities and limits to copy and transfer technologies and practices to other socio-economic environments, e.g. from one country to another. It will be argued that adoption of new technologies, such as bioenergy, is always interlinked with social practices, actors and institutions; in order to create sustainable bioenergy policies we need to understand and study how the social practices related to bioenergy change.

Disposition

1. What is bioenergy?
 - a. Introduction to EU bioenergy policies: setting targets to tackle CO₂ emissions
 - b. Review of environmental and social implications: results from a European wide interdisciplinary dialogue process
 - c. Summary: bioenergy as a complex governance problem: politicization of bioenergy policy, need to understand the changing socio-economic practices; relation between politics and policy

2. Bioenergy at the grassroot level
 - a. Implementing the goals: Case Finnish small heating businesses as a means to increase renewable energy
 - b. Small scale bioenergy in the forestry sector: The transformation of forest owners to energy producers; increasing capacities and changing natural resource use practices
 - c. Summary: Bioenergy as a driver of change in natural resource use/source of empowerment
3. Towards more sustainable bioenergy policies
 - a. Preconditions for grassroot innovations: how to support bioenergy solutions that respond to local contexts and communities?
 - b. Possibilities to copy best practices and avoid bad habits: technology transfer and environmental governance

Suggested Readings

ECNC (2008). Impacts of biofuel production on biodiversity in Europe. European Centre for Nature Conservation, Tilburg;

Peltola, T. (2007) Business on the margin: Local practices and the politics of forests in Finland. *Ethics, Place and Environment* 10 (1), 29-47;

Seyfang, Gill & Smith, Adrian (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental politics* 16 (4), 584-603

Questions / Tasks for Working Groups

- 1) Give examples from other policy fields where environmental governance fails to address solutions to problems and rather give rise to new problems. What social practices are interlinked in these cases and produce new problems?
- 2) What are the possibilities/limits of transferring good practices from one socio-economic setting to another? What are the limits of grass-root innovations to produce sustainable solutions to environmental problems?

“Forestry Management and Policy in North-West Russia”

by Ludmila Ivanova, Kola Science Centre

Abstract / Disposition

The lecture includes first, a general description of forest resources of the Russian Federation (“forest fund” definition, geographical distribution, classification of forests. Second, a forestry management development in Russia is mentioned as a governmental regulation of ecological-legal regime of forest use, its elements. There is also a description of the forest sector (forestry and the forest industry), brief historical overview, organization structure, actors, system of property rights, system of licensing for forest use, stakeholders, institutions, analysis of the legislative basis, reform and institutional development; comparative characteristics of main principles of the two Forest Codes (1997 and 2006). Third, a description of the North-West Federal District includes geography, economy, role of forestry and the forest industry; specificity of forest use in different regions included in the District. Fourth, a management of specially protected areas: their role in nature protection activities, positive and negative influence on local communities, governmental regulation. Final, a present situation with the state forest policy in Russia is mentioned: Federal Conception of the forestry development, main directions of the forest industry development (certification), regional forest plans, etc.

Suggested Readings

Comments on the New Russian Forest Code. http://www.taigareshape.org/_v3/files/pdf/201.pdf;
Tatu Juhani Tornaiainen, Olli Juhani Saastamoinen and Anatoly Pavlovich Petrov, Russian Forest Policy in the Turmoil of the Changing Balance of Power. <http://ideas.repec.org>

Questions / Tasks for Working Groups

- 1) What are the main current challenges in the Russian forestry?
- 2) Are there positive examples from other countries that could be used in Russia to improve the forestry management?

5th Day: GROUP REPORTS

Report # 1 by the Group No. 1 by Daria Khyutte

Tutor: Eeva Kortenien

Task: Give examples from other policy fields where environmental governance fails to address solutions to problems and rather give rise to new problems. What social practices are interlinked in these cases and produce new problems?

To illustrate governance's failure to address solutions to critical issues we picked up an example of GMOs, or Genetically Modified Organisms. Why is this issue critical?

Firstly, we want to mention that there is no definite laws/legislation in that area, as a result, in case of a failure governments blame manufacturers, and vice versa, hence this issue is put back and forward, while no one wants to be responsible. Moreover, we raised the issue of greenhouse food and food with preservatives that one can buy in a supermarket in winter. These goods are mainly produced within the country and hence they are not that expensive. What concerns imported food is that we never know whether it contains GMOs or not, as in the majority of cases this information is not put on a box. Here the question rises: should we buy local or imported food?

Another bright example of failure is the use of pesticides and fertilizers. The problem with these mostly concerns organic fruit and vegetables. For instance, if one farmer uses pesticides and his neighbour does not, he may as well have his crops poisoned, as pesticides tend to spread over big territories. These kinds of cases lead to a high level of lawsuits thus representing the social side of this problem.

Another drawback of the use of pesticides is that they 'destroy' the soil and kill indigenous plants. As a result, only pesticide-resistant crops can grow on that types of land. But in majority of cases this so-called pesticide abuse leads to soil erosion, water pollution, etc. and it becomes a cycle. Unfortunately, nowadays it is hard to find non-GMO products, as more and more countries start using this technology, which in fact is not that bad itself. Anyways, for instance, in Mexico one can hardly find non-GMO corn. And again, as it has already been mentioned, there are no signs on the package. Why is it crucial? Here comes an example: a company several years ago produced soy beans with Brazil nut extract added to that, but it turned out that some people were allergic to that rare plant.

And back to the issue of legislation again. We need proper unified legislation, because nowadays different countries stick to various practices, as for instance, in South European countries such as Italy and Spain they prefer to have loose legislation, and on the contrary in Austria and Finland

people basically say 'no' to GMOs. Another point is that governments should strengthen patent control, and not sell patents to outright GMO using companies.

To sum up, our solution to this kind of government failure is better legislation (as nowadays even the EU countries started developing GMOs) in order to resolve the problem of responsibility.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 1 by Laura-Maria Heikkinen

Tutor: Eeva Korteniemi

What are the main problems in the forest industry?

The forest industry is suffering from deforestation and permanently polluted areas. In some areas the soil contains too much heavy metals that it is impossible to clean it. In our group we came up with one solution to this problem: worms. There had been an article in a newspaper about worms which can clean the soil of heavy metals by eating it.

If cut down there should always be new trees planted. The forest management should be more efficient to control this.

We also discussed about state ownership of forest in the Russian Federation but we did not come to any conclusion whether it is a problem or not.

On Finnish side of the border the swamps should not be dried because they are good storages for carbon dioxide. Dried swamps also produce bad quality trees.

Valuable forest should be preserved and left the way they are.

The governance should be made clear so it could function more efficiently and problems could be solved more easily and not thrown around.

At the moment Finland and other countries are not willing to invest in the Russian forest sector

Also there is a problem with documents. They treat the forest nothing more than a source for the forest industry. Forest is much more than what it could offer for the forest industry.

Illegal loggings should be controlled and within the companies as well, so they would not add to the problem by buying the timber from those loggings.

Report # 1 from group No 2 by Krista Willman

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

Taru Peltola's presentation discussed bioenergy as a challenge for environmental governance. She represented bioenergy as a solution to one environmental problem and a cause for new problems at the same time. In our small group we talked about Taru Peltola's first question in which she asked us to think of examples from other policy fields where environmental governance fails to address solutions to problems and rather give rise to new problems.

First we talked about nuclear power usage instead of fossil fuels in energy production to diminish greenhouse gases as a part of solving the climate change problem. International Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) has mentioned nuclear power in its recent report as one way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We noted, that because of the climate change and IPCC's recommendations to use nuclear power it seems to be much more popular now than a few years ago. We thought that nuclear power is not a very sustainable way to solve climate change because it causes new risks, and also because we need to think about generations to come as well. In addition, building nuclear power plants needs a lot of energy itself. Building those plants gets quite an amount of money too and we thought it would be a more reasonable and sustainable resolution to use that money in developing and building power plants that produce energy from renewable sources.

Secondly we talked about social problem-solving causing an environmental problem or solving an environmental problem causing social problems. For example in Soviet Union they were using rivers near Lake Aral for irrigation to help cultivate corn for citizens to eat. Eventually this attempt to reduce hunger led to a huge environmental problem when the rivers and Lake Aral dried off and the area turned into desert.

Another example we talked about was a factory near Lake Baikal. This paper and pulp factory produced a lot of emissions that polluted the lake. Fixing this environmental problem affected the quality of the products and paper could not be sold any more. In the end they had to close the factory which caused social problems for the area in terms of enormous unemployment rates. The last example we discussed was about a still-ongoing case in Finland about building an artificial lake Vuotos in Lapland to make hydropower. This conversation, or rather a debate, has been going on for decades. Building Vuotos would harm the nature and ecosystems, affecting especially rare birds.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 2 by Krista Willman

Tutor: Alexandra Bagaeva

Task: What are the main problems of the forest sector? How the situation can be improved?

The discussion began with comparing private and state ownership of forest (the examples of Finland and Russia). Conclusion: both state and private ownership have their own advantages and disadvantages. Private owners always take care of what they have, but at the same time most of them are not experts in forestry, that why they can damage the forest because of the lack of knowledge about it.

The main problems of the forest sector:

- Finland: The lack of forest reservations.
- Russia: We export only timber though we could make more profit if we made consumer goods of it (for example, furniture).
- Problem of utilization of waste woods in Russia: we have too much waste woods which are not used, while in Finland it's possible to produce energy from it.
- Lack of monitoring of the implementation of legislation. Illegal forest cutting.

Possible solutions:

- Localization of governance (from federal to local level), because local authorities are more aware of current problems of forest sector on their area of responsibility
- Better implementation of the legislation; fight with corruption.
- Long-term planning: we need to consider long term consequences of our actions.
- Transparent cooperation between Russia and Finland (Russia and EU): science sphere, import of technologies.
- More responsibility for our policy concerning forest sector.

Report of the Group No. 3 by Khramtsova Ksenia

Tutor: Nina Tynkkynen

Task: Give examples from other policy fields where environmental governance fails to address solutions to the problems.

During the group discussion we have come to conclusion that there are many fields and examples when the environmental policy fails, however most of them are concerned with the social sphere. And our group has provided some examples.

When factory is closed just because it doesn't meet ecological standards as a result we get people unemployed, for instance in Romania, Poland (coal factory).

The usage of biodiesel reduces CO₂ emission, but at the same time it creates the other kinds of emission.

The nuclear power is used to prevent climate change, but it isn't applied to all types of energy (it can be applied only in the houses with electricity).

Also there are so called storages of carbon emission, but it doesn't contribute to the reduction of energy consumption – as result there is over consumption. And here the question arises – what will happen if it explores?

The creation of so-called “fake-lakes” (in Norway, China) has serious social consequences – people have to move away from these territories.

Also we have discussed the traffic policy in Finland – the one of possible ways to reduce air pollution is to impose higher taxes on the cars and fuel, but for those, who live in the remote areas it's quite expensive to reach to the center, so ecological policy can also affect the structure of population (possible solution is the differentiation taxes for various regions).

However, There are brilliant examples of solving ecological problems – for instance in Stockholm – those, who want drive in rush hours, have to pay for it, as a result two problems such as traffic jams and air pollution are resolved.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 3 by Maria Pavlova

Tutor: Nina Tynkkynen

Question: What are the main problems of forest sector? How the situation can be improved?

- Private/state ownership

Forestry policy is different in Russia and Northern countries.

Forests can belong to a state or to individuals. In this case, Finland and Russia constitute opposite models. In Finland, there is a system of private ownership. Therefore, people take care of what they possess, they try to make use of forests, make them valuable, keep it functioning. Finns can buy or rent lands with forests.

Russia has great amounts of forests, great potential. But forestry belongs only to the government. This is written in several official documents, and the Constitution – the main legal document. Thus, here, in Russia we can not introduce such kind of ownership, private ownership, because we'll have to change the legislation.

- Regulations

In Finland there are strict regulations on how a person can use the land and what he/she must or must not do with the ground. You can make only certain amounts of cuts and this is highly regulated by the state.

- Transportation

Russia has great amounts of forests, both protective and reserve. But mostly these forests are located in the North-West part of Russia, in Siberia. Thus, the problem of transportation is the crucial one. The state aims at receiving a benefit from forests and wood trade, but it'll cost much to deliver wood from Siberia to the consumer. Moreover, a good and modest system of transportation should be built. This costs a lot also. Forests can not be easily utilized without infrastructure.

- Illegal cuts of forests

We came to the conclusion that if forests are in private sector, the number of illegal cuts will be reduced. People will be more attentive to what they possess, they will take care of forests they possess.

- Reproduction of Forests

Lots of trees are being cut down in Russia these days. But people don't plant new trees. So, in some years this will become the most crucial issue for Russians. We have to keep in mind that we must plant trees as well as cut them down.

How the situation can be improved?

Our generation is in charge of solving all these critical problems. We discussed some measures that could be taken for improving the situation. These proposals are:

- More intensive monitoring
- More strict sanctions against illegal transportation
- Inspect situation on the border to straggle with "wood terror"
- Make efforts to raise consciousness of individuals
- Shift more power from central government to local governments
- Give money/compensations to land owners to stimulate them not to cut trees down and leave them untouched. But the question here arises: Who will pay for this?

Report # 1 of the Group No 4 by Katja Alakerttula

Tutor: Anton Lapshin

Group discussion concerning Taru Peltola's presentation on "Bio energy from forest" and what kind of examples there are when environmental governance fails and new environmental problems emerge.

Our main topic was hydropower and many examples around the world where damns or artificial lakes have caused major environmental and social impacts. For instance in China the big damn project covered with water many villages, forests and consequently it will have more ecological impacts in the future.

Taru Peltola talked about European Union and its new targets concerning bio energy. EU aims to increase hydropower among other things inside the Union. In Finland there have been discussions and even conflicts whether or not to build new artificial lakes in northern Lapland. The main discussion has been around artificial Lake Vuotos, which has been the topic of hydropower ever since the early nineties. Although the Supreme Court decided that it is not only against the Finnish law to build Vuotos but also against EU's nature protection goals, one of the main parties in the government demands that Vuotos should be built in the future. Arguments that our Central party and other actors are using in favour of Vuotos are taken from the EU's targets on bio energy and

combating climate change. The main argument is that Finland can't fulfil our targets of new bio energy unless we build new hydropower and with it wind power. Even though hydropower doesn't cause carbon dioxide emissions, it does produce methane and it always does have ecological, social and economical impact on local level.

Lake Vuotos is a good example of causing new environmental problems when solving another. All in all Vuotos is mainly part of the local politics of the Central party in Finland; although EU's new bio energy targets have given them once more an opportunity to bring hydropower projects back to the political agenda.

Report # 2 of the Group No. 4 by Sami Koivuniemi

Tutor: Anton Lapshin

What are the main current challenges of Russian Forestry?

The group discussed various problems and challenges that are connected to Forestry in Russia. A very important theme in discussion were the environmental problems, but they were seen rather as results and symptoms of malfunctioning system and various challenges, than challenges in themselves. The core challenges identified were divided into three categories: structural, systemic and technological.

Structural Challenges were seen to arise from the forest structure and location: Russia has a lot of forest, but most of this is in remote areas, not easily accessible. E.g. to get wood from some areas in Siberia would be possible only when using a helicopter, since the weather conditions make all means of transport difficult or costly, e.g. building of railroads in the areas of permafrost is not easy. Some areas like NW Russia, the Ural Federal District, Southern Siberia, however, are easily accessible and in these areas forestry is easier. However, there has commonly been overcutting of forests in these areas.

Systemic Challenges were seen to be part of the societal and legal framework. Forests are owned by the state and only rented out to companies for periods of 49 years. Many people view the forests only in the same way as any other natural resources, and there is no private interest in assuring the renewal of the forests that are being used for industry. In the Soviet times the industry was the first priority, and nature was not cared for; this way of thinking has not disappeared. Systemic problems include also corruption, non-implementation of laws and lack of political will. Officials will often overlook damage caused to the environment.

Technological challenges were seen to arise from the state of processes, technology and efficiency. Not all processes are well developed, and only part of the wood collected is used. Technology is sometimes old and not the most efficient; it is also sometimes misused. Efficiency differs a lot when comparing for example Russia and Finland.

Environmental problems were seen as symptoms of a system that is not functioning well. They are arising from several of the listed challenges. Clear-cutting is common in the areas where the forests are easier accessible. Naturally protected areas are established mainly in areas that are inaccessible anyway. Although protection is good, biodiversity will suffer when forests are not protected at all in some regions. Environmental crimes are often not punished for, and this will increase

Further Discussion

It was also discussed, whether forests should be considered as a renewable or non-renewable resource, since they take time to renew and they will not renew if not planted. It was seen as a major problem that forests are being destroyed fast, and also the disappearing of old trees was considered harmful for biodiversity. The ownership issue of forests was discussed as well, since it has been considered that the state-ownership of forests would be harmful in Russia. Some of the Finnish students came from forest-owning families and presented their views how protecting and keeping the forest is important. It was seen that in some countries this works very well. However, it was seen that quick privatization of Russia's forests would not lead into immediate changes in the attitudes concerning how to treat forests, but could be risky as some investors might want to just get all the possible money from the forest immediately.

Suggestions

The group also considered some solutions on how to improve the situation. We make the following suggestions:

- Make a general plan, a Forest Strategy covering all aspects
- Develop technology and co-operate with countries practising forestry in Northern locations, to copy the best practises from them.
- Increase environmental education in all levels of schools, environmental awareness in the society. This could be done partially through the involvement of NGOs.
- Work for implementation of the existing laws, and report misuses. State will benefit on the long run greatly about this.
- Systematic re-plantation of forests in areas where they have been cut.

* * *

6th Day: "On Environmental Governance in the Eurasian North"

Climate Change in the North: Contemporary and Possible Scenarios

by Nikolai Filatov and Larisa Nazarova, Karelian Research Centre

Abstract

The main aim of the present study is to estimate the climate change of the North of Eastern Part of Russia and response of water ecosystems. This study includes analysis of long-term data from multi-year records of basic climatic parameters (air temperature, precipitation, evapotranspiration, index of continentality, river runoff, etc.). Variability of the hydrological regime of individual rivers and lakes, as well as the study area at large related to the regional climate change is presented and discussed. As the result of data analysis of the climate, water balance and water level for water bodies over the period 1880-2007, their noticeable changes were detected. It was found that time series of annual air temperature, precipitation and evapotranspiration over a 120-year period contain significant positive linear trends, and river runoff contains a negative trend for the given period. Considerable climate changes in the region in those years are manifest also in a shorter period of snow cover in the catchments and a longer ice-free period on the lakes. Potential changes (spatial and temporal) in the regional climate and hydrologic regime for the period 2010-2050 were estimated using the results of numerical experiments with the ECHAM4/OPYC3 model and for two IPCC scenarios of the global climate change.

"Corporate Environmental Reporting"

by Alexandra Bagaeva, University of Oulu

6th Day: GROUP REPORTS

Task for Working Groups by Lassi Heininen and Nina Tynkkynen

Role game by several actors and with a problem or event causing environmental damage. Try to have an agreement if all the actors are ready to agree, and even to have a solution if possible.

Report of the Group No 1 by tutor Maria Pitukhina

Topic: Is it possible to reach various actors' agreement on the climate change?

The role-game provided the division of roles among students. Heated debates resulted in no agreement achievement.

Media

The Euronews channel represented media during our round-table negotiations. This channel utilizes environmentally-friendly technologies as well as aimed at running the environmental propaganda (commercials of smart cars, recycling as well as launching new movements in favour of bicycles).

Scientist

Professor from the Climate Research Institute was concentrated on the emissions reduction. He believed that *politicians* should invest more money for the research and environmentally-friendly technologies. Business and NGOs are those societal structures which should be much more involved in environmental agenda.

NGO

This NGO was represented by an anarchist sorority within the Tampere University. Its activity was extremist (for example, they were in favour of border elimination between Russia and Finland). They believed that NGOs should and would replace governments if they can't solve the environmental problems.

Businessman

The representative of Volvo Co was interested in both the production rocketing and environment topic. The environment security issue has always been on Swedish agenda (the Stockholm Conference in 1972, Margaret Walstrom, the EU environment commissioner nowadays etc.). Volvo voted for more efficient vehicles production which would use less fuel.

Citizen

Estonian-Russian citizen also participated in the round-table negotiations. He was very pessimistic and disappointed strongly with the environmental politics (the Baltic Sea pollution) as well as with the latest elections in Estonia and Russia. He believed that a new lobby combined of NGO representatives, scientists, environmentally-friendly businessmen and volunteers is highly necessary.

The European Commission

We invited Margareth Wallström, the EU environment commissioner to come. She was mainly concentrated upon the tools which could affect climate change issues. The main tool in her point of view should be renegotiations of the Kyoto Protocol in December 2009 in Copenhagen.

Politician

A right-wing politician turned to be a nuclear-power supporter, radical enough due to some reasons. The main bullet point he presented was to solve economic crisis and to ensure economic growth, he was not going to pay much attention to environmental agenda. He believed that at the end hi-tech would solve most of the problems in the nearest future.

Civil Servant

Russian civil servant was interested mainly in economic crisis resolving. The issue he was concentrated upon was the Kyoto Protocol renegotiations. He strongly believed that cooperation on environmental agenda with NGO, business, scientific circles as well as neighboring countries is in high demand. He also highlighted the Arctic Region priority of the RF in terms of the climate change which has been stated in the Concept of Foreign Policy of the RF 2008.

In conclusion: no agreement has been reached and it became clear that it can't be partly reached or reached in the nearest future.

Report of the Group No. 2 by tutor Anton Laphsin

Role game “Construction of pulp-and-paper mill in Petrozavodsk”.

1. Participants of the role game and their interests at the start of negotiations:

1. **Businessman (forest industry)** – want to construct the pulp-and-paper mill in Petrozavodsk with old and cheap treatment plants; low level of building and administrative expenses; short time of construction.
2. **Citizens of Petrozavodsk** – work places, high salary, low interest to environment.
3. **Government (Mayor of Petrozavodsk and Head of Republic of Karelia)** – work places and stable social situation in Petrozavodsk and Karelia before new election of Mayor of Petrozavodsk and re-appointment of Head of Republic; tax proceeds from pulp-and-paper mill; small personal financial interest (bribe). Medium-term political and financial interests.
4. **Civil Servant** – very lazy and amotivational person, he have too much to do and needs some financial motivation (bribe) to do his job in time and avoid the official circumlocution.
5. **Researcher** – scientific interests in the field of environment; understand his social responsibility for clean environment.
6. **“Green”NGO activist** - clean environment.
7. **Media (local newspapers and TV-chanel)** – popularity not only on regional, but even on federal and international levels by any ways. Mostly, by means of scandalous news and comments. Money is less important.

2. Negotiations process:

In the beginning, the **Businessman** easily gets the permission from **Government** for construction of pulp-and-paper mill with old and cheap treatment plants. (Because, **Government** needs work places for Petrozavodsk before the new election (re-appointment) ASAP. Also, the **Government and the Civil Servant** gets some bribe.)

The direct talks of **NGO and Researcher** with **Government** about environmental risks from old treatment plants were unsuccessful.

Citizens of Petrozavodsk keep silence.

At the next stage, **NGO and Researcher** start the active PR campaign in **Media (local newspapers and TV-chanel)**. It's a good opportunity for local media to get the popularity on federal and international level.

As a result, **Citizens of Petrozavodsk** have changed their position to environmental risks from old treatment plants. At this stage, they are ready go on strike against process of construction.

As for **Government**, it can't ignore the public indignation before the new election (re-appointment).

In this situation, the **Businessman** had to become aware of his image and financial damages because of inoperative pulp-and-paper mill. After the long negotiations with **NGO and Citizens**, the **Businessman** had to agreed with their point of view. After that, Media have prepared a lot of articles and news about high level of social and environmental responsibility of the **Businessman**.

3. Outcomes for participants:

Businessman – the pulp-and-paper mill in Petrozavodsk with new and expensive treatment plants; heavy expenses, but image of person with high level of social and environmental responsibility.

Citizens of Petrozavodsk – work places, clean environment.

Government – work places, tax proceeds... and keep their bribes.

Civil Servant – prosperity.

Researcher and **“Green”NGO** - clean environment and public support.

Media (local newspapers and TV-channel) – short period of popularity during the negotiations)

4. Conclusions:

- Importance of environmental expertise and wide and open public discussion before the construction of industrial objects. Only open public discussion can demonstrate full spectrum of interests and prevent the corrupted deals between Business and Government.
- NGO, media and researches must play more important role in decision-making process.
- As a most serious problems for public discussion and decision-making process in similar situations, we can define: problem of corruption, official circumlocution, low level of environmental education and public activity among common people.

Report of the Group No. 3 by tutor Andrey Demidov

Participants of the role game:

1. NGO activist
2. Media representative
3. Municipal official
4. Government official
5. EU representative (Commission)
6. Citizen (gypsy entrepreneur)
7. Researcher
8. Businesswoman (car industry)

The problem:

The discussion started around the problem of air pollution. Increased traffic, reduction of number of “green zones” and overall worsening of atmosphere in a big city located several kilometers from the border with a Fenno-Scandian country were taken as central points of departure during the discussion. The problem was narrowly defined as the problem of increased city traffic that badly affects the air in the city.

The researcher revealed the results of the recent survey and research conducted with the purpose to investigate how increased traffic affects the state of health of the city’s inhabitants. The results demonstrate that as a result of constant environmental deterioration people face with increase of number of lung and cardial diseases. Another effect of air pollution is acid rains.

NGO representative highlighted that the underlying problem was “stealing of public space” due to increase of traffic and securing additional space for roads and parking lots which lead to less communication of citizens, decline of social capital and erosion of community. Moreover, scarce public funds are used to sort out traffic problems while they are very much needed for “community rebuilding and restoration”.

These actors came out with an idea of traffic reduction by any possible means. The idea was discussed and all the participants were given a chance of their opinion’s expression. As a results three possible solutions were discussed.

1. Introduction and exploitation of new means of transportation (bypass road/new metro lines)

Pros:

1. need to reduce CO₂ / less air pollution (researcher). New metroline is much more environmentally-friendly solution than new bypass road
2. public space/community/ (NGO)
3. new jobs (construction of new roads and metro lines will creat jobs)
4. cheaper (EU is ready to support the project of new bicycle roads building)

Contras:

1. Economic crisis requires that jobs are kept. Traffic reduction will lead to decline of car industry while it needs state support and state should revitalize it (business)
2. New metro would damage ecosystem too (politician)
3. Money shortage. Municipal budget has already been planned for other problems solving. Bicycles are not that popular and will not solve the problem (civil servant)
4. This will kill individual entrepreneurs whose families depend on cars they use (mainly as illegal taxis). Unemployment is not seen as smth which is the most coveted thing against the backdrop of economic crisis (citizen).
5. metro will cause crowds of people which is sometimes unsafe (citizen, researcher)
6. construction itself is costly

Politician demonstrated less enthusiasm about the discussion since the topic touched upon problems of a concrete city. The media representative chose a position of a neutral observer who posed questions to participants rather than expressed own opinion on the problem.

2. Development and usage of new technologies (new types of fuel, new buses, natural gas, electric cars)

Pros:

1. less pollution/ better air quality
2. boom in Hitech industry that will give an impulse to economy (politician)
3. car industry will not face with massive stuff reduction and costs. New Hitech products will regalvanize its functioning (businesswoman)
4. new jobs
5. this will be beneficial for research institutions (researcher)
6. this will allow to keep the tariffs low (civil servant)

Contras:

1. investments under question (EU is not ready to support projects of this kind)
2. cars are cheaper and citizens prefer cars due to simple rationality (citizen)
3. electric cars life expectancy? (citizen)
4. technology requires time to develop (businesswoman)
5. technologies cant reduce air pollution for 100% (NGO)
6. quality of fuel? (researcher)

3. alternative ways (limit access to the city)

Pros:

1. this will keep tariffs at the certain level and will support public transport (civil servant)
2. this will "support" citizens' entrepreneurship (citizen)

Contras:

1. reduction of pollution is doubtful (researcher, politician, NGO)
2. business downturn (businesswoman)
3. need of more investments into public transport (politician)
4. limit of personal freedom (NGO)

Report of the Group No. 4 by tutor Eeva Kortenieniemi

Group number 4 decided to simulate the situation in the meeting of possible Nord Stream project actors. In this role play actors from different countries and sectors were represented.

Roles were as follows:

Germany (state): Germany is for the project, because it wants to ensure gas and oil supplies from Russia.

Russia (state): Russia is for the project, because it wants to have alternative energy and gas routes to Europe.

Nord Stream (company): Nord Stream company is definitely for the project.

European Union (representative from commission): EU is also for the project, because it wants to enhance further the energy dialogue with Russia.

Finland (state): Finland is quite neutral actor; not against the project, but not for the project.

Finnish media: Finnish media is an external controller of the meeting, without a personal opinion of the project.

Greenpeace (NGO): Greenpeace is definitely against the project, which will harm the nature and Baltic Sea, which is already very vulnerable.

Scientist: Scientist, who has carried out the environmental assessment of the project, is totally against the building of the pipeline to the bottom of the sea.

Estonian fisherman (citizen): Estonian fisherman is against the project: according to his opinion it will have a negative impact to his occupation.

No doubt, there was a huge discussion on the topic: should the project be accomplished and the constructions of the pipeline to be started or not. There were plenty of arguments for the start-up of the constructions, and plenty of arguments for the postponing and giving up the project. Unfortunately, the final decision and the consensus were not met in this meeting. However, participants will continue the dialogue, and they will soon have a new meeting.

Power Point Presentations - Links

DAY I

Lassi Heininen - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Heininen.pdf> (103,7 Kb)

Dmitri Lanko - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Lanko.pdf> (71,1 Kb)

DAY II

Bjorn Gunnarsson - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Gunnarsson.pdf> (9,1 Mb)

DAY IV

Anna Kuhmonen - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Kuhmonen.pdf> (1,2 Mb)

Nina Tynkkynen - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Tynkkynen.pdf> (169,6 Kb)

DAY V

Taru Peltola - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Peltola.pdf> (2,3 Mb)

Lyudmila Ivamova - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Ivanova.pdf> (6,5 Mb)

DAY VI

Nikolay Filatov and Larisa Nazarova -

<http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Nazarova%20and%20Filatov.pdf> (2,5 Mb)

Alexandra Bagaeva - <http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/ISSK'09/Bagaeva.pdf> (861,2 Kb)

Other

Text about ISSK at PetrSu website: http://petsu.ru/Faculties/Politology/int_sum_sch.html

Text about ISSK at University of Lapland website: <http://ulapland.fi/studies>

Text about ISSK 2009 at RES website:

http://www.res.is/is/news/res_at_the_international_summer_school_in_russia/

Appendix

About the International Summer School in Karelia

The International Summer School in Karelia (ISSK) is a great meeting-point for Russian and Nordic university students with focus on European, Russian and Northern studies. Since the initial Summer School in 2003 the ISSK's goal has been to bring together a modest amount of master's degree students (25-30) for one week at Petrozavodsk State University (PetrSU) in Petrozavodsk, Russia, to further increase their knowledge of Nordic-Russian policies and cooperation, and promote dialog and discussion.

Among the many prior study themes of ISSK are: Geopolitics, Security, Eurasia, The Northern Cooperation, and Energy. Coming now into its 6th year of existence in 2009, the ISSK'09 is expanding its scope, vision and geography to include larger audience of students and provide them with a more diversified academic, professional and social learning experience.

The Organizing Committee for the ISSK consists of representatives of all the partner institutions involved in the program. Dr. Lassi Heininen, University of Lapland, is the Director of ISSK.

The ISSK'09 is organized by Petrozavodsk State University (Russia); Aleksanteri Institute at the University of Helsinki, University of Joensuu, University of Lapland and University of Tampere (Finland); and RES - School for Renewable Energy Science (Iceland).

The ISSK in 2010

The International Summer School in Karelia 2010, ISSK'10 will be organized in Petrozavodsk, Republic of Karelia in May 10th – 16th 2010 as a joint summer school in cooperation with the Finnish-Russian Cross-Border University, CBU's, International Relations M.A. Degree Programme. The main theme will be "Changing Geopolitics and International Relations in the North".

Contact Information for ISSK

For additional information about the International Summer School in general or particularly dealing with ISSK'10 please contact with Gleb Yarovoy, Coordinator of the ISSK (e-mail: [gleb.yarovoy \(at\) mail.ru](mailto:gleb.yarovoy@mail.ru)).

You can also contact with other members of the ISSK Organizing Committee – the members are:

Lassi Heininen, Docent, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lapland, Finland ([lassi.heininen \(at\) ulapland.fi](mailto:lassi.heininen@ulapland.fi));

Tapani Kaakkuriniemi, Director, Master's Programme ([tapani.kaakkuriniemi \(at\) helsinki.fi](mailto:tapani.kaakkuriniemi@helsinki.fi)) and Eeva Kortenien, Tempus Project ([eeva.kortenien \(at\) helsinki.fi](mailto:eeva.kortenien@helsinki.fi)), both at Aleksanteri Institute, University of Helsinki, Finland;

Nina Tynkkynen, Senior Assistant, Department of Environmental Politics, University of Tampere, Finland ([nina.tynkkynen \(at\) uta.fi](mailto:nina.tynkkynen@uta.fi));

Joni Virkkunen, Researcher, Karelian Institute, University of Joensuu ([joni.virkkunen \(at\) joensuu.fi](mailto:joni.virkkunen@joensuu.fi));

Gleb Yarovoy, Lecturer, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, Petrozavodsk State University, Russia ([gleb.yarovoy \(at\) mail.ru](mailto:gleb.yarovoy@mail.ru)).

The Program of the ISSK'09

1st Day: "What is International Environmental Politics all about?"

Lassi Heininen (Finland): "Politicization of the Environment and International Environmental Politics as a part of IR and Foreign Policy"

Dmitry Lanko (Russia): "EU Environmental Politics"

2nd Day: "Climate Change and Energy Redefining/Challenging International Environmental Politics"

Björn Gunnarsson (Iceland): "Energy and Climate Change"

Vladimir Lukanin (Russia): "Climate Change in the North"

3rd Day: Excursion around Petrozavodsk

4th day: "EU's and Russian Environmental Policies and Politics - EU/Nordic/Russian Cooperation on Environmental Protection and Management"

Nina Tynkkynen (Finland): "Finnish/EU-Russian Environmental Cooperation and ND Environmental Partnership"

Anna Kuhmonen (Finland): "Finnish-Russian Neighbouring area cooperation with Russian environmental NGOs"

5th Day: "Forestry and Forest Management as a Case Study in Environmental Policy"

Taru Peltola (Finland): "Bioenergy from forest: a wicked case of environmental policy?"

Ludmila Ivanova (Russia): "Forestry Management and Policy in North-West Russia"

6th Day: "On Environmental Governance in the Eurasian North"

Nikolai Filatov and Larisa Nazarova (Russia): "Climate Change in the North: Contemporary and Possible Scenarios"

Alexandra Bagaeva (Finland): "Corporate Environmental Reporting"