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The Case for Arctic Cooperation & Governance

• Need to ensure security and stability in the Circumpolar region;
• To cope with the challenges of climate change;
• To control conflicts arising from competing goals and enforce shared interests;
• To prevent the appearance of negative global developments in the Arctic and to curb the release of regional trends on the global geostrategic tableau.
The Arctic

Definition of Arctic:

- Areas north of 66° 33′
- Areas north of forest line & 10° degree July Isotherm;
- Human Development Index area marked on map by red Line;
- Territory (land- & sea) of the 8 Arctic States: Canada, Denmark w. Faroer and Greenland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and U.S.A.
Arctic Puzzle: How to Strengthen Governance without Circumscribing Arctic Nation’s Sovereignty?

• What is Governance? How to govern a “frozen desert” without a state or political hierarchy? (Bötzel/Risse, 2010)
• Governance = institutionalized modes of social/political coordination to produce and implement collectively binding rules or collective goods;
• Governance structures are made up by configurations of state and non-state actors;
• Governance process consists of modes of social/political coordination by which actors engage in rule making & implementation and the provision of collective goods;
• Non-hierarchical coordination is based on voluntary commitments and compliance. Conflicts are solved by negotiations leading to compromise & mutual concessions.
Climate Challenges as a Starting Point

- Climate change is a catalyst for new governance structures is, it has a big impact on societies and the environment:
  - enhances access to natural resources (oil, gas, metals);
  - risks oil spills, damage to natural habitats, harm to traditional societies;
  - brings danger of over-fishing, unregulated industrial fishing, whale and seal hunting;
  - worsens conflicts on sea borders, rights of passage, claims for submerged ridges (Lomonosov Ridge);
- Climate change can destabilize post-Cold War resource & power balance and -> lead to a “battle for the pole”;
- Currently, however, the Arctic is a peaceful region;
- In the Arctic, “security” mostly refers to “soft security”;
- To safeguard security and stability in the region, states use both national strategies & multilateral governance structures.
Environmental Hazards: Russian oil platform sinks (Sachalin), Alaska well blow-up + grounding of oil rig (2012)
Competing Arctic States’ National Strategies in the Region

- Canada: sovereignty and security, insistence on NWP as internal passage, coastal shelf conflict with US, Dk, Ru;
- Denmark: defense of Greenland, freedom of Northern seaways, claims on Hans I. (Cn), & Lomonossow Ridge (Ru);
- Iceland: freedom of surrounding seaways;
- Norway: economic & social development of High North, exploitation of hydrogen resources, protection of national security and fragile ecosystems, détente with Russia;
- Russia: economic development of Northern Siberia, NSW as internal passage, claim for coastal shelf extending to North Pole;
- USA: freedom of the seas, security for Alaska from hostile incursions, exploitation of gas/oil resources (land and sea).
Arctic Multilateral Governance Structures

- Reflect Arctic puzzle regarding ambivalence between multilateral and national priorities;
- Respond with a network of legal (UNCLOS), political (AC, BEAC), ecological (AEPS) and maritime institutions (IMO);
- Most important legal institution: Law of the Sea Treaty (UNCLOS), political institution: Arctic Council (AC);
- Processes of confidence building, information exchange, cooperative research, negotiations & institution building;
- Results are joint strategies on environmental protection, sustainable development, safe resource exploitation, hazard-less navigation.
[The Evolution of the Arctic Council]

• 1996: eight Arctic nations establish Council as high-level forum for implementing AEPS; set up WGs to provide scientific answers to region’s challenges; invite permanent observers from indigenous peoples, interested non-Arctic states and institutions; Senior Arctic Officials (SAO) prepare bi-annual reports to Ministers + coordinate follow-up;

- 1\textsuperscript{st} phase sees Arctic as “frozen desert”, basically focused on Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy implementation;

- 2\textsuperscript{nd} phase: change of concepts, with Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) the new metaphor is “Arctic in change”; out of concern about sea shelf allocation five Arctic Coastal States in 2008 meet in Ilulissat, protests from “left outs”;

- 3\textsuperscript{rd} phase: 2011 Nuuk Ministerial members conclude S&R Treaty, establish perm. secretariat, appoint Magnus Johannesson (IS) as Secretary and vow to strengthen AC.
Arctic Governance Achievements

• Today the Arctic Council is a prominent and visible Arctic actor, but has still weak governance functions;
• Success of Governance due to strict observance of fine line between joint action and respect for Arctic states’ sovereignty;
• Biggest achievement has been the development of strategies to protect the endangered Arctic natural habitat;
• Establishment of jointly funded Arctic Secretariat and nomination of General Secretary, gives AC work more permanence;
• Conclusion of binding international agreements: AEPS (1992), S&R Treaty (2011), Guidance on safe oil & gas exploitation;
• Conflict resolution by reference to UNCLOS and through negotiations, results are compromises or mutual concessions;
• IMO created a set of maritime conventions: Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), but need to adopt mandatory polar code to end fragmentation;
• Emergence of new regional (BEAC) and functional institutions (Coast Guard Forum).
Indigenous Peoples of the North
Arctic Governance Deficits

- AC has decision-shaping, not –taking function, weak governance;
- Lack of crisis response mechanisms & of instruments for implementing consensus decisions/recommendations;
- Limited agenda: (military) security, shipping, oil & gas, living marine resources, & tourism are not dealt w. in gov. structures;
- Inclusion or exclusion of Non-Arctic states in AC? Unclear status of Permanent Observers, selected according to their research achievements + financial contributions;
- Continuing debate on AC role, reach and observers;
- Indigenous representatives no equal partners, weak role of Indigenous Peoples’ Secretariat, Russia prosecuting RAIPON;
- Linkage between state and indigenous peoples’ level but not with other sub-state entities (e.g. provinces);
- Non-mandatory recommendations instead of binding agreements;
- Shortage of funds for Arctic work program and research;
- Little institutionalized cooperation between Arctic organizations.
Conclusions

• Is there a solution for the Arctic Puzzle?
• Impact of governance helps strengthen and expand Arctic network of institutions, invigorates links between them; empowers AC to take binding decisions;
• Governance improves communication, exchange of information on and transparency of Arctic activities;
• Follows a pragmatic governance approach, blending multilateral procedures with respect for Arctic states national interests;
• National approaches should strengthen multilateral structures, joint institutions offer a bonus for compliance such as secure access to resources, financial & technological support;
• Prepares for fundamental geopolitical changes in the Arctic with new political actors (EU, China)? But will old strategies continue to work?
Thank you for your attention!