

NGOS IN THE ARCTIC REGION: OPPORTUNITIES AND RANGES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JOINT GOVERNANCE CONCEPT

Статья посвящена анализу деятельности неправительственных организаций Арктического региона в контексте перспектив реализации концепции совместного управления. Экологические проблемы региона и сложность освоения его природных ресурсов требуют максимально широкого сотрудничества на всех уровнях – от межгосударственного до регионального и местного, с привлечением всех заинтересованных сторон: бизнеса, местных органов власти и гражданского общества. Автор оценивает достижения и трудности этого процесса. Учитывая деятельность НПО различного уровня и степень их влияния, автор приходит к выводу, что в институциональных, международно-правовых и национально-правовых параметрах существуют определенные проблемы, препятствующие реализации концепции совместного управления. Особое внимание уделяется как концептуальным, так и политическим позициям Российской Федерации в отношении идеи совместного управления территориями.

Ключевые слова:

Арктика, Арктический Совет, глобальное управление, неправительственные организации.

Stetsko E.V. NGOs in the Arctic region: Opportunities and ranges of implementation of the joint governance concept // Общество. Среда. Развитие. – 2017, № 4. – С. 53–61.

© Stetsko Elena V. – Ph.D in philosophy, associate Professor, St. Petersburg state university, St. Petersburg; e-mail: ali1814@yandex.ru

The emergence and expansion of new actors in world politics in the twentieth century encouraged the transformation of the world political system from a hierarchical form of organization and governance to a decentralized system with a horizontal and networked nature. In addition to the significant role of intergovernmental institutions, which no one disputes, non-state actors, in particular non-governmental (non-profit) organizations, are beginning to play an important role in the process of political decision-making. In addition, the role of business structures and local administrative structures (municipalities) has essentially increased. The reason for these trends lies in two groups of factors that developed in the last decade. The first is increased self-awareness and activeness of civil society and the second is the inability of modern states to consider and satisfy all the needs of its population using centralized methods of control, long-term processes of decision-making, and a primitive system of reward-punishment. For prevention of a social conflict and the development of cooperation, the modern state must develop a new model of governance where there is engagement of individuals (businessmen, experts) and public organizations.

This so-called 'model of co-governance' has emerged, with its main task being 'the transformation of internal and external relationships of traditional government based on the use of communication networks with the aim of optimizing the providing of services to citizens

and business; moreover, the expansion of citizen participation, including the participation of public and private actors in administrative processes and the overall governance of the country' [3, p. 64]. The most relevant social goals are achieved in cooperation with private and public organizations. The process of co-governance involves and simultaneously stimulates the decentralization of power, increasing the role of consultative and advisory practice, a variety of actors interested in public discourse.

The purpose of this article is to examine the possibilities and limits of participation of non-governmental organizations in dealing with Arctic issues, discuss possible options for activities in the region, and provide for the existence and development of mechanisms for co-governance. The structure of the Arctic Council shows us that there are conditions for the development of the co-governance. The structure of the Arctic Council includes the Arctic States, non-governmental organizations, representatives of business, and all interested non-Arctic countries and organizations that have permanent observer status.

The Arctic can be regarded as a unique project for the implementation of the system of co-governance on the regional and international scale. The acuteness of environmental problems, the survival of indigenous peoples and the difficulty of industrial development are real prerequisites for international cooperation. However, the degree of legitimacy and legal responsibilities of the Arctic Council as a

54 | forum and not an intergovernmental organization raise the question of the binding nature of decisions, about really effective forms of cooperation and, ultimately, about the common understanding of the concept of co-governance, if it is possible.

In this article the author highlights the successes and challenges of NGOs that work on Arctic issues, but which have different statuses in the Arctic Council: permanent members, observers and non-member stakeholders. Non-governmental organizations of indigenous peoples are a problematic entity with regards to co-governance, and resolving their role depends on the implementation of relevant binding international programs. The most active are NGO-observers, which are large and experienced enterprises with significant expertise, financial resources and influence. Others NGOs are local that work on special programs for their countries. The interaction of all these types of NGOs on specific issues is an example of co-governance already in place on the level of civil society. Although we already have experience in this field, but the ubiquitous nature he has not.

A few important elements in the development of the concept of co-governance are the following initiatives: the creation of the Arctic Economic Council, consisting of representatives of business; and possibly – in the long term – the strengthening of the Northern Forum as an organization of governors and other officials of the Arctic region.

In our opinion, there are two obstacles for the implementation of the ‘local government – business – civil society’ chain: the dominance of the government approach; and differences in the understanding of the concept of co-governance. Special attention will be paid in this context to the position of the Russian Federation and its legislation.

This research is based mainly on official sources: programs of international non-governmental organizations, UN and the Arctic Council documents, legislative acts of the Russian Federation, expert materials etc.

The methodological basis of this paper are the concept of co-governance, as well as classical and contemporary concepts of civil society – from Antiquity to Postmodernism. Comparing the concepts of governance and co-governance, the authors use a systematic approach in political studies, developed by T. Parsons, D. Easton and G. Almond.

Considering the co-governance concept in the Arctic region, it is important to analyze the activities of NGOs who are keenly interested in taking into account specific target groups’ interests and civil society in general.

As a matter of law, the need for the non-state actors’ involvement was recurrently admitted as a key element in sustainable development. Thus, for example, in the report ‘Our common future’ it was mentioned that the participation of non-governmental organizations and the public is a necessary condition of successful work of the World Commission on environment and development that was created in 1983 [15]. The Aarhus Convention on access to environmental information also points to the need for public participation in the decision-making process concerning the environmental issues [10].

NGO-permanent members of the AC: the need for participation and effectiveness

All NGOs, to an extent engaged in the system of society-power-business in the Arctic region, can be divided into four groups: permanent members of the Arctic Council; observers in the Arctic Council; dynamically participating in addressing the region’s problems, but having a permanent observer status in the AC; separate civil initiatives.

The first three groups establish the agenda for civil participation, and the fourth one represents temporary activists.

The permanent members of the Arctic Council are:

1. The Atabask Arctic Council (AAC);
2. The Aleut International Association (AIA);
3. The Guichin Council International (GCI);
4. The Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC);
5. Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East (RAIPON);
6. The Saami Council (SC).

These organizations represent the indigenous peoples of the Arctic region. Along with the Arctic states’ governments, a privileged legal status of the permanent members determines their right to draw up the agenda or, at least, affect it. So, for instance, on May 17th, 2004 the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which is crucial to environmental security, was enacted. The Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC) took part in its preparation [14]. However, admittedly, the capacities of these organizations are confined by a range of circumstances. Firstly, all these organizations were established relatively recently, the majority – after 1996, i.e. following the Arctic Council’s emergence. It means that the non-governmental organizations of the indigenous peoples have fairly limited experience in international activity and struggle for their rights. Secondly, the paucity of indigenous peoples, the particular traits of their economic activity, concomitant social issues, and dependence

on foreign finance sources (predominantly state funds) makes participation of the indigenous peoples NGOs in Arctic co-governance sufficient for understanding of the problem, but insufficient for its solution. Indeed, a fair co-governance system in the Arctic cannot be built up without involvement of these peoples. The institutional status of these NGOs and permanent membership in the AC attaches legitimacy to the Arctic Council itself. However, specific decisions still hinge upon the political will of states and local authorities, as well as on the readiness of business for social partnership with the indigenous peoples communities.

Among the problems of the development of the peoples of the North there are important issues of local self-governance. These issues are likely to define the participation of the indigenous peoples in the process of political decision-making in the Arctic region. Self-governance may be regulated not only by the state (the idea maintained by the majority of experts) but also by non-state, formal (legal and institutional) and informal actors. This self-governance includes both modern and traditional forms. In modern conditions the people of the North have preserved many traditional forms of self-governance. They exist at the level of tribal communities (i.e. small groups of relatives), at the level of clan connections, and at the level of collections of respected informal leaders.

According to the Russian scholar Popkov [7], the problems in the development of national policy framework on issues of indigenous peoples of the North in the Russian Federation are a reflection of a general crisis of views on the development and solution of the problems of indigenous peoples. The main features that characterize this crisis are as follows:

- The authors of numerous concepts of the development of indigenous peoples are not from these indigenous communities, but are mainly from external expert communities;
- Indigenous peoples are commonly perceived as a homogeneous enlarged object of governance influence;
- The main emphasis in these concepts is on some external sources of development, on the creation of some material objects (building of housing, schools, hardware installation, creating of objects of energy supply, etc.);
- The approach does not encourage actualization of positive scenarios of the development of indigenous peoples [7].

In modern conditions it is necessary to implement a new conceptual approach. Its essence should be to create a system that will pay attention to the socio-cultural potential of indigenous people and the mechanism of its involvement in the process of modern development.

In our opinion, the development of self-governance of indigenous peoples and the participation of some major NGOs – permanent members of the Arctic Council in the activities of this organization, are complementary processes with the aim of helping indigenous peoples not only constitute a necessary component of the Arctic cultural identity and heritage, but also to become real political players. Unlike the NGO-permanent members that represent the so-called Arctic ‘ground’, NGO observers implement in its activities, certain social technologies.

The Arctic Economic Council has become a noteworthy element in the participation model of the region, encompassing all parties concerned. The unique status of this organization, along with ample opportunities for actor participation, make it possible to consider the organization a center for accommodation of interests between the business communities, power authorities and civil society existing inside the Arctic Council and, at the same time, independent of it.

The AEC’s emergence has been induced by a lack of mechanisms which would draw business communities into the region. The AEC was initiated by Canada during its presidency in the AC (2013–2015). For the first time, the issue of setting up such an entity was raised at the session of the Arctic Council held in Kiruna (Sweden) in May 2013, whereby the ministers signed the Declaration of Kiruna. It declared that “economic activity in the Arctic is an integral part of sustainable development of the indigenous peoples and communities” [11]. They also agreed upon setting up the task force in the context of the Sustainable Development Working Group in the Arctic region, which would facilitate hold in the Circumpolar Business-Forum (TFCBF). Canada, Finland, Iceland and Russia became countries, co-presiding over the task force, which conducts the Circumpolar Business-Forum.

The subsequent sessions of the task force took place in Reykjavik, St. Petersburg and Helsinki. In the course of discussions, the AEC’s complete independence from the Arctic Council came up on the agenda. However, in the end it was decided that the organization would be autonomous, but open to monitoring by the AC member-states and permanent members.

In December 2013, the task force suggested a new name for the Circumpolar business-forum, which was approved by senior officials from the Arctic Council in January 2014 [11]. The constitutional conference was held in September 2014 in Iqaluit (Canada). On the

56 Russian side, the representatives from Russia's Chamber of Commerce and Industry, OJSC "Rosneft" and OJSC "Sovcomflot" were added to the board.

At the constitutional meeting, both representatives and organizations of the polar nations, acting on behalf of the Northern indigenous peoples (the Athabasca Arctic Council, the Aleut International Association, the Inuit Circumpolar Council, the Guichin International Council and others), were present. Their engagement can be explained by the top-priority social-economic tasks assigned to the newly-established organization, which cover the contributions and influence of traditional indigenous industries and account for their interests in the development of the Arctic region [4, p. 61–62].

Within the documentary framework, concluded in September 2014, creation of working groups in six sectors was planned:

- infrastructure (marine, aviation, information and communication technologies);
- power generation and renewable energy sources;
- mining industry;
- tourism;
- fishery;
- investment in human capital development.

The AEC task forces are formed upon the board members' suggestions. The task force participants are assigned over the course of discussions inside the Arctic Economic Council and are affirmed by the executive committee. Outside participants may be drawn in for the objectives' fulfillment.

An indicative case took place in April 2015, when the American representative Tara Sweeney (the Inuit Circumpolar council and the "Alaska Slope Regional Corp.") was elected the AEC Chairwoman until 2017, having thus replaced Tom Paddon. As the Russian observer Medvedev D.A. notes, contrary to her predecessor, formally, Tara Sweeney does not belong to any polar nation, combining work in the Inuit international organization with performing administrative duties in their business-community. The very fact that the representative of the non-governmental organization became the chairperson of the executive committee may herald ever wider independence of the AEC on the Arctic Council [4, p. 64–65].

Still, in spring 2015 Tara Sweeney as the chair-person of the AEC executive committee called for adjusting activity by the Arctic Economic Council to the priorities of the American Programme of the Arctic Council as of 2015–2017 [3, p. 65].

NGOs – observers as conductors of modern social technologies.

The observers in the Arctic Council are: Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), Arctic Institute of North America (AINA) – Formerly Arctic Cultural Gateway (ACG), Association of World Reindeer Herders (AWRH), Circumpolar Conservation Union (CCU) etc.

Having scrutinized the goals, tasks and activity of these organizations, several conclusions regarding their engagement in the co-governance system can be made. The NGOs constituting the AC as observers are quite large and influential entities, mirroring interests of various communities within the region. Every organization has established relationships with local authorities and business-communities. The partnership vectors in co-governance stem from those realms of activity where the NGOs are traditionally strong: environment and cultural heritage protection, education, and public health care, rights of the indigenous peoples, monitoring of working legislation and local authorities.

Viable opportunities for participation of these organizations in joint administration are preconditioned by the following factors:

- extensive international exposure;
- lofty educational, scientific and social status of representatives from these entities;
- establishment of the top-performing network structures;
- complementary programmes;
- state backing along within dependence in stipulating the agenda (among the majority of them).

The NGO-observers, in our opinion, showcase a successful model of civil society in joint governance of the region, whereby representation of a multitude of social layers (from the reindeer-herders and academicians – to governors and lords) is used to tackle various issues, and cohesion and a high level of expert consultation is demonstrated.

As such, for instance, the 'observers' are currently represented by two quite influential NGOs on the global scale – Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) and the World Wide Fund for Nature-Global Arctic Program. Their activity encompasses all regions of the globe, and they are financially independent, donate funds to the cause, and their recommendations are included into the agenda of numerous international organizations.

The WWF is the only NGO in the world to channel efforts into wild life protection of the 8 Arctic countries via the national affiliates of the Fund in the USA, Canada, Norway, Denmark (Greenland), Finland, Sweden, Russia and the Icelandic Wildlife Protection Association.

The WWF Arctic Programme consists of two constituents. The first one – the Coordinating core of the Arctic programme – has ten functionaries, who work in the headquarters in Ottawa (Canada), Oslo (Norway), Gland (Switzerland) and in Moscow. They pinpoint areas of interest and run implementation of the WWF overall Arctic strategy. The second component is represented by 50 employees working in national affiliates across the ten countries. The WWF annual total budget amounts to 7–8 million euro [9].

The WWF Arctic Programme has been performing for more than twenty years. The current convention on polar bear protection was prepared by the WWF even back in the early 1970's. The WWF dynamically carries out plans for the protection of polar bears, including via support measures for national plan implementation aimed at protection of the species, scientific research, and mitigation of conflicts between humans and bears. Some other tasks are:

- creation of conservation areas system across the whole Arctic, especially in Russia;
- removal of threats emanating from oil and gas exploration and production;
- mitigation of adverse impact from maritime traffic in the Arctic;
- fishery in the Arctic seas;
- awareness-building efforts (publications, collaboration with mass media and public community) [18].

The Fund's attitude to oil and gas fields development in the Arctic, maritime shipping and fishery appears to be extraordinary meaningful. Precisely these spheres are lucrative for the Arctic and other nations. And here, the experts' input to the Fund has been playing quite a prominent role in the sustainability rate of economic projects.

For instance, the WWF believes that it is too soon to speak of new wide-scale development of the oil and gas fields in the Arctic shelf area. Furthermore, experts underscore that there are certain districts in the Arctic where by no means should oil and gas be extracted, since they are so environmentally-valuable (the Lafontaine Isles area, the Bay of Bristol, segments of the Kara and Barents seas area, the West-Kamchatka shelf). And states should work not only on highlighting such areas, but also conferring a special status to them, which would defend them and bring economic activity under regulation [9].

Regarding maritime shipping, the WWF reasons that elaboration of a legally-binding Polar Code is indispensable. It is still being drawn up by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). It is expected to regulate

water borne traffic on the level of the very large cargo carriers in the polar areas of the world – the Arctic and Antarctic. The Polar Code is to come into force in January 2017 [6].

Major efforts on the certification of sustainable fishery in the Barents and Bering Seas in compliance with the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) standards have been set into motion. In Russia's segment of the Barents Sea, 30% of the cod fishing industry has been certified under MSC standards, and another 20% is currently being tailored to certification. In Kamchatka, the salmon fishing industry is being certified [9].

Implementation of the idea of education for the region via the "University of the Arctic" (UArctic) seems to have great prospects, as it encompasses universities, colleges, scientific research institutes and other organizations of the AC member-states, which deal with education matters.

Major contributions to the development of circumpolar medicine have been made by the International Union of Circumpolar Healthcare (IUCH). It is one of the few international medical (non-governmental) organizations to tackle healthcare issues among the indigenous population, cure typical diseases and render their necessary preventive care. The Union also plays its role in improving living standards for other population groups and supports scientific research in this field, ultimately fostering a more favorable environment for development in the region.

The issues of sustainable development and living standard improvement of the indigenous peoples are worked out by almost all organizations-observers in the AC. But two of them should be underscored particularly. These are the Northern Forum (NF) and the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA). In the Northern Forum, representation of indigenous peoples, except for a series of Russian regions-members, is minor, but all regions of the North are represented there (other organizations pale in comparison to their representation). The NF Activity is focused on certain practical affairs in the region, and that is why membership in this organization is on the level of governors, municipal entities heads, private companies and non-governmental organizations. Although this organization does not make any serious foreign policy missions, it features a showcase of joint governance at the level of commercial entities, which impact on the process of solution-finding of specific problems. The decision to include four new subjects of Russia (Krasnoyarsk region, Magadan area, Primorskiy region and Nenets autonomous area) into the

58 Northern Forum was adopted at the General Assembly of the Northern Forum, which was held in Yakutsk on November 4–6, 2015. The partnership of the Northern Forum can be an engine for the development of business in regions that attract investments.

In January 2016 the International Organization of the Northern regions Governors “the Northern Forum” held a round table discussion entitled “the Role of regional governments and local communities in sustainable development of the Arctic” in the context of the international forum “Arctic Frontiers-2016” in Tromsø, Norway. “Arctic Frontiers” is a major annual conference dedicated to a wide range of issues on Arctic development, where politicians, scientists, business people, and public communities participate [12].

Roundtable participants agreed that there was a lack of a regional dimension in Arctic cooperation. It was necessary to create a mechanism through which the Northern Forum, which had had observer status in the Arctic Council, and regional governments, could participate in decisions shaping the development of the Arctic and implementation of the Arctic policy. There were ideas about the need to unite for greater representation of the northern regions of the Northern Forum, and how to develop active projects and present solutions for common challenges through the exchange of experiences and best practices. To achieve this, it is necessary to improve the organizational pattern of the Northern Forum. It was decided to establish a small task force of experts, which would develop a concept of strategic development of the Northern Forum [12].

From our view point, issues pertaining to cooperation by the regions of the Arctic countries within the current political context appear to be the most relevant, and in the long-run, the most effective. This has been caused by the overall deterioration of relations between Russia and Western countries over the last two years. This tension set a mood where reciprocal grievances were filed on the interstate level, thereby inhibiting cooperation and limiting compromise solutions and trade-offs, whereby national interests of certain countries are affected. Nevertheless, such problems can be overcome, and an awareness of the importance of making decisions is clear. Closer cooperation between not only heads of regions, but also ministerial officials, business communities and public sphere in the Sub-Arctic regions will contribute to finding new common platforms, especially in the environmental policy sphere, protection of rights of the indigenous peoples, and social infrastructure development.

For Russia’s side, challenges which might obstruct cooperation, stem, in our opinion, firstly, from financial-economic hardships in the regions, which, in their turn, emanate from the economic crisis, and, secondly, from adjusting the theoretically rising status of Russia’s Sub-Arctic regions within international organizations (e.g., the Arctic Council) with constitutional law and the Federal treaty of the Russian Federation.

Incontestably, rights of the NGO-observers are restricted by their status. However, the capabilities of the AC activity monitoring system, the submission of recommendations to various governments, and publicity generated by the AC itself testifies to the tangible contribution of these non-governmental actors to co-governance of the Arctic region. These real contributions were made thanks to the NGOs scrutinizing crucial issues of the Arctic region and adding up and working out the agenda for the permanent AC-members. Thus, having assumed part of the critical work load, they proved their relevance and the right to participate in co-governance in the AC format.

Shortcomings of these NGOs’ contribution to co-governance, from our viewpoint, are particularly felt in insufficient effectiveness of their cooperation with power and business locally. At the local level, establishment of long-term partnerships entails financing (alternatively, state order), and this is an obstacle both to the NGOs as well as small and medium-sized enterprises. Large-scale and influential NGOs are quite self-sufficient and occupy primarily an expert niche, although this activity is also important and necessary. Their sway or sway on authorities in power is considerable, but is far from being absolute.

The role of other regional NGOs

The NGOs, dynamically solving regional issues, but not having observer status in the AC, belong to the third group. These entities exert, incontestably, less impact on foreign political processes, but their daily activity does constitute the ‘third sector’ in the economy through civic involvement in social and political life, i.e. – in joint government of the region.

The majority of organizations directly involved in “Arctic affairs” are located either in Canada or the USA. This comes as no surprise, as Canada is second only to the Russian Federation in land mass beyond the Polar Circle and direct access to the Arctic Ocean. In the USA the Arctic territory swathes are much more modest, but the number of civil initiatives and NGOs have traditionally been ample. Most organizations represent networking entities, open to the expert community, volunteer assistance, and donations by citizens and organi-

zations from neighboring countries. Principal focal areas of these organizations are: protection of the environment and cultural legacy, public health care, and protection of rights of the indigenous peoples. Apart from that, the polar range of issues is dealt with by many NGOs, carrying out quite a broad mission. Among them: Greenpeace, Natural Resources Defense Council, Ocean Conservancy, Pacific Environment, PEW Environment Group, Nature Conservancy and others.

As a showcase, let us review involvement of the major actors – Greenpeace and PEW Environment Group – in the Arctic agenda.

From Greenpeace's core areas of business, the project "Save the Arctic" is one of the role models among similar projects of other non-governmental organizations functioning in the Arctic countries, both in terms of scope and public response. The goals of this project are, firstly, to give an expert estimate to efficiency and security of fossil fuel extraction in the Arctic shelf; secondly, to demonstrate the horrendous environmental implications of irresponsible activity of exploration companies to government officials and civil society; thirdly, to suggest alternative options for tackling the energy issue. The hallmark of Greenpeace is its striking, fairly extraordinary, and at times, audacious awareness-raising activity.

One of the recent profound researches by Greenpeace-Russia was a report "The cost of environmental dumping in the oil industry. What is behind the high profitability of the Russian oil companies". The author of this paper point out the set of conditions, whereby oil companies are able to avoid complete financial accountability for oil spills that would otherwise lead to the loss of significant funds, but instead lead to the apparent maintenance of zero accident rates in the oil infrastructure.

According to the author' estimates, the extent of financial liability (penalties, fines) for virtually inflicted environmental damage may reach several hundreds of billions roubles annually, which is equals to not less than 10% of oil companies net profit. Oil spill data submitted by companies is far from the truth. In reality, according to estimates by Russia's Minister for natural resources and environment S.E. Donskoy, 1,5 million tons of oil are spilled annually. That is approximately 30 times higher than what is declared by companies, and, thus, actual damage from oil spills much greater than officially designated [16].

Greenpeace experts believe that extraction of oil and gas in the Arctic shelf (particularly, in the Russian sector) is too costly and detrimental to the Arctic ecosystem. And, therefore, it can be replaced by alternative ways of ex-

tracting and utilizing energy sources. Among such options are: biobutanol use, increase in oil recovery efficiency at the producing fields, deeper conversion of crude oil (drawdown in residual oil), use of bio-gas and coal-mine methane, modernization of gas-firing plants, and gas transport efficiency upgrading [1].

Apart from its activity on the 'scientific expert' level, Greenpeace organizes pro-environmentalist meetings and demonstrations, petitions to governments, environmental poster contests, and raises ecological awareness among population. In total, Greenpeace uses a full range of tools accessible to a modern civil society organization. Greenpeace's scale of activity does not allow politicians and exploration and production companies to ignore their efforts.

PEW Environment Group (the USA) champions implementation of scientifically grounded policy in accordance with indigenous peoples' needs and traditional practice in the following spheres:

- sustainable commercial fishery;
- sophistication of off-shore fossil fuels extraction and oil spills responses standards;
- marine habitat protection;
- improvement in the Arctic maritime shipping security rules [16].

One of the crucial scientific and expert attainments by PEW is the report "Arctic Standards. Recommendations on Oil Spill Prevention, Response, and Safety in the U.S. Arctic Ocean", published in 2013.

The report concludes that the federal government should acknowledge and take into account the unique issues of the Arctic region (its American part), which is essential not only in terms of energy potential, but also availability of extreme ecological and climatic conditions, infrastructure gaps and particular needs by Alaskan indigenous communities, which should be scrutinized [13].

The report presents a system of standards, drawn up by PEW experts, for environmentally-responsible development of the Arctic zone. These standards encompass agreed-upon requirements on project engineering, fitting up, installation works and exploitation of equipment for safe exploration and production of oil and gas resources; oil spill incidents response rules in the region, engaging the best achievements of the Arctic science, technologies and expertise [17].

Participation of the European NGOs in the Arctic affairs is also significant. These are: Arctic NGO Forum, the Kola Environmental Centre, the Finnish Nature League, the Komi regional non-commercial foundation 'Silver Taiga', the Russian Geographic Society and many others. Interestingly, most cooperation

60 projects between the NGOs from the Northern nations have been progressing due to engagement in the programmes, initiatives, and grant projects within the framework of the Barents-Euro Arctic region. Among the cooperation avenues are: the economy, tourism, environment protection, transport and communications, energy saving, agriculture and reindeer farming, indigenous peoples, information network systems, the Northern Sea Route, public health care, science, culture and education, youth cooperation, collaboration within the Tasis and Interreg EU Programmes (Kultura Barents Regiona).

Undoubtedly, the Russian NGOs differ on their capabilities. For instance, there is the oldest public organization (established in 1845) – the Russian Geographic Society. It is generously funded by the state and pursues real programmes and projects in the Arctic, such as the ‘International Arctic Forum’, The Arctic Clean-up programme’, etc. Yet, new public initiatives, wishing to become organizations with monitoring and supervision functions, run into serious difficulties. These troubles are not unique: they are accompanied by the traditional paternalist sentiments in the society and implications of the current economic crisis, which are pervading all spheres of social life.

Still, despite all these negative moments, the civil society has assertively become an influential factor, whose interests cannot be ignored in national and international strategies of Arctic development. It is this activity of non-governmental organizations within the Arctic region, even those which do not even have the ability in and of themselves to make a drastic impact, that has been building in influence and will begin to affect the policies of the leading Arctic powers.

In conclusion several theoretical aspects of the global governance and co-governance concepts should be mentioned, which currently occupy a niche in Russian science. A discussion, which over the recent years has thrived within the pages of Russian journals on global governance and co-governance, undoubtedly, deserves a separate research paper. Let us focus merely on its outcomes. They are laid down in-detail in the collaborative study by the Institute of world economy and international relations – “Global governance: opportunities and risks” [2].

The “global governance” notion is construed by the authors in the ordinary way and is practically on the par with what is featured in the documents of international organizations. “Global governance implies a multi-tiered system of existing international and

supranational regulation and governance institutions and those, which are scheduled for establishment, carrying out their functions with regards to various kinds of activity, natural and social spaces, as well as subsequent political and economic relations” [2, p. 34].

Analyzing further the “global governance” (GG) concept, the authors put emphasis on the core of this notion – legitimacy deficit, which hampers transition of “global governance” to governance per se. “If to rely merely on the grounds of law, then present GG legitimacy’s source is essentially the will of democratic states’ governments, performing acts of sovereignty of those countries’ peoples. Everything else does not empower GG with such grounds” [2, p. 19].

Recent events such as the “Arab spring”, rise of international terrorism, ISIS emergence, as well as the raging financial crisis reject visions of the “erosion of a state’s role in contemporary world politics” [2, p. 39]. Moreover, the authors fairly note: “neither currently, nor in foreseeable future, are the elites of globalization the front-runners in setting the GG formation of institutions and principles against the status, interests, and smoothly running functioning of their states” [2, p. 40].

However, surveying perspective of applying the “global governance” ideas and principles over next 10–15 years, it is emphasized that “Space, open areas of global ocean, the Antarctic, partially Arctic and largest natural ecosystems will remain niches for the application of the GG idea” [2, p. 40]. Global social challenges also belong to these spheres.

In general, as follows from the compound analysis, the Russian expert community advocates promulgation of the “global governance” concept, given that it is gradually applied and decision-making is conducted in a consensual manner. At the same time, the significance of regional GG and the possibilities for mitigation of existing friction between states under the aegis of regional entities is underscored.

The “co-governance” idea, which can be put into practice in the context of Arctic cooperation, evokes controversial prognostications among numerous Russian pundits. This is because of its definite interpretation, namely that it is viewed as a transfer of control and governance over the state’s natural resources to supranational institutions. And this is despite the fact – we have just found out – that any supranational structures, which lay claim to governance, do not enjoy sufficient legitimacy. Counseling is allowed, whereas control and governance are prohibited. That is why a part of the Russian expert community is in-

clined to consider that “the Western global governance concepts elaborated in foreign think-tanks do not inherently foresee Russia’s role as a “leading factor”. It would be an illusion to believe that such concepts imply a kind of “co-governance” by the Atlantic West and Russia – “on a parity basis” [5].

Yet, we assume that the “co-governance” idea still has prospects for its own application. Perhaps it is not the Arctic Council’s role in this process, rather than cooperation

at lower tiers, which can be launched in the Arctic cooperation context. Furthermore, co-governance as a domestic trend is advancing in Russia. The state encourages the establishment of socially-oriented NGOs through the grant and subsidy system. As well, a public-private partnership system is evolving, albeit slowly. Persons engaged in these processes will gradually become aware of a need for more intensive and open cooperation in this format with other Arctic countries.

Список литературы:

- [1] Альтернативы нефтегазовому освоению Арктики. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.greenpeace.org/russia/ru/campaigns/protect-the-arctic/Arctic-drilling-alternatives/> (02.05.2016)
- [2] Глобальное управление: возможности и риски / Под ред. В. Барановского, Н. Иванова, – М: ИМЭМО, 2015. – 315 с.
- [3] Курочкин А.В. Государственное управление и инновационная политика в условиях сетевого сообщества. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <https://disser.spbu.ru/disser2/disser/KurochkinDissertacija.pdf> (01.06.2016)
- [4] Медведев Д.А. Международное экономическое сотрудничество в Арктике. Арктический экономический совет. – М.: Центр стратегических исследований и прогнозов, 2015.
- [5] Овлащенко А.В., Покровский И.Ф. Глобальное океаническое соуправление: какое место в нем уготовлено России? (политические, правовые и институциональные аспекты) // Транспортное право. – 2011, № 3. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.center-bereg.ru/o2212.html> (01.05.2016)
- [6] Полярный Кодекс для арктического судоходства. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://pro-arctic.ru/28/05/2014/news/8857> (13.06.2016)
- [7] Попков Ю.В. Коренные народы Севера в условиях глобализации. – Век глобализации. № 1(13). – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.socionauki.ru/journal/articles/242966/> (16.06.2016)
- [8] Цена экологического демпинга в нефтяной отрасли. Чем обеспечена высокая рентабельность российских нефтяных компаний? – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.greenpeace.org/russia/Globa/russia/report/2016/Eco_Dumping.pdf (16.05.2016)
- [9] Шестаков А. Для Арктики нужны чёткие правила игры // Информационный портал «Русский мир». – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.russkiymir.ru/publications/87974/> (01.05.2016)
- [10] Aarhus Convention. 1998. Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.jus.uio.no/english/services/library/treaties/06/6-01/justice-environmental-matters.xml> (12.06.2016)
- [11] Arctic Economic Council. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/about-us/working-groups/8-featured-work/news-and-events/195-aec-2> (01.05.2016)
- [12] Arctic Frontiers of the Northern Forum. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.northernforum.org/en/news/231-arctic-frontiers-of-the-northern-forum> (03.05.2016)
- [13] Arctic Standards. Recommendations on Oil Spill Prevention, Response, and Safety in the U.S. Arctic Ocean. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/oceans_north_legacy/page_attachments/pewarcticstandards092313.pdf?la=en (04.05.2016)
- [14] Heininen L. 2004. Circumpolar international relations and geopolitics. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.svs.is/images/pdf_files/ahdr/Russian_version/12_Geopolitic.pdf (15.06.2015)
- [15] Our common future. 1987. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Transmitted to the General Assembly as an Annex to document A/42/427 – Development and International Co-operation: Environment. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm> (12.06.2016)
- [16] PEW, Protecting Life in the Arctic. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/protecting-life-in-the-arctic> (14.06.2016)
- [17] What Are Arctic Standards. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/reports/0001/01/01/arctic-standards> (16.05.2016)
- [18] WWF. – Интернет-ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.wwf.ru/about/where_we_work/arctic/arctic (20.05.2016)