

# **International Journalist Workshop Gdansk, September 13-19, 2009**

**Markku Ollikainen, Saara Bäck, Markku Viitasalo, Sakari Kuikka,  
Mari Walls ja Erik Bonsdorff**

## **Mission Baltic Sea 11 theses on the Protection of the Baltic Sea**

# Background of the theses

## Theses

- Summary of the emerging understanding of the challenges of protecting the Baltic Sea gleaned from a two-year seminar series, discussion and research
- **Content:** Value basis; political analysis; sectoral policy analysis, (7 pages long paper)

## Authors

- Wish to push forward research, discussion and policies by presenting ideas for open debate

## Goal

- To promote the protection of the Baltic Sea at all levels

# ***1. The Baltic Sea is a valuable source for human wellbeing***

- **Message:** the Baltic Sea is the historical, political and cultural source of wellbeing for all people in costal states
- An appreciative attitude towards of the Baltic Sea is required; protection depends on it

# Political analysis

## ***2. Pollution of the Baltic Sea is predominantly a social problem***

- **Message:** The social nature and roots of the environmental problems in the Baltic Sea are not properly understood
- **The role of hydrography of the Baltic Sea:**
  - Stratification of water, hypoxia, the vicious cycle of the Baltic Sea and *transfer of nutrients*
  - There is a great threat that eutrophication problems emerge
- **The role of social institutions**
  - The Baltic Sea is a **common property resource**: coastal states have no supranational obligatory body: countries are free to pollute and none can legally prevent them from doing so

## ***2. Pollution... a social problem***

Hydrographic features create an **asymmetry**: the loads of polluters (Poland, Russia) transfer to other countries (Finland, Sweden),

- polluters do not find (**perceive**) eutrophication a big problem
- polluters profit from purifying less

The **non-simultaneous nature of social development** strengthens asymmetry: polluting countries are poor, while the countries suffering damage are well-off

**Inversely for policy**: hydrography and non-simultaneous social development mean that the poor countries carry the costs of reducing nutrients, while the rich countries reap the benefits

### ***3. A binding international agreement for the protection of the Baltic Sea is needed***

**Message:** We need a truly binding agreement instead of mere policy recommendations

**Binding agreement:** must be fair and cost-efficient

- **Fairness:** if costs and benefits are unevenly distributed, a **mechanism** is needed to compensate those who must pay more than others.
  - transfer of money, international nutrient trading or nutrient tax
- **Cost-efficiency:** joint costs must be minimized to obtain the desired environmental quality

**Baltic Sea Action Plan:** obtainment good, but the plan is expensive and unfair

- Role of Helcom, role of the EU, activities of coastal states

Theses 4, 5 and 6 elaborate the content of  
theses 2 and 3

***4. In absence of true political willingness, national environmental policies have been ineffective***

**Water policy:** The goals, activities and foci can be severely criticized; especially nitrogen policy in Finland and Sweden

**Politics:** true supporters of protection are too few; politicians fear losing voters

***5. As a heritage of the socialist system, the Baltic Sea receives annually almost 5000 tons of unpurified phosphorus***

- **A historical datum**, which has to be overcome
- **Investments in WWTPs:** quickest, cheapest and best results in water quality

Theses 3, 4, 5 and 6 elaborate the content  
of thesis 2

***6. Protection of the Baltic Sea requires  
publicity, democracy and civilian initiatives***

**Message:** long run problem and thread of Baltic  
Sea protection in transitional economies is

- Lack of publicity, deficit of democracy and  
negative attitude to environmental movement

They prevent the increase of environmental  
consciousness of citizens, which is required to  
improve national environmental policies

# **Sectoral analysis**

## ***7. One must find more effective means of reducing agricultural runoff***

- CAP increases more loads than provides means to reduce them
- Basic problem of current agri-environmental instruments: they do not allocate actions to the most erosion sensitive fields

## ***8. Risks and loads of marine traffic at the Baltic Sea must be brought under control***

- We must do more to reduce oil accident risks and to improve our capacity to handle accidents

## ***9. Preservation of biodiversity of the Baltic Sea requires new and creative solutions***

- Biodiversity encounters resistance at first but reveals its beneficial impacts later on; Designs of proactive policies?

## ***10. Climate change will modify the ecosystem of the Baltic Sea***

What consequences for the Baltic Sea, marine policy, and policy in the drainage basin? Designs of proactive policies?

## ***11. Effective and integrated administration practices must be established for protection of the Baltic Sea*** *- coordination of all sectors impacting the Baltic Sea*

# -88 ministerial declaration and BSAP

	1988 Recom.	1988 Reduct. %	BSAP Recom.	BSAP Reduct. %
Latvia	69190	50%	2560	6%
Lithuania	<b>18695</b>	50%	<b>11750</b>	<b>13%</b>
Poland	<b>60193</b>	50%	<b>62400</b>	<b>20%</b>
Sweden	<b>59307</b>	50%	<b>20780</b>	28%
Germany	<b>7200</b>	50%	<b>5620</b>	12%
Finland	<b>36135</b>	50%	<b>1200</b>	3%
Denmark	41717	50%	17210	39%
Russia	53307	50%	6970	8%
Estonia	10566	50%	900	2%