

TALLINNA PEDAGOOGIKAÜLIKOO
LOODUSTEADUSTE DISSERTATSIOONID
TALLINN PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY
DISSERTATIONS ON NATURAL SCIENCES

8

**DRIVING FORCES OF THE FORMATION
OF ESTONIA'S INTERNATIONAL
ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION IN THE 1990-s**

ABSTRACT

ANDRES KRATOVITS

 **TPÜ KIRJASTUS**

TALLINN 2003

Chair of Geoecology, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Tallinn Pedagogical University, Estonia.

The dissertation is accepted for the commencement of the degree of *Doctor philosophiae* in Ecology on 7 November 2003 by the Doctoral Committee of Ecology of the Tallinn Pedagogical University.

Supervisor: Jaan-Mati Punning, Doct. Geogr., Director and Head of Environmental Research Department of the Institute of Ecology at Tallinn Pedagogical University, Professor and Head of the Chair of Geoecology of the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences at Tallinn Pedagogical University.

Opponents: Tuomas Kuokkanen, Doctor in Laws, University of Helsinki, Counsellor, Ministry of the Environment.

Mart Külvik, Ph.D., Docent, Environmental Protection Institute, Estonian Agricultural University.

The academic disputation on the dissertation will be held at the Tallinn Pedagogical University (Lecture Hall 223), Narva mnt 25, Tallinn, on 7 November 2003 at 2 p.m.

ISSN 1736-0749 (*on-line*, PDF)
ISBN 9985-58-290-X (*on-line*, PDF)

ISSN 1406-4383 (trükis)
ISBN 9985-58-282-9 (trükis)

© Andres Kratovits, 2003

CONTENTS

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS	4
PREFACE	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	7
2.1. Background	7
2.2. Objectives	7
2.3. Hypothesis	8
2.4. Methodology	8
3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	8
3.1. Environment and international regimes	8
3.2. Formation of international environmental regimes	9
4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS	10
4.1. Estonia and international environmental regimes	10
4.2. Bilateral environmental cooperation	13
4.2.1. Bilateral cooperation in the Western direction	13
4.2.2. Bilateral cooperation in the Southern direction	14
4.2.3. Bilateral cooperation in the Eastern direction	15
5. CONCLUSIONS	16
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	17
SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN	17
REFERENCES	18
ANNEX I. List of environmental conventions in force in Estonia (1991–2002)	19
ANNEX II. List of bilateral environmental agreements, signed since September 1991	20

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following original papers, which are referred to in the thesis by their Roman numerals:

- I. Kratovits, Andres, Punning, Jaan-Mati. Driving Forces for the Formation of Environmental Policy of the Baltic Countries. *AMBIO*, Vol. 30, No. 7, Nov. 2001, pp. 443–449.
- II. Kratovits, Andres. The Role of International Regimes in the Formation and Maintenance of Baltic Environmental Cooperation. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, Vol. XXIII, Fall 2001, pp. 289–307.
- III. Kratovits, Andres. Driving Forces of the Emergence and Maintenance of Estonian-Russian Bilateral Environmental Cooperation Regime in the 1990s. *TRAMES*, No. 2, Vol. 6(56/51), 2002, pp. 173–191.
- IV. Kratovits, Andres, Punning, Jaan-Mati. Bilateral Environmental Cooperation in 1991–2001 and its Role in the Improvement of the Ecological Situation in Estonia. *International Journal of Environment and Pollution*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 2002, pp. 138–148.

Other publications in the relevant area:

- V. Kratovits, Andres. Environmental Policies of the Baltic Countries. In: Gustafsson, Börje K. and Magnusson, Ulf (eds.). *Envirovet Baltic: Workshop on Ecosystem Health*. SLU Service/Repro, Uppsala 2002, pp. 21–22.
- VI. Kratovits, Andres. The Nordic Countries and Estonian Environmental Policy. In: Lepik, Aira and Poom-Valickis, Katrin (eds.). *Dialogue and Common Interests of Social and Educational Sciences*. TPU Publishers, Tallinn 2002, pp. 603–622.
- VII. Kratovits, Andres. International Environmental Agreements. In: *Eesti Entsüklopeedia 11 (Estonian Encyclopedia, Vol. 11) (in Estonian)*, Estonian Encyclopedia Publ., Tallinn 2002, p. 215.
- VIII. Kratovits, Andres. Contributor to Estonian National Report on Sustainable Development 2002. Akadeemiarükk, Tallinn 2002, 56 pp.
- IX. Kratovits, Andres. Accession Negotiations between Estonia and the European Union on Environmental Protection. In: *Environmental Policy of the European Union (in Estonian)*. REC Estonia, Tallinn 2002.
- X. Kratovits, Andres. The Baltic States and Environmental Conventions 1991–2000: General Observations. In: *Proceedings of the fourth Conference on the Environmental Conventions and the Baltic States: Facing the New Millennium*, SEI-Tallinn, 2001, pp. 14–19.
- XI. Kratovits, Andres. International Environmental Agreements. In: *Estonia in the XXI Century: Development Strategies, Visions, Options (in Estonian)*. Estonian Academy Publ., Tallinn, 1999, pp. 79–85.
- XII. Kratovits, Andres. UN Framework Convention on Climate Change – Three Years Since Ratification in Estonia. In: *Proceedings of the third Conference on the Environmental Conventions and the Baltic States*, SEI-Tallinn, 1997.

The above-mentioned papers are reproduced by kind permission of the following: Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (I), Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies (II), Estonian Academy Publishers (III), Inderscience Enterprises Ltd (IV).

PREFACE

In the present thesis I examine the driving forces behind the formation and maintenance of Estonia's international environmental cooperation. I focus on the attempt to interpret social reality governing international environmental protection from the point of view of a small country. This is the first comprehensive analysis of reasons behind developing and maintenance of Estonia's international environmental policy since regaining her independence in 1991. In analysing interrelations of ecological situation and political response taken to improve the state of the environment, the objective basis was looked for, upon which international environmental cooperation is built. Analysis of the first stages of Estonia's international environmental policy aimed also at suggesting ideas for planning next steps of a small country's environmental policy – achieving sustainable development within the European Union.

After regaining her independence in 1991, Estonia inherited a complex environmental legacy from the Soviet era. The state of the environment in general was far from satisfactory – biggest problems related mainly to the use of out-of-date technologies in the extensively developed industry and agriculture, lack of appropriate wastewater purification and waste disposal facilities as well as military pollution caused by Soviet troops. Low prices of energy and raw materials had led to the creation of material-, energy- and transport intensive and, therefore, heavily polluting industries. Practically unlimited Soviet market caused an excessive concentration of agriculture and related environmental pollution. The North-East oil-shale mining and processing region was the most problematic environmental pollution area. Estonia ranked among the biggest CO₂ and SO₂ emitters *per capita* in the world. Much of environmental concern also stemmed from inefficient use of groundwater resources, eutrophication of waterbodies and water pollution. Since Estonia is situated in the Baltic Sea drainage basin, much of this pollution was eventually discharged into the Baltic Sea. On the other hand, forestry and nature protection in Estonia were comparatively sustainable and maintained much higher levels of biodiversity than the western countries (Kratovits, Punning, 2001).

Although in general the environmental legislation before the 1990s in general corresponded to internationally recognized principles and norms of environmental protection, and in many respects was even more stringent, there were limited mechanisms for their practical implementation. Therefore, there was an urgent need to redraft the existing legislation. By the end of the 1990s, the updated legal framework of environmental protection, which largely corresponded to the European Union's environmental *acquis*, was in place. All the main fields of environmental protection – air, water, waste, nature protection, industrial pollution, etc. had in general been covered by legal acts. Estonia was also one of the first countries in the world, enacting the Sustainable Development Act already in 1995.

Prioritisation of environmental problems and goals, drafting of regulatory legal instruments as well as financial and technical support provided by bilateral and multilateral financial donors in the 1990s have significantly contributed to the improvement of ecological conditions in Estonia. The state of the environment in Estonia has been improving during the last ten years. Significant improvements have been achieved especially in reducing the emissions of pollutants into atmosphere and hydrosphere (State... 2000; Keskkond... 2000). Emissions have been reduced mainly due to the changed economic structure – the share of energy-intensive industry has substantially diminished and the share of less energy-dependent sectors, like tourism and services, has increased rapidly. At the same time a lot of efforts have been made to improve the energy-efficiency in different economic sectors. To a large extent improvement of the state of the environment has been the result of major restructuring of industry and the whole economic system, however, elaboration and implementation of goal-oriented environmental policy has also played its positive role.

The main purpose of the study is to analyse one of the main pillars of Estonia's environmental policy – international cooperation. The know-how and financial resources provided by international society have played a crucial role in the improvement of the state of the environment in Estonia. However, to date, no academic effort has been made to understand the reasons and driving forces behind the formation and maintenance of Estonia's international environmental cooperation itself. The aim of the study was also to review rational ways for Estonia to take part in international environmental processes and to use them for her own benefit, considering especially the upcoming membership of the European Union.

The results allow to suggest that Estonia's behaviour in developing her international environmental cooperation has not always been driven by domestic priorities – existence of ecological problems, that need urgent international cooperation in order to deal with them. Estonia's behaviour can be rather seen as prescribed – both implicitly and explicitly – by international social institutions governing environmental protection as well as by individual state-members of international society.

1. INTRODUCTION

Estonia has achieved remarkable success in elaborating and implementing her environmental policy, dedicated to the improvement of the state of the environment. On 12 March 1997, the National Environmental Strategy (NES) was approved by the Riigikogu, the Estonian Parliament. The Strategy listed priority environmental problems, set the main mid- and long-term goals as well as envisaged the ways to achieve these targets. Based on the Strategy, the Estonian National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) was approved by the Government in 1998. In 2001, the revised NEAP, emphasizing the need for effective and resultful implementation of the agreed targets, was approved. By the end of the 1990s, the legal framework of environmental protection has been in place. In general, the Estonian environmental policy can be described as laying largely on international cooperation. It is based on internationally accepted legal norms and principles of environmental protection and it is built upon explicit policy planning, raising both short- and long-term goals as well as envisaging the ways and means of their achievement (Kratovits, Punning, 2002).

The Estonian National Environmental Strategy lists priority environmental problems (NES, 1997: 16). They are defined as follows: (1) pollution of ambient and urban air which has a negative impact on human health, ecosystems and buildings; (2) past pollution caused by industrial, agricultural and military activities, which poses a threat to ground and surface water quality, damaged landscapes; (3) decrease in water quantity and quality due to irrational use of groundwater resources; (4) pollution and eutrophication of surface water bodies, deterioration of aquatic ecosystems, including a decrease in reproduction and deterioration of the quality of fish stocks; (5) increase in environmental pollution caused by waste disposal and in areas contaminated by waste, inappropriate waste and hazardous waste management; (6) threats to biological and landscape diversity as a result of economic activities and land reform; and (7) insufficient correspondence of built environment to environmental and health principles.

Estonia's environmental policy goals and ways to achieve these goals are also generally described in the NES. The main policy goals to reach the targets set in the NES are as follows: (1) promotion of environmental awareness; (2) promotion of clean technologies; (3) reduction of negative environmental effects of energy sector; (4) improvement of air quality; (5) reduction of waste generation and improvement of waste management; (6) elimination of past pollution; (7) better use and protection of groundwater resources; (8) protection of surface water bodies and coastal seas; (9) preservation of landscapes and biodiversity; and (10) improvement of the quality of built environment (NES, 1997: 18–38). The Estonian National Environmental Action Plan, elaborated on the basis of the NES was approved by the Government on 26 May 1998 (NEAP, 1998). The NEAP included tables of concrete activities as well as responsible institutions, implementation cost and sources of possible funding to implement those actions, for both short (1998–2000) as well as long-term activities (2001–2006) to reach the goals described in the NES. On 5 June 2001, the updated National Environmental Action Plan for 2001–2003 was approved by the Government. The main emphasis of the new NEAP has shifted from drawing up a plan to its effective and resultful implementation, taking into consideration overall political priorities – accession to the European Union and promotion of the principles of sustainable development (NEAP, 2001). One of the main outcomes of drafting all these policy documents was the understanding that Estonia is not able to earmark necessary financial resources from its internal sources and the recognition of the importance of international financial contribution to reach the above goals.

Environmental problems do not recognize the state borders and, therefore, international cooperation is inevitable to solve these problems. Disintegration of the Soviet Union allowed Estonia to take appropriate actions in order to turn back to where she considered herself to belong – to the Western culture and traditions, learning and quickly accepting “western” principles and rules of behaviour governing global as well as bilateral environmental relations. One of the main priorities of Estonian authorities since the restoration of independence was to integrate Estonia into the fastly growing net of multilateral legal arrangements – environmental conventions and related international regimes, aimed at enhancing international cooperation in order to mitigate global and regional problems. The main goals to be achieved in international relations were integration of internationally accepted principles and best practices into environmental legislation and implementation, attraction of additional foreign investments and promotion of regional cooperation (NES, 1997: 13). Since 1991, Estonia has ratified or acceded to more than 30 environmental multilateral legal instruments (Annex I), becoming thus a party to the most important global and regional international environmental regimes, like biodiversity protection regime, climate regime, ozone protection regime, nuclear emergencies and radiation protection regimes, air and water protection regimes. In 1995, Estonia and the European Union (EU) signed the Association Agreement. In 1997, at the Luxembourg Summit, the EU officially invited Estonia to start accession negotiations. In 1999, negotiations on the Environmental Chapter were officially opened and on 1 June 2001, negotiations as regards to taking over the environmental *acquis* of the EU have been successfully finished with the provisional closure of the chapter. As a result of these negotiations Estonia has declared its readiness to take fully over the environmental *acquis*, consisting of more than 300 legal acts, including directives, regulations, decisions, recommendations and other policy documents, with the exception of only five investment-heavy directives (MoE, 2003).

In parallel, Estonia has also signed 27 bilateral legal instruments, mainly intergovernmental agreements (Annex II). 20 bilateral legal instruments, dedicated to environmental protection, have been signed with Western as

well as with Central European countries, 2 agreements with the Russian Federation and 5 with other Baltic countries. Negotiations to conclude bilateral agreements were started immediately in 1991 and agreements have been quickly signed thereafter. In all the cases countries have first signed the so-called framework agreements, which set general goals as well as rules of cooperation. Later, these general agreements have then been complemented by more specific agreements dealing with different environmental media, like air, water, hazardous waste, oil-spills, radiation protection and climate change. Thus, Estonia has created a network of successfully operating international regime-like arrangements, based on bi- or trilateral agreements as well as on commonly accepted behavioural norms and rules.

In this thesis I focus on analysing two aspects of Estonia's international environmental cooperation, which were crucial during the first phase of developing Estonia's environmental policy (from 1991 up to the end of the 1990s, when Estonia engaged seriously into transposing the environmental *acquis* of the European Union). These two aspects are (1) relations with international environmental regimes and (2) bilateral cooperation with individual state-actors of international society. The aim of the analysis was to find out how these aspects have contributed to implementing Estonia's environmental policy goals and improvement of the state of the environment.

2. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

2.1. BACKGROUND

The thesis consists of four publications and this review. The publications are referred to as Papers I to IV. Paper I deals with the role of international environmental agreements and regimes in the formation of Estonia's environmental policy in comparison with other Baltic countries by analysing their correspondence to the priorities of Estonia's environmental policy.

Paper II examines the role of international environmental regimes and individual members of the international society in the formation and maintenance of trilateral Baltic environmental cooperation regime, *i.e.* driving forces of Estonia's cooperation with her Southern neighbours Latvia and Lithuania. The role of Baltic cooperation in dealing with sub-regional ecological problems was analysed. In this paper theoretical background of international regime theory has also been discussed.

Paper III examines driving forces behind the formation and maintenance of the Estonian-Russian bilateral environmental cooperation regime, including the role of international epistemic community and individual members of the international society in it. The role of existing ecological problems in influencing emergence of state-level cooperation was discussed.

Paper IV deals with the role of individual members of the international society (Western countries) in the formation and implementation of Estonia's environmental policy and discusses the benefits Estonia has gained from cooperation with Western countries as well as related improvements in the state of her environment.

2.2. OBJECTIVES

The aim of the present thesis is to improve the understanding about the interrelations between states, non-state actors and their physical environment by integrating political analysis with environmental explanations. Natural sciences in general as well as specific knowledge about the state of the environment and ecological problems in Estonia were well developed by the beginning of the 1990s. On the other hand, in 1991 when Estonia resteped onto international arena as an independent subject of international law, both academic as well as practical knowledge about the nature of social processes governing inter-state relations in the field of environmental protection, were nearly not existing. Small size, openness to international influences and inexperience in academic theory and everyday's practice of behaving within international environmental social institutions makes Estonia an interesting object of study to improve the knowledge about functioning of these institutions.

The objectives of the present thesis are to:

1. Analyse the role of existing ecological problems in the development of Estonia's international environmental cooperation. On the one hand to find out whether existence of ecological problems between two countries has been sufficient reason for developing bilateral environmental cooperation, and on the other hand whether successful bilateral environmental cooperation regimes have arisen only in cases when specific ecological problems needed to be solved.

2. Analyse whether and how international social institutions governing regional and global environmental protection have influenced development and maintenance of Estonia's international environmental cooperation.
3. Analyse Estonia's international environmental cooperation and find out whether this cooperation has been beneficial from Estonia's point of view, as well as to suggest ideas how to improve efficiency of international cooperation in the sake of dealing with her own priority environmental problems.

2.3. HYPOTHESIS

Quick and resultful elaboration as well as implementation of environmental policy in Estonia owes mainly to international cooperation and especially to the know-how and financial resources channelled to Estonia through normative institutions called international environmental regimes as well as through individual members of international society of states. The working hypothesis of this study is: The main driving force behind formation of Estonia's international environmental cooperation has been influence of international environmental regimes and state-actors of international society, rather than pursuing always Estonia's own rational interests – need to solve existing ecological problems.

2.4. METHODOLOGY

The data analysed in the study are gathered from official legal and political documents, official letters as well as from interviews with top experts, dealing in practice with issues studied in this thesis. The goals of Estonia's environmental policy, planned ways and means of their implementation as well as prioritisation of ecological problems were taken from official documents, setting environmental policy in Estonia – the National Environmental Strategy and National Environmental Action Plans. Bilateral agreements and environmental conventions were the main source of analysis of Estonia's environmental foreign policy. In addition, bilateral exchange of letters between decision-makers was studied. Where official written records or data were missing or interpretation was needed to evaluate the relevance of studied phenomena, interviews with top experts in their fields were conducted. The study is based on principles of qualitative analysis in order to interpret the social reality governing international environmental protection (Silverman, 2000; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 2001).

In the thesis Estonia's international environmental cooperation has been divided into the four "directions" deriving from the need to deal with global, regional and local ecological problems: (1) multilateral cooperation in the frames of international environmental regimes; (2) Western direction, *i.e.* bilateral cooperation with Western countries; (3) Southern direction, *i.e.* bilateral cooperation with Estonia's southern neighbours – Latvia and Lithuania; and (4) Eastern direction, *i.e.* bilateral cooperation with the Russian Federation. In bilateral relations only such ecological problems were considered, which have not been dealt with in larger multilateral settings or which are best suited to deal with bilaterally. In each of these directions relevance of both – existence of pressing ecological problems as well as presence of either an international environmental regime or an individual member of international society – and their possible impact on the formation of international cooperation has been analysed.

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.1. ENVIRONMENT AND INTERNATIONAL REGIMES

Debates concerning relations of ecology and policy processes aimed at dealing with environmental problems refer to the political and social conditions surrounding the causes, experiences and management of ecological problems. Academic approaches to the relations between political systems – both on national and international levels – with their social and physical environment, studies about the interdependence of the natural world and human society, have lead to wide range of explanations (List and Rittberger, 1992; Bryant and Bailey, 1997; Forsyth, 2003). As of the role of international arrangements in alleviating ecological problems, it has, on the one hand, been suggested that international regimes and related multilateral agreements can be seen as the most widespread and effective tools for the improvement of the state of global, regional and local environments. On the other hand, it has been noted that while there have been substantial reductions in emissions and improvements in ecological conditions in areas governed by some international environmental regimes, it is difficult to determine the extent to which these positive trends are results of

coordinated international actions (Hasenclever et al., 1997; Young, 1997; Zürn, 1998; Global..., 2000).

According to Bull (1995: 9-10, 13) international society exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with each another. This society is structured by social institutions, *i.e.* persistent and connected sets of formal and informal rules that prescribe to state actors behavioural roles, constrain their activities and shape their expectations (Keohane, 1995: 28). Social institutions called international regimes have been in the centre of scientific efforts to explain the emergence and maintenance of cooperative behaviour of state actors in the field of environmental protection (Zürn, 1998). The widely accepted starting point for the definition of international regimes states that regimes are sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors expectations converge in a given issue-area of international relations (Krasner, 1983: 2). It is also accepted that an observable behavioural element should be added to the definition in order to distinguish regimes from mere promises or contracts which actors may or may not live up and, therefore, no arrangements should be called an international regime, unless (1) the arrangement has to meet the explicit rule test, *i.e.* it has to be based on international legal instrument(s) – agreements or conventions; and (2) the arrangement meeting the explicit rule test has to achieve prescriptive status, *i. e.* actors should refer regularly to the rules both in characterising their own behaviour and in commenting the behaviour of others (Rittberger, 1995: 9–11).

According to Keohane (1984: 61), issue-areas are “sets of issues that are in fact dealt with in common negotiations...”. The issue-area in the field of environmental protection can be and in most cases is identified as negotiated on the basis of notions like commodity or geographical location, *i.e.* regimes are constructed by interested actors around a problem of mutual interest. These interests can include issues like (1) international commons, *i.e.* physical or biological systems that lie wholly or largely outside the jurisdiction of any individual member of international society but that are of interest to two or more of them as valued resources; (2) shared natural resources, *i.e.* physical or biological systems that extend into or across the jurisdiction of two or more members of international society; or (3) transboundary externalities, *i.e.* issues arising when activities within the jurisdiction of one state produce consequences that affect the welfare of those located in other jurisdictions (Young, 1997: 8-9). Thus, speaking of international environmental regimes, one can have in mind different types of regimes, ranging from global to bilateral arrangements, governing for instance, the use of global commons, such as oceans, atmosphere, space (Vogler, 1993), regimes of regional importance, like protection of the Baltic Sea (List, 1990) or the Mediterranean (Haas, 1995) as well as regimes of local importance.

3.2. FORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGIMES

The mainstream academic approaches to the study of international regimes assume the prior existence of state-actors with a clear sense of their own identities and of their interests flowing from those identities (Mayer et al., 1995; Wæver, 1997; Hasenclever et al., 1997). Such actors are motivated to create institutional arrangements when they discover that proceeding individualistically leads to joint losses or to an inability to reap joint gains. Accordingly, regimes are devices created by self-interested state-actors to solve or at least to ameliorate collective-action problems. On the other hand, proponents of the so called constitutive perspective in the study of international regimes assume that institutions play a major role in defining the interests of participants and even in shaping their identities. Accordingly, institutions have formative effect on their members rather than the other way around (Young, 1997: 276).

Besides the recognition of the leading role of states in formation and maintenance of international environmental regimes, the role of civil society, especially in the area of transboundary waters’ protection and management, has been appreciated in several studies on formation of international cooperation (Bernauer, 1997: 194; Breitmeier, 2000; Rittberger, 2000: 84; Valiante, 1997: 198; Wapner, 2000). It has been suggested that in parallel with the state-centric international society another social system is emerging in parallel with the society of states – the global civil society. According to Wapner (1997: 281) “this system is made up of a variety of non-state actors – including interest groups, professional associations, and corporations – that operate above the level of the individual but below or apart from the level of the state”. The importance of development of influential multinational communities that are external to the formal regimes has been acknowledged as one of the crucial elements allowing transboundary waters’ governance regimes to make progress in improving the environmental quality of concerned international waterbodies. These communities consist usually of scientists, environmental non-governmental organizations, and to a lesser extent of other interest groups in civil society. Their role in supporting the formal regime consists mainly of

monitoring and making public the Parties' success or failure in implementing the regimes' principles and formal obligations (Valiante, 1997: 219).

A particular segment of civil society – epistemic communities – has attracted attention of researchers, interested in interrelations of knowledge and policy coordination (Adler and Haas, 1992; Haas, 1992; Haas, 1995; Peterson, 1992; Adler, 1997). Epistemic (related to knowledge) communities can be defined as “groups of experts who generate policy-oriented knowledge relevant to a given issue-area” (Wilkening et al., 2000: 193). They are collectives or networks of “professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area”, who share a common set of principled and causal beliefs and notions of validity and engage in a policy mission (Haas, 1992: 3). Ecological epistemic communities are seen as entities generating and providing information and new ideas for policy-makers, minimising uncertainties before entering into new international policy deals, setting standards and assisting policy-makers in identifying state interests (Adler and Haas, 1992). It has been noted that epistemic policy coordination is likely to occur if there is a high degree of uncertainty among policy-makers and high degree of institutionalization and consensus among scientists. Epistemic communities can be influential in four phases of the policy process during formation and maintenance of international regimes. These are (1) policy innovation, *e.g.* minimisation of uncertainties and framing issues for decision-makers; (2) policy diffusion, *e.g.* communication of new ideas and information to their colleagues in other countries, who can thereafter influence their governments; (3) policy persistence, *e.g.* advocacy of established regimes as best-suited means to attain common goals; and (4) to a lesser extent also policy selection (Hasenclever et al., 1997: 150–152).

4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

4.1. ESTONIA AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGIMES

Short summary of the relevance of accession to the main international environmental legal instruments from the point of view of Estonia's main ecological problems and priority environmental policy goals, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Relevance of accession to selected international environmental regimes.

International regime	Year of accession to the relevant multilateral agreements ^a	Relevance to Estonia's main ecological problems ^b	Relevance to Estonia's priority environmental policy goals ^c
International climate regime	New York (1992) conv. – 1994 Kyoto (1997) protocol – 2002	Climate change not seen as an urgent problem	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (3): reduction of negative environmental effects of energy sector
International ozone layer protection regime	Vienna (1985) conv. – 1996 Montreal (1987) protocol – 1996 London (1990) amendment – 1999 Copenhagen (1992) amendment – 1999 Montreal (1997) amendment – 2002	Ozone layer depletion not seen as an urgent problem	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (6): elimination of past pollution
International biodiversity protection regime	Ramsar (1971) conv. – 1993 Bern (1979) conv. 1992 Washington (1973) conv. – 1993 Rio de Janeiro (1992) conv. – 1994	Problem (6): threats to biological and landscape diversity as a result of economic activities and land reform	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (9): preservation of landscapes and biodiversity
International nuclear safety regime	Vienna (1963) conv. 1994 Vienna (1979) conv. – 1994 Vienna (1986) conv. – 1994 Vienna (1986) conv. – 1994 Vienna (1988) joint protocol – 1994	Problem (2) partly: past pollution caused by [...] military activities [...]	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (6): elimination of past pollution

International hazardous waste regime	Basel (1989) conv. 1992	Problem (5) partly: increase in environmental pollution caused by [...] inappropriate [...] hazardous waste management	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (5): [...] improvement of hazardous waste management
International acid rains prevention regime	Geneva (1979) conv. – 2000 Geneva (1984) prot. – 2000 Helsinki (1985) prot. – 2000 Sofia (1988) prot. 2000 Geneva (1991) prot. – 2000	Problem (1): pollution of ambient and urban air which has a negative impact on human health, ecosystems and buildings	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (3): reduction of negative environmental effects of energy sector Goal (4): improvement of air quality
International Baltic Sea protection regime	Helsinki (1974/1992) conv. 1995	Problem (4): pollution and eutrophication of surface water bodies, deterioration of aquatic ecosystems [...]; Problem (2): past pollution caused by industrial, agricultural and military activities, which poses a threat to [...] surface water quality	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (6): elimination of past pollution Goal (7): better use and protection of groundwater resources Goal (8): protection of surface water bodies and coastal sea
International regime for the protection of seas from pollution from ships	London (1973) conv. – 1992 Brussels (1969) conv. – 1993 Brussels (1971) conv. – 1993	Problem (4) partly: pollution [...] of surface water bodies, deterioration of aquatic ecosystems [...]	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (8): protection of surface water bodies and coastal sea
International regime for the protection and sustainable use of international water-courses	Helsinki (1992) conv. – 1995	Problem (4): pollution and eutrophication of surface water bodies, deterioration of aquatic ecosystems [...]; Problem (2): past pollution caused by industrial, agricultural and military activities, which poses a threat to [...] surface water quality; Problem (3): decrease in water quantity and quality due to irrational use of groundwater resources	Goal (1): promotion of environmental awareness Goal (2): promotion of clean technologies Goal (7): better use and protection of groundwater resources Goal (8): protection of surface water bodies [...]

^a – full titles of the conventions are given in Annex I

^b – according to the main ecological problems listed as priorities in the Estonian National Environmental Strategy

^c – according to the main environmental policy goals listed in the Estonian National Environmental Strategy

The study allows to draw the following conclusions as of the relations between Estonia and international environmental regimes (Paper I):

1. Estonia has been active and open for international environmental collaboration, proving this by the relatively quick accession to international environmental regimes. By the end of 2002, Estonia had ratified or acceded to 33 environment-related conventions, protocols or other multilateral legal instruments, thus becoming part of the most important global and regional international environmental regimes, like biodiversity protection regime, climate regime, ozone protection regime, nuclear emergencies and radiation protection regimes, air and international waters protection regimes.

2. Estonia has been active and open for international environmental collaboration, proving this by the relatively quick accession to international environmental regimes. By the end of 2002, Estonia had ratified or acceded to 33 environment-related conventions, protocols or other multilateral legal instruments, thus becoming part of the most important global and regional international environmental regimes, like biodiversity protection regime, climate regime, ozone protection regime, nuclear emergencies and radiation protection regimes, air and international waters protection regimes.
3. Estonia has first joined preventive international regional and global regimes (e.g. biodiversity protection, climate change, nuclear safety), while regimes, which could be seen as more beneficial from the point of view of solving her own environmental problems, came on the agenda next. As a rule, Estonia first joined preventive regimes, which contain less stringent qualitative obligations, however, being more important from the point of view of broader ecological security. As a rule, accession to the conventions and protocols with more rigid quantified objectives has started not earlier than in 1996, *i.e.* in the period of economic growth. This, on the one hand, indicates the rigidity of these legal instruments, but on the other points out the policy of Estonia to use these legal instruments as tools for promoting the principles of sustainable development by “greening” economic development, as well as her wish to maintain emission trends, which are expected to grow in the stage of expected rapid economic development, under control.
4. Participation in the most of the, but not in all, international environmental regimes and related international legal instruments has been beneficial to a large extent as far as alleviation of Estonia’s main ecological problems is concerned. This has also contributed towards reaching the priority policy goals set in the National Environmental Strategy.
5. International environmental regimes have contributed to the improvement of the state of the environment in Estonia mainly by setting paths for and supporting financially the development of policies in the relevant sectors, but not by providing finances into investment projects. The following policy documents, aimed at the implementation of respective environmental conventions have been drafted and adopted in Estonia: the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan has been elaborated in 1999, the National Programme for the Implementation of the Basel Convention for the years 2000–2005 has been approved in 1999, the National Programme on Phasing out the Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer for the years 1999–2002 has been approved in 1999, and the climate change mitigation programme is expected to be elaborated in the year 2003. For the implementation of the requirements set by conventions dealing with nuclear issues, a new institution – the Estonian Radiation Protection Centre – was established in 1996.
6. International environmental regimes have been beneficial in raising public awareness about regional and global environmental problems, in setting legal ground for the “import” of environmentally-friendly technologies and in supporting the inflow of international know-how into relevant areas.
7. The Baltic Sea protection regime, concentrated around the Helsinki (1974/1992) Convention, is aimed at taking specific actions to improve the state of the marine environment of the heavily polluted Baltic Sea and to protect its living resources. This convention can be seen as the most important for Estonia. Actions towards the protection of the Baltic Sea and improvement of wastewater treatment in that relation began before the ratification of the Helsinki (1974/1992) Convention. This can be explained by the fact that Estonian experts were involved in the activities of Helcom already before the restoration of independence.
8. There is no clear link between the official accession to international environmental conventions and improvement of the state of the environment in the respective areas. Positive environmental trends have started before the elaboration of explicit environmental policies as well as before joining respective international regimes. These trends are rather influenced by economic developments than requirements of the international environmental conventions.
9. The know-how and experience acquired through the international environmental regimes has created a fruitful ground for taking the next steps in developing environmental policy of Estonia – taking over environmental norms and standards of the European Union. Active and early accession to the conventions can be seen as beneficial from the point of view of building necessary capacity to deal with new environmental issues or tackle existing problems from different angles, establishing contacts with international society, to which the EU and its member states have been members for a long time.

4.2. BILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION

The summary of the main findings as of the relevance of urgent ecological problems, that are best suited to be dealt with in bilateral settings, and influence of members of international environmental society (*i.e.* international environmental regimes or individual state-actors of international society) to the formation and maintenance of Estonia's bilateral environmental cooperation regimes are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The relevance of ecological problems and international environmental regimes to the formation and maintenance of Estonia's bilateral environmental cooperation.

“Direction”	Form of cooperation	Relevance of eco-logical problems	Relevance of inter-national environ-mental regimes	Other main contributing factors
Western direction	(1) Bilateral agreements; (2) Regular meetings; (3) Joint commissions/ working groups/ coordinators	(1) Shared natural resources (<i>e.g.</i> the Gulf of Finland); (2) Transboundary externalities	“Channel” of inflow of know-how and information about the form and substance of international environmental cooperation	(1) Openness of Estonia and her political priority of reintegration into the “Western world” (2) Financial benefits
Southern direction	(1) Bilateral agreements; (2) Regular meetings	No urgent eco-logical problems	(1) Basel (1989) convention; (2) Espoo (1991) convention; (3) Rio de Janeiro (1992) convention; (4) donor countries financing the Baltic Environmental Forum	Similar political goals and problems
Eastern direction	(1) Bilateral agreements; (2) Regular meetings; (3) Joint commissions	Shared natural resource – the Lake Peipsi	(1) Helsinki (1992) convention on trans-boundary waters; (2) donor countries and organisations financing activities of civil society in the Lake Peipsi region	(1) negative political attitude on state level; (2) active multi-national epistemic community

In addition to the general findings presented in Table 2, particular characteristic features of bilateral cooperation regimes in all the three directions are presented below (Papers II, III, IV).

4.2.1. Bilateral cooperation in the Western direction

1. Establishment of bilateral environmental cooperation regimes with Western, and in particular, with the Nordic countries started right after regaining Estonia's independence in the end of 1991. Signed bilateral agreements can be characterized as international regime-like arrangements. Parties to these arrangements bind themselves voluntarily to certain common interests and values. They conceive themselves to be bound by agreed common set of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures in their relations with each another. Cooperation arrangements with a specific country are based on international legal instruments – bilateral agreements - and contain agreed behavioural principles as well as specified issue-areas of mutual interest.
2. This cooperation is well institutionalized and active. Since August 1991 until the end of 2002, Estonia has signed 27 bilateral intergovernmental agreements in the field of environmental protection, 20 of them with Western and Central European countries, and mainly with the Nordic countries. In all the cases countries have first signed the so-called framework agreements, which set general goals as well as rules of cooperation. Later, these general agreements have then been complemented by more specific agreements dealing with different environmental media, like air, water, hazardous wastes, oil-spills, radiation protection and climate change.
3. Bilateral cooperation with Western countries is concentrated on (1) shared natural resources, mainly the Baltic Sea and especially the Gulf of Finland, and (2) transboundary externalities. Improvement of ecological situation in Estonia owes mainly to the cooperation with Western countries.
4. Since cooperation in the Western direction started at the earliest possible time and has been the most beneficial from the point of view of improving the state of the environment in Estonia, it has served as an example and path setting for elaboration of cooperation patterns with Estonia's Southern and Eastern neighbours as well.
5. Western cooperation has been the most rational and beneficial for Estonia. Major benefits of bilateral environmental cooperation for Estonia in the Western direction can be grouped into three broad groups: (1) financial benefits, *i.e.* financial assistance provided by donor countries to improve the state of the environment in Estonia. Bilateral investments, especially by the Nordic countries in the 1990s, their participation in more than 300 environmental projects has been the main channel of international finances and know-how to the Estonian environmental sector; (2) political benefits, *i.e.* assistance to

Estonia to support it with know-how in drafting its main policy documents as well as assistance to prepare Estonia for and successfully carry on the accession negotiations with the European Union in environmental sector; (3) assisting Estonia to be engaged in regional and global efforts to deal, besides its own problems, also with emerging regional and global environmental issues.

6. Estonia has been very successful in her efforts to attract foreign financial resources from Western donors into her environmental sector. The biggest bilateral donors are the European Union, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany and Norway. The most outstanding investment projects implemented in Estonia with foreign assistance are dealing, among others, with renovation of the wastewater treatment plants in bigger towns as well as in smaller municipalities, drinking water supply projects and waste management activities, including also hazardous and radioactive waste, all over Estonia. Other, softer forms of assistance have substantially contributed to, among others, the better management of nature conservation, raising of public awareness in environmental matters, implementation of the principles of integrated pollution prevention and control in enterprises, implementation of other preventive environmental protection management schemes, techniques and tools at all levels of society.
7. International know-how acquired mainly through the “Environment for Europe” process has led to the elaboration of the Estonian National Environmental Strategy and Action Plans, which in turn has paved the way towards the next steps in the Estonian environmental policy – taking over the EU environmental *acquis*.
8. The experience acquired through bilateral and multilateral cooperation with individual members of international environmental society has created a fruitful ground for moving further in developing environmental policy of Estonia towards her present priority goal – taking over the environmental norms and standards of the European Union. In the process of accession negotiations to the EU, experience gained in bilateral cooperation with Western countries as well as personal contacts, have been of great importance. The projects designed primarily for raising the awareness and institutional capacities of the candidate countries to cope with the EU’s environmental *acquis*, have to a large extent been implemented in Estonia with the involvement of experts from the Nordic countries.

4.2.2. Bilateral cooperation in the Southern direction

1. Since the formal restoration of independence at the end of 1991, the three Baltic countries – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – have successfully built up an active cooperation regime in the field of environmental protection. Such a regular and active cooperation between the three Baltic countries has not sprung merely from their own interests. Formation and maintenance of the trilateral cooperation in the field of environmental protection has rather been a result of the existence and influence of international regimes as well as individual members of international society.
2. Estonia has signed 5 bilateral intergovernmental agreements in the field of environmental protection with Latvia and Lithuania. As in the case of Western cooperation, countries have first signed the so-called framework agreements, complemented later by more specific agreements dealing with different environmental sectors. The format of bi- and trilateral agreements resembles both in form and substance those, signed with the Nordic countries and Germany, and often follows explicit and implicit norms, rules and decision making procedures introduced by various international environmental regimes, accepted globally within the international ecological society.
3. There are no urgent common “Baltic environmental problems” which need common actions by environmental authorities of the Baltic countries. Similarity of priority environmental problems and policy goals allows to look at the Baltic countries as competitors. It would be rational, in financial terms, to spend the very limited resources of the Baltic Governments on the promotion of friendly relations with possible donor countries, international organizations and international regimes in order to improve the state of their environment by attracting additional foreign financial means. Spending resources on “unnecessary” trilateral activities can be seen as waste of scarce resources.
4. Cooperative international regime-like arrangements between Estonia and other Baltic countries have emerged mainly in areas where environmental problems could not be identified at the time of creation of cooperative arrangements. The common factor in all the cases have been the interest and presence of either particular members of international society or an international environmental regime, governing a specific issue in international relations. This suggests that the normative social institutions have had an identifiable formative impact on the behavioural paths of the new members on the international environmental scene – the three Baltic countries.
5. The normative environmental cooperation between Estonia and other Baltic countries has emerged only in cases when the presence of one or more members of international society or influence of international environmental regimes can be identified: (1) Estonian-Lithuanian agreement on hazardous wastes, signed in 1996, can be seen as based on/prescribed by the Basel (1989) Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal; (2) Agreement

between Estonia and Latvia on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, signed in 1997 can be seen as prescribed by the Espoo (1991) Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context; (3) Agreement between Estonia and Latvia on the Management of Nature Conservation in Transboundary Context, signed in 2000, also largely relies on the principles laid down by international biodiversity regimes, especially the Rio de Janeiro (1992) Biodiversity Convention and the Ramsar (1971) Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat.

6. There are no officially recognized common Baltic environmental problems, which necessarily need to be solved in common trilateral actions. However, day-to-day technical cooperation is very active. The Baltic environmental regime can, therefore, be seen as facilitated by members of international society, in particular, by actors sponsoring device, designed to promote environmental cooperation between the three Baltic countries, the Baltic Environmental Forum (BEF) – Germany, the EU, Sweden and Finland.
7. No cooperation, however, could have emerged and been sustained if the actors concerned had not been interested in it at all, seeing no benefits from collective actions. Besides the acknowledgement of the importance of the exchange of information and preparation of contacts for possible future joint actions, notwithstanding whether these contacts are facilitated or even imposed by the outside actors, an other explanation can be drawn. It suggests that the Baltic States have identified themselves as belonging to an international ecological society of states, *i.e.* they are conscious of certain common environmental interests and values, and they conceive themselves to be bound by these values and related sets of rules of behaviour. The Baltic countries have acknowledged this and their sub-regional cooperation can be explained as (1) learning to use the basic principles of international environmental relations in a relatively safe environment – possible mistakes can not be punished by other actors of similar importance and level of (un)experience; and (2) demonstration of their readiness to belong to the international society, demonstration to both themselves as well as to the other members of “international environmental family”.

4.2.3. Bilateral cooperation in the Eastern direction

1. Bilateral environmental cooperation regime with the Russian Federation is based on two intergovernmental agreements, first the framework agreement and the second, a specific agreement on the protection and sustainable use of transboundary waters. Bilateral environmental cooperation regime has turned into reality despite of the different cultural background, size and political goals of the two countries, which due to historical reasons have a suspicious or even hostile attitude towards each other.
2. Negotiations to conclude bilateral framework agreements on cooperation in the field of environmental protection with the western countries – Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany – as well as with the Central and Eastern European countries – Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary - have not taken more than one year. Unusually long time-period from the beginning of negotiations of bilateral Estonian – Russian framework agreement until its signing (1991–1996) indicates, on the one hand, the low priority, and on the other, inexperience and unwillingness of both the countries to adapt quickly to changed political circumstances. Estonia’s inability to develop bilateral cooperation with the Russian Federation quickly can be explained on the one hand as unwillingness and mistrust to deal with the partner, which is seen as the successor of the occupying country – the Soviet Union. On the other hand, since Estonia’s overwhelming priority in the 1990s has been re-establishment of her direct contacts with the western world, the lack of interest as well as scarce resources – both financial and institutional – have not allowed her to be active in parallel also in the Eastern direction. Relatively inactive behaviour of the Russian Federation can be explained by the difficulty to accept the changed political reality in dealing with its former “Soviet Republic” even in such an area of “low politics” as environmental protection.
3. The real interest and driving force for bilateral environmental cooperation is the shared natural resource – the Lake Peipsi (the largest international lake in Europe), its watershed and related ecological as well as economic benefits.
4. The efforts of epistemic community, which has arisen around the concern about the worsening of ecological conditions of the lake, have played a vital role in the establishment and maintenance of the cooperative regime on the protection and sustainable use of transboundary waters between Estonia and the Russian Federation. In the phase of establishment of bilateral environmental cooperation regime, the epistemic community has provided scientific evidence about the urgency of the problem, appealed to authorities not to delay the process, and proposed models for the joint management of the lake. After official establishment of bilateral Lake Peipsi protection regime in 1997, the epistemic community has influenced different stages of policy process aimed at successful maintenance of the established international regime. It has been most beneficial in the phases of policy innovation and diffusion, as well as in advocating the merits of the established regime.

5. Members of international environmental society – bilateral donor countries, environmental conventions and international environmental organisations – have actively, but indirectly, encouraged the establishment and maintenance of Estonian-Russian bilateral environmental cooperation regime by supporting the actions of the core institutions of the Lake Peipsi epistemic community.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. Results of the thesis allow to suggest an identifiable impact of international social institutions governing regional and global environmental protection on development and maintenance of Estonia's international environmental cooperation. Knowledge about functioning of international environmental society and its main actors has been channeled to Estonia through the Nordic countries.
2. Formation and successful implementation of environmental policy in Estonia was and still is largely dependent on the influence of the members of international society and international environmental regimes. The know-how and financial assistance from international society have significantly contributed to the alleviation of environmental problems in Estonia. However, besides regulating issue-areas, for which they have been created, international environmental regimes have also had a "side-effect" in Estonia: they have served as an example and driving force for setting behavioural path for the general international environmental cooperation. Estonia's bilateral environmental cooperation is based on international regime-like arrangements. Parties to these arrangements bind themselves voluntarily to certain common interests and values and they conceive themselves to be bound by agreed common set of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures in their relations with each other.
3. Urgent ecological problems alone, which need bilateral actions to be taken by neighbouring countries, has not always been a sufficient factor for developing bilateral cooperation regimes. However, the presence of either international environmental regimes or individual state-actors of international society, has facilitated the formation of formal bilateral cooperation regimes. Bilateral cooperative arrangements have in some cases emerged also in the areas with no urgent ecological problems and, therefore, establishment and maintenance of international regime-like cooperative arrangements can be attributed to the formative effect of international environmental regimes rather than the existence of urgent ecological problems, on the behaviour of Estonia in developing her international environmental cooperation.
4. Environmental cooperation in the Western direction is on the one hand based on existing ecological problems which need common actions and on the other hand, on influences of international environmental society. Improvement of the state of the environment in Estonia owes mainly to the cooperation with the Western, and especially with the Nordic countries.
5. Environmental cooperation in the Southern direction is not based on existing or anticipated bilateral ecological problems needing common actions. Nevertheless, the cooperation regime is very active and results of the study allow to attribute it mainly to the formative effect of international environmental regimes.
6. Environmental cooperation in the Eastern direction is based on an existing urgent ecological problem. This problem alone has, however, not been a sufficient driving force for developing successful bilateral cooperative regime, since overall political relations between the two countries have not been friendly. However, the influence of the members of international environmental society together with the existence of a large ecologically and economically valuable shared natural resource of broader international importance, together with an active knowledge-oriented group, which is ready to engage in policy mission for the sake of this natural resource – the epistemic community, have played a vital role in the emergence and maintenance of cooperation between the two state actors.
7. Based on the results of the study, some suggestions how to develop further Estonia's international environmental cooperation becoming the member of the European Union, can be drawn: (1) Experience gained during the first phases of developing Estonia's international environmental cooperation, should allow her to adapt quickly to the work within the European Union. This on the one hand should increase further the financial assistance flow to deal with Estonia's ecological problems, and on the other increases also Estonia's potential in participating in alleviation of regional and global ecological problems; (2) less attention

should be paid to environmental cooperation on Southern direction; and (3) considering the unique experience, Estonia has acquired in establishing her environmental relations with the Russian Federation, opportunity arises for Estonia to act within the European Union as one of few countries, able to lead successful environmental negotiations with the Russian Federation, raising thus, among others, also chances to deal more efficiently with ecological problems of the Lake Peipsi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Jaan-Mati Punning, supervisor of my thesis, for his support and advice, and for keeping me on a right track.

I am also grateful to my colleagues at the Ministry of the Environment for their understanding, patience and practical assistance.

Most of my thanks belong to Mairit for continuous support, valuable suggestions, insightful discussions and all other actions appropriate to a married lady as well as to my son Kalju for tolerating his sometimes sulky father and for being an excellent kind of successor.

And finally, I would express my appreciation to the marvellous coffeshops and wonderful green parks surrounding the Old Town of Tallinn, where I structured my thoughts as well as to the Sun for often accompanying me during my wanderings.

EESTI RAHVUSVAHELISE KESKKONNAKAITSELISE KOOSTÖÖ TEKKE JA ARENGU TEGURID 1990. AASTATEL

Kokkuvõte

Dissertatsioonis uuritakse väikese riigi seisukohalt rahvusvahelist keskkonnakaitset suunavat sotsiaalset reaalsust, lähtudes ökoloogiliste probleemide ja nende lahendamiseks ette võetud poliitiliste sammude analüüsist. Töös käsitletakse esimest korda tegureid, mis mõjutasid Eesti keskkonnapoliitika ühe olulisima koostisosa – rahvusvahelise keskkonnakaitse koostöö – teket ja arengut 1990. aastatel, st vahetult pärast taasiseseisvumist. Eesmärgiks on seatud analüüsida ühest küljest olemasolevate ökoloogiliste probleemide ja teisest küljest rahvusvaheliste keskkonnakaitse režiimide mõju Eesti keskkonnapoliitika kujunemisele. Töös uuritakse ka, kuivõrd on senine rahvusvaheline keskkonnakaitse koostöö olnud Eesti ökoloogiliste probleemidega tegelemise seisukohalt kasulik ja mida võiks Eesti tulevikus Euroopa Liidu liikmesriigina oma keskkonnapoliitika planeerimisel arvestada, lähtudes vajadusest liikuda edasi säästva arengu teel. Lähtudes globaalsete, regionaalsete ja kohalike ökoloogiliste probleemidega tegelemise eripäradest, vaadeldakse töös eraldi Eesti rahvusvahelist koostööd neljas suunas: 1) koostöö ülemaailmsete ja piirkondlike rahvusvaheliste keskkonnakaitse režiimidega; 2) kahepoolne keskkonnakaitse koostöö läänesuunal, st koostöö lääneriikidega ja eriti Põhjamaadega; 3) kahepoolne keskkonnakaitse koostöö lõunasuunal, st koostöö teiste Balti riikidega, ja 4) kahepoolne keskkonnakaitse koostöö idasuunal, st koostöö Vene Föderatsiooniga.

Tehtud uuringu põhjal võib järeldada, et rahvusvahelisel koostööl on olnud oluline osa Eesti keskkonnaseisundi paranemisel 1990. aastatel, seda eriti tänu koostööle Põhjamaadega ja rahvusvaheliste keskkonnakaitse režiimidega. Keskkonnakaitse koostöö lõuna- ja idasuunal on samuti edukalt välja kujundatud ja sarnaneb vormilt läänesuunalise koostööga. Samas ei ole koostöö tekke juures mitte alati mänginud võtmerolli vajadus tegeleda mõne olemasoleva ökoloogilise probleemiga, küll on aga alati eduka kahepoolse koostöörežiimi tekke puhul täheldatav kas mõne rahvusvahelise keskkonnakaitse režiimi või välisriigi mõju. See lubab väita, et ehkki ühest küljest arvestab rahvusvaheline koostöö oluliselt Eesti prioriteetsetele keskkonnaprobleemidele lahenduste otsimise vajadusega, oli Eesti kahepoolse keskkonnakaitse koostöö tekke ja arengu põhiliseks mõjutajaks 1990. aastatel rahvusvahelist keskkonnakaitset suunavate sotsiaalsete institutsioonide otsene ja kaudne mõju.

REFERENCES

- Adler, E., Haas, P. M. 1992. Conclusion: epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program. *International Organization*, Winter 1992 Vol. 46, Number 1, pp. 367–390.
- Adler, E. 1997. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3 (3), pp. 319–363.
- Bernauer, T. 1997. Managing International Rivers. In: Young, O. (ed.). *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. 155–196.
- Breitmeier, H., Rittberger, V. 2000. Environmental NGOs in an Emerging Global Civil Society. In Chasek, P. S. (ed.). *The Global Environment in the Twenty-First Century: Prospects for International Cooperation*. Tokyo, NY, Paris: United Nations University Press, pp. 130–163.
- Bryant, R., Bailey, S. 1997. *Third World Political Ecology*. London: Routledge.
- Bull, H. 1995. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S. 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publ.
- Estonian National Environmental Strategy*. 1997. Tallinn: Tallinna Raamatutrükikoda.
- Estonian National Environmental Action Plan*. 1998. Tallinn: Tallinna Raamatutrükikoda.
- Estonian National Environmental Action Plan 2001–2003*. Tallinn, 2001. Paar Ltd.
- Forsyth, T. 2003. *Critical Political Ecology: The Politics of Environmental Science*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Global Environment Outlook 2000*. London: UNEP, Earthscan Publ.
- Haas, P. M. 1992. Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, Winter 1992 Vol. 46, Number 1, p. 3.
- Haas, P. M. 1992. Banning chlorofluorocarbons: epistemic community efforts to protect stratospheric ozone. *International Organization*, Winter 1992, Vol. 46, Number 1, pp. 187–224.
- Haas, P. M. 1995. Epistemic Communities and the Dynamics of International Environmental Co-operation. In: Rittberger, Volker and Mayer, Peter (eds.). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hasenclever, A., Mayer, P., Rittberger, V. 1997. *Theories of International Regimes*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. 1984. *After Hegemony. Co-operation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. 1995. The Analysis of International Regimes: Towards a European-American Research Programme. In: Rittberger, V. Research on International Regimes in Germany: The Adaptive Internalization of an American Social Science Concept. In: Rittberger, V. and Mayer, P. (eds.). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Keskkond 2000. Environment*. Statistical Office of Estonia. Tallinn, 2001. Ofset OÜ.
- Krasner, S. D. (ed.) 1983. *International Regimes*. New York: Ithaca.
- Kratovits, A., Punning, J.-M. 2001. The Driving Forces of the Formation of Environmental Policy of the Baltic Countries. *AMBIO*, 30, 7, 443–449.
- Kratovits, A. 2001. Role of International Regimes in the Formation and Maintenance of the Baltic Environmental Cooperation. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, Vol. XXIII, Fall 2001, pp. 289–307.
- Kratovits, A. 2002. “Driving Forces of the Emergence and Maintenance of Estonian-Russian Bilateral Environmental Cooperation Regime in the 1990s”. *TRAMES*, No. 2, Vol. 6(56/51), pp. 173–191.
- Kratovits, A., Punning, J.-M. 2002. Bilateral Environmental Cooperation in 1991–2001 and its Role in the Improvement of the Ecological Situation in Estonia. *International Journal of Environment and Pollution*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 138–148.
- List, M. 1990. Cleaning up the Baltic: A Case Study in East-West Environmental Cooperation. In: Rittberger, V. (ed.). *International Regimes in East-West Politics*. London and New York: Pinter Publishers.
- List, M., Rittberger, V. 1992. Regime Theory and International Environmental Management. In: Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, B. *The International Politics of the Environment*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mayer, P.; Rittberger, V. and Zürn, M. 1995. Regime Theory: State of the Art and Perspectives. In Rittberger, V. and Mayer, P. (ed-s.). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MoE, 2003 – the web page of Estonian Ministry of the Environment: <http://www.envir.ee>
- Peterson, M. J. 1992. Whalers, cetologists, environmentalists and the international management of whaling. *International Organization*, Winter 1992 Vol. 46, Number 1, pp. 147–186.

- Rittberger, V. 1995. Research on International Regimes in Germany: The Adaptive Internalization of an American Social Science Concept. In: Rittberger, V. and Mayer, P. (eds.). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rittberger, V. 2000. NGOs and Global Environmental Governance: Introduction. In: Chasek, P. S. (ed.). *The Global Environment in the Twenty-First Century: Prospects for International Cooperation*. Tokyo, NY, Paris: United Nations University Press, pp. 83–86.
- Silverman, D. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publ.
- State of Environment in Estonia on the Threshold of XXI Century*. 2000. Estonian Environmental Information Centre. Tallinn: OÜ Mansfield.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. 2001. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. SAGE Publications.
- Valiante, M., Muldoon, P., Botts, L. 1997. Ecosystem Governance: Lessons from the Great Lakes. In: Young, O. (ed.). *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. 197–224.
- Vogler, J. 1993. Regimes and the Global Commons: Space, Atmosphere and Oceans. In: McGrew, A. G., Lewis, P. G. et al. *Global Politics*. Polity Press.
- Wapner, P. 1997. Politics beyond the State: Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics. *World Politics* 1995, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 311–340, referred to in: Young, O. (ed.) (1997). *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, p. 281.
- Wapner, P. 2000. The Transnational Politics of Environmental NGOs: Governmental, Economic and Social Activism. In: Chasek, P. S. (ed.). *The Global Environment in the Twenty-First Century: Prospects for International Cooperation*. Tokyo, NY, Paris: United Nations University Press, pp. 87–108.
- Wilkening, K., Hippel, D., Hayes, P. 2000. Sustainable Energy in a Developing World: the Role of Knowledgeable Markets. In: Chasek, P. S. (ed.). *The Global Environment in the Twenty-First Century: Prospects for International Cooperation*. Tokyo, NY, Paris: United Nations University Press, pp. 193–194.
- Wæver, O. 1997. Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons Instead of Paradigms. In: Neumann, I. B. and Wæver, O. *The Future of International Relations. Masters in the Making?* London and New York: Routledge.
- Young, O. 1997. (ed.). *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Zürn, M. 1998. The Rise of International Environmental Politics: A Review of Current Research. *World Politics* 1998, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 617–649.

ANNEX I

List of environmental conventions in force in Estonia (1991–2002)

- 1) Basel (1989) Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal (ratified on May 14th, 1992);
- 2) Bern (1979) Convention on Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (entered into force on August 3rd, 1992);
- 3) London (1973) Convention on Prevention of Pollution from Ships (entered into force on March 16th, 1992) and its supplementary protocol (MARPOL 1973/78) and Annexes I–V (Annexes I and II entered into force on March 16th, 1992, Annexes III–V on November 18th, 1992);
- 4) Gdansk (1973) Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources in the Baltic Sea and the Belts (rat. on February 10th, 1993);
- 5) Ottawa (1978) Convention on Future Multilateral Co-operation in the North-West Atlantic Fisheries (rat. on Feb. 10th, 1993).
- 6) Copenhagen (1964) Convention on International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (rat. on Feb. 10th, 1993),
- 7) Brussels (1969) Convention on Civil Liability for Oil-pollution Damage (entered into force on March 1st, 1993);
- 8) Brussels (1971) Convention on Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil-pollution Damage (entered into force on March 1st, 1993);
- 9) Ramsar (1971) Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (rat. on October 20th, 1993);

- 10) Washington (1973) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (rat. on Oct. 20th, 1993);
- 11) Vienna (1963) Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damages (rat. on April 6th, 1994);
- 12) Vienna (1979) Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (rat. on April 6th, 1994);
- 13) Vienna (1986) Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (rat. on April 6th, 1994);
- 14) Vienna (1986) Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (rat. on April 6th, 1994);
- 15) Joint protocol (1988) relating to the application of the Vienna Convention and the Paris Convention (rat. on April 6th, 1994);
- 16) Rio de Janeiro (1992) Convention on Biodiversity (rat. on May 11th, 1994);
- 17) New York (1992) UN Framework Convention on Climate Changes (rat. on May 11th, 1994).
- 18) Helsinki (1992) Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (rat. on April 19th, 1995);
- 19) Helsinki (1992) Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (rat. on May 3rd, 1995);
- 20) Vienna (1985) Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (rat. on September 11th, 1996);
- 21) Montreal (1987) Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (rat. on September 1st, 1996);
- 22) London (1990) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol (rat. on January 27th, 1999);
- 23) Copenhagen (1992) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol (rat. on January 27th, 1999);
- 24) Helsinki (1992) Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (rat. on March 9th, 2000);
- 25) Geneva (1979) Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP) (rat. on January 19th, 2000);
- 26) Helsinki (1985) Protocol to the LRTAP on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent (rat. on January 19th, 2000);
- 27) Sofia (1988) Protocol to the LRTAP concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes (rat. on January 19th, 2000);
- 28) Geneva (1991) Protocol to the LRTAP concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes (rat. on January 19th, 2000);
- 29) Espoo (1991) Convention on Environment Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (rat. on November 15th, 2000);
- 30) Geneva (1984) Protocol to the LRTAP on Long-term Financing of the Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) (rat. on December 21st, 2000);
- 31) Århus (1998) Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (rat. on June 6th, 2001);
- 32) Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Changes (rat. on September 3rd, 2002);
- 33) Montreal (1997) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol (rat. on October 23rd, 2002).

ANNEX II

List of bilateral environmental agreements, signed since September 1991

- 1) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environment of the Kingdom of Denmark on cooperation in the field of environmental protection. September 2nd, 1991 (Copenhagen);
- 2) Agreement between the Republic of Estonia and the Republic of Finland on environmental cooperation. November 7th, 1991 (Helsinki);
- 3) Agreement between the Republic of Estonia and the Kingdom of Sweden on cooperation in the field of environment. March 30th, 1992 (Stockholm);
- 4) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environment, Nature Protection and Reactor Safety of the German Federal Republic on cooperation on environmental protection. May 25th, 1992 (Düsseldorf);

- 5) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on air protection. July 2nd, 1993 (Tallinn);
- 6) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on water protection. July 2nd, 1993 (Tallinn);
- 7) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on Cooperation in the field of combatting oil spills. December 8th, 1993 (Helsinki);
- 8) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Latvia on cooperation in the field of environmental protection. February 18th, 1994 (Riga);
- 9) Agreement between the Ministry of Environment of Estonia and the Minister of Environmental Protection, National Resources and Forestry of Poland on cooperation in the field of environment protection. June 28th, 1995 (Warsaw);
- 10) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia, the Government of the Republic of Latvia and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on cooperation in the field of environmental protection. July 21st, 1995 (Tallinn);
- 11) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of Estonia and the Ministry of Interior of Denmark on co-operation and technical assistance in the field of nuclear emergency preparedness and response including radiation protection. November 3rd, 1995 (Tallinn);
- 12) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Russian Federation on cooperation in the field of environment. January 11th, 1996 (Pskov);
- 13) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environmental Protection of the Republic of Lithuania on the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes between Estonia and Lithuania. March 22nd, 1996 (Tallinn);
- 14) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Latvia on environmental impact assessment in a transboundary context. March 14th, 1997 (Pärnu);
- 15) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Russian Federation on cooperation in the field of protection and sustainable use of transboundary watercourses. August 20th, 1997 (Moscow);
- 16) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of Estonia and the Ministry of Interior of Denmark on co-operation and technical assistance in the field of nuclear safety, radiation protection and nuclear emergency preparedness and response. January 14th, 1998 (Tallinn);
- 17) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden on cooperation on activities implemented jointly. March 16th, 1998/June 10th, 1998;
- 18) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on water protection, February 12th, 1999 (Tallinn);
- 19) Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Finland (Activities Implemented Jointly), February 12th, 1999 (Tallinn);
- 20) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia on management of nature conservation in transboundary context. January 27th, 2000 (Tallinn);
- 21) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Hungary on environmental and nature protection. June 19th, 2000 (Szentendre);
- 22) Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Estonia concerning the participation of the Republic of Estonia to the European Environment Agency and the European Environment Information and Observation Network. October 9th, 2000 (Brussel);
- 23) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on environmental impact assessment in a transboundary context. February 21st, 2002 (Helsinki);
- 24) Declaration by the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environment of the Land of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern on co-operation in the fields of environmental and nature protection. March 12th, 2002 (Castle Granitz/Binz);
- 25) Memorandum of Understanding between the European Community and the Republic of Estonia on Estonia's participation in the Community action programme promoting non-governmental organisations primarily active in the field of environmental protection. September 27th, 2002 (Brussel);
- 26) Agreement between the Ministry of the Environment of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine on cooperation in the field of environmental protection. October 14th, 2002 (Kiev);
- 27) Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on joint implementation of emission reductions of greenhouse gases. December 17th, 2002 (Tallinn).