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Foreword

The Nordic Forum for Security Policy, coordinated by the Finnish Committee for European Security (STETE), organized a conference *Models for Cross-border Co-operation – Focus on the Pskov Region* in Pskov, Northwest Russia, in May 2006. This broad-based discussion forum continued the series of conferences organised by the Nordic Forum in different parts of the Baltic Sea Rim. It was held in cooperation with local partners, the NGO Chudskoe Project, Pskov and CIRP, St Petersburg.

The purpose of the Pskov conference was to support the stability and democratic development of the Baltic Sea region. The project was considered crucial for developing broad security, economic development and civil society collaboration. The border between the EU and Russia is a challenging one where closer international co-operation and dialogue is needed for the stability and security of the whole Baltic Sea region.

The Nordic Forum for Security Policy has been particularly interested in spreading a wider notion of security. The participants at its conferences and seminars represent institutions and organisations that are very different from one another. This diversity of participants and collaborators creates a fruitful basis not only for the conferences but also for common future work. The Pskov conference with over 150 participants was a good example of this endeavour.

Sinikka Hurskainen, STETE’s Chair
Introduction
Pskov: a concrete focus for cross-border cooperation

GUNNAR LASSINANTTI
SPECIAL ADVISER, THE OLOF PALME INTERNATIONAL CENTRE

The conference in Pskov was the eighth in a series of bigger conferences co-organized by the Nordic Forum for Security Policy. The conference gathered about 150 participants from 11 countries and some international organizations, including the Council of Baltic Sea States, CBSS. The main themes of the conference were the Northern Dimension, good neighbourly relations, the situation in the Pskov region, political perspectives and every day life at the borders, concrete cross-border cases and in three parallel workshops business cooperation, environmental safety and human security.

After the end of the Cold War, when it was no longer taboo to discuss security policy matters within the framework of the official bodies of the Nordic cooperation – the Council and the Council of Ministers – we decided to reorganize our Nordic Forum to become a leading platform for an extended security dialogue between the Nordic region and what we called at that time “our new neighbours east and south of the Baltic Sea”.

Additionally, in the early 1990s we organized several smaller seminars on topics like The New Europe and the Baltic Sea Region after the end of the Cold War, Russian-Baltic Relations and Nuclear Tests and Wastes.

Our first broad-based dialogue conference was held in Lohusalu, outside Tallinn, in November 1991, and brought together participants from several countries and international organizations. The participants of the Lohusalu conference were the first bigger international group to be invited to visit the then still existing Soviet Naval Base Paldiski, roughly one month before the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Including the Pskov Conference the Nordic Forum for Security Policy have gathered about 2,000 participants to our eight conferences from the Baltic Sea States, other countries and international organizations, including ministers, parliamentarians, diplomats, experts and researchers, NGOs and journalists.
The conferences have been carried out in Estonia, Lithuania and Poland, and four of them have been located in Russia, namely 1996 in St. Petersburg – where at that time Deputy Mayor Vladimir Putin was our host – 2001 in Kaliningrad, 2003 in Murmansk and this year in Pskov. Thus, over the time we have focused more and more on dialogue with North-West Russia.

From the start we defined security in the broadest sense of the concept, reflecting both ‘hard’ military security aspects and ‘soft’ civil security aspects. In fact, we have gradually toned down the importance of military security from the earliest conferences until today, also due to the disappearance of previously existing military threats in our part of the world. We have turned from confrontation to cooperation perspectives.

Our earliest conferences expressed hopes, dreams, visions and some preliminary ideas for the post–cold war cooperation. Today, we are much more concrete and focused on particular topical areas and projects in our discussions.

The Baltic Sea Region is regarded as the most dynamic region for cross-border economic and trade cooperation in the whole of Europe. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Johan Gahr Støre, has described the northern region – and particularly the Barents Euro-Arctic Region – as the New Energy Region of Europe, because of the localization here of huge oil and gas resources.

I think we are all happy to share President Putin’s optimistic views concerning economic growth and forecasts of improvements of the Russian population’s socio-economic conditions. I remember from several visits to Russia the hard times of the 1990s, when salaries and pensions were not paid for long periods due to the economic and financial crises. These improvements are also in the interest of the whole Baltic Sea Region, Europe and the international community.

A well-functioning, negotiating labour market, to which both employers and employees are committed, seems to bring the best results in terms of employment, the standard of life and equality. A recent study of OECD confirms this. The economic growth has been quite remarkable in countries as Denmark, Finland and Sweden.

We have stuck with the Northern Dimension, the EU and its enlargement. But we must not either forget the process of globalization, which is here to stay. In the present “flat” world, China, India and others are also neighbours with their low wages but growing potentials of high technology.

The Finnish Minister for Foreign Aid and Trade, Paula Lehtomäki, reminded us about the two prioritized partnerships of the EU’s Northern Dimension, namely the environmental partnership and the social and health partnership.
The Northern Dimension is entering a new six-year action plan from the beginning of 2007, putting a main focus on EU-North-West Russian affairs, but also involving Norway and Iceland.

There are several other cross-border networks and partnerships to be promoted in order to build a new civil Baltic Sea region from below, not from the top down. Important here are the links bringing youth and students, women, disabled and socially vulnerable people together.

The aims of Baltic Sea cooperation are to strengthen peace and stability through cross-border co-operation, democracy, human rights and the empowerment of civil societies.

I brought positive experiences from the conference back home, with just one exception: I hope when we next return to Pskov the cross-border regulations and the visa arrangements are far easier.

On behalf of all participants I would like to extend our joint thanks to the hosts and co-organizers of the Pskov conference for all what they have done for us. They are:

- Pskov Regional Administration;
- Regional Duma of Pskov;
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation – Pskov Office;
- The NGO “Lake Peipsi Project - Pskov”, conducted by Olga Vasilenko and her team – our main local partner for the conference;
- Center for International and Regional Politics, CIRP of St. Petersburg;
- Konrad Adenauer Foundation’s Office in St Petersburg.

Thanks also to the sponsors of the conference. They are:

- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland;
- Ministry of Education of Finland;
- Ministry of Environment of Finland;
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, SIDA;
- Consulate General of Finland in St. Petersburg;
- Pskov Regional Administration;
- Institute of Inland Water Management and Waste Water Treatment, Riza, the Netherlands.

And last – but not least – I would just like to add to the list the Finnish Committee for Security Policy, STETE, which has once again, within the framework of the Nordic Forum for Security Policy, served as the main coordinator of the conference in an excellent way. Without the hard work and efforts by the whole staff of STETE it would not have been possible to set up the Pskov conference. Special thanks to the STETE project leaders.
The Northern Dimension
Raising the quality of life

Mikhail Margelov
Council of Russia

This year Russia chairs the Council of Ministers in Council of Europe. Among the tasks for this period is to promote the building of Europe without borders. Another aim is to make our relations in the framework of the Northern Dimension really neighbourly, without double standards and fruitless discussions on what values are more valuable.

The Northern Dimension is the most practical structure, if we compare it to similar ones. The simple truth is, that we need solidarity that will overcome the threats and challenges that are above nationalities. And the need for this solidarity is stronger, the more serious the challenges are.

Russia sees the main aim of the Northern Dimension as the liquidation of barriers in the North, and of new ones in the way of borders between Russia and Europe. Russia is for a European order in the Northern Dimension. This means the work of taking into account the principles of equality and the compatibility of solutions. It means taking a practical approach to projects. Russia considers that the sectoral elaborations of the Northern Dimension have such a practical approach. The work of Northern Dimension has been recognized by Russia, and it would like to spread its zone of influence to all across Russian Northern territory as far as Chukchee.
President Vladimir Putin has set the goal of making Russia a powerful country in terms of energy. The goal doesn’t look too ambitious and doesn’t mean changing relations with Europe. Russia does not belong to any of the energy importing or exporting institutions. It is therefore possible to pursue quiet and flexible energy policies. Russia promises Europe that the energy supply will remain stable despite its planned expansion to the East.

In this connection it would be a disadvantage for the countries or participants of the Northern Dimension and other countries of Eastern Europe to become a new cordon sanitaire between Russia and Old Europe. The countries of the Northern Dimension have sea terminals and their territories can be used for Russian gas and oil transit. You don’t have to follow the example of the countries of the Visegrad group, that not long ago were hypnotised by US Vice-president Richard Cheney in Vilnius.

There is another aspect of energy cooperation with Europe. In order not to become a resource appendage but to become an energy country, Russia needs structural reform in its economic sector. We need innovations for different sectors of the economy, including the energy complex. If possible, we need a programme of ‘oil for innovation’. Unfortunately, Europe has so far not done much in this direction.

The main aim of the Northern Dimension is to increase the life quality of people living on both sides of the border. That is why the setting of this Forum is Pskov, which is becoming a Russian window on Europe.
Challenges mean opportunities

PAULA LEHTOMÄKI
MINISTER FOR FOREIGN TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT, FINLAND.

The Northern Dimension has for six years been a part of the external and cross-border policies of the European Union. The establishment of the Northern Dimension policy was a natural consequence of the enlargement of the Union to the north. The then acceding countries, Finland and Sweden, wanted to make the rest of the European Union aware of the challenges and opportunities up here in the north. Many of the challenges were too big for individual countries to handle alone. The opportunities, for example in the field of trade, investments, transport and energy, would benefit not only this region, but the economy and wellbeing of the whole Europe. These original ideas behind the policy are still valid.

As a political concept, the Northern Dimension has drawn the Union’s attention to issues of Northern Europe in general and the importance of close cooperation with North-west Russia, in particular. On the practical level, two partnerships have been established within the Northern Dimension: the Environmental Partnership (NDEP) and the Partnership for Public Health and Social Wellbeing (NDPHS).

The Environmental partnership aims at solving problems related to waste water, solid waste, air pollution and nuclear waste. The fund of this partnership
has now collected 225 million euros in donations from EU Member States, the Commission and partner and observer countries. Russia is one of the biggest donors.

The Fund gives only the seed money to the projects of the partnership. The main bulk of financing comes from loans that mainly Russian actors take out from international financial institutions. When we add the projected credits to the seed money in the Fund, the total value of projects in the pipeline or planning exceeds two billion euros. This is, of course, a substantial amount of money and an enormous achievement.

These projects are equally and vitally important for both the European Union and Russia. The ecological state of the Baltic Sea is of importance to all countries around the Baltic Sea. The first big Partnership project, the St. Petersburg Southwest Wastewater Treatment plant, was inaugurated last September by the highest political level – by President Putin, President Halonen and Prime Minister Persson. Several other projects are under construction or in the planning phase, not only in St. Petersburg.

The Partnership in Public Health and Social Wellbeing focuses on the prevention of communicable diseases, such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. It also focuses on lifestyle-related health and social problems. Taking into consideration the health and social problems in the region, and the cross-border nature of these phenomena; this is a sector in which we all have a common interest of urgent nature.

Besides the partnerships, the Northern Dimension can be seen as a broad political framework for everything that various actors do at the practical project level in the Northern Dimension region. This includes individual countries, groups of countries, the Commission, regional councils, NGOs, private companies and so on. Many of the things would surely have taken place also without any Northern Dimension policy concept, but quite a few have certainly been directly or indirectly inspired by it. I am sure that at least there has been no harm of a boarder conceptual framework for any separate project.

Our region has managed to show good example for the rest of the EU when it comes to the cross-border cooperation programmes. EU’s programmes have very much been inspired by the cross-border co-operation between the countries in the Northern Dimension region. This cooperation is of special importance for promoting people-to-people contacts over the borders. Most of the cross-border cooperation has been bilateral so far but there are interesting opportunities for trilateral and multilateral cooperation also.
Discussion on the future of the Northern Dimension started already last year, as the present Action Plan expires in the end of 2006. The Northern Dimension Ministerial Meeting last November decided the guidelines for the renewal of the Northern Dimension policy, taking into consideration the changes in its operational environment.

In order to have a strong and active Northern Dimension policy in the future, it needs to be made a common endeavour of all the countries in the region. The future Northern Dimension should be a common policy between the EU, Russia, Norway and Iceland. This means that the new Northern Dimension document will be negotiated between these parties.

Another important decision of the Ministerial Meeting in 2005 was to accommodate the Northern Dimension to the EU-Russia cooperation framework. The Northern Dimension will be seen as a regional expression in implementing the Four Common Spaces. However, there are some important Northern Dimension issues that are not covered by the Common Spaces, such as healthcare and social welfare, arctic cooperation and indigenous peoples’ issues. These issues should be upheld in the future Northern Dimension policies.

It is important that the future ND document contains sufficient structures and mechanisms for the efficient implementation of the Northern Dimension. The Northern Dimension partnerships have proved their strength and value. We hope that the new common policy gives impetus for strengthening and developing the current ND partnerships.

An efficient work of the Health Partnership, its secretariat and the expert groups, will need continuous financial support and active participation of all the partnership countries.

The Environmental Partnership will require further financing in order to be able to implement all the planned projects. In addition to large environmental investments, there is also demand for small and medium sized environmental and energy efficiency projects in Northwest Russia, particularly in the municipal services sector. The Environmental Partnership could provide a well-functioning cooperation structure also for the implementation of these projects.

The benefits of increased cooperation in the field of transport and logistics have been discussed in Finland. This is an important area in which all European countries have an interest. A partnership, in line with the Environmental Partnership model, could facilitate projects to improve infrastructure and technical methods in order to meet the challenges of the rapidly growing transportation of goods and economic growth in the region.
In my view, the cross-border cooperation at the civil society level is still pretty modest in our region. To intensify this connection is surely our common goal and task. We could learn much more of our neighbours by having more intensive youth and student and cultural exchange.

The bilateral technical co-operation between Finland and Russia, the so-called Neighbouring Area Cooperation, is based on an agreement signed in 1992. It is mainly financed by the Finnish national instrument carrying the same name.

Our bilateral instrument is gradually decreasing in the years to come. We warmly welcome the more explicit interest in regional and cross-border cooperation, including increased financial participation, as expressed by Russian authorities.

Regional and cross-border co-operation are facing challenges. But as usually, challenges mean also opportunities. We are committed to further develop regional and cross-border co-operation. We are ready to face the challenge of coordination of the national instrument with multi-national instruments, of coordinating bilateral co-operation with multilateral, notably within the framework of EU-cooperation, including Northern Dimension, but also with the regional councils.
Local involvement crucial for working cross-border ties

JAAN ÕUNAPUU
MINISTER OF REGIONAL AFFAIRS, MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, ESTONIA

Cross-border cooperation with the border regions of Russia is one of the most important ways for cooperation to enhance Estonia’s economic development. Estonia knows from experience that problems can be solved only by practical cooperation, and that it is the only way to find solutions to environmental concerns and border-crossing issues. The border regions have the possibility to increase their potential for economic development, and the main objectives are to develop cooperation between enterprises and to develop cross-border infrastructures.

In recent years, several Estonian and Russian local governments and counties have established or re-established contacts. In the field of environment and getting people engaged in it, a good example of cross-border cooperation between organisations is the work of the Pskovskii Centre for Cross-border Cooperation. However, one of the important projects, the development of ship-navigation possibilities on Lake Peipsi between Tartu and Pskov, unfortunately still needs to overcome administrative obstacles.

Estonia holds important the principle of subsidiarity, which brings the decision-making to the regional and local levels. In the cross-border cooperation closeness to people is needed. The interests of local residents and local governments must be taken into account, because they know best the local situation, its needs and possibilities. This means getting local people engaged in the preparation and implementation of the projects. Cooperation would be
much more effective if the local institutes in the border regions had the possibility to lead the preparation and implementation of the projects, and to have funds and rights of decision-making.

Trust and confidence are needed for this development to happen. Working together effectively is possible only if we really respect and trust each other. More contacts are needed between our people, enterprises and local governments to come closer and build trust. INTERREG IIIA has been a significant programme to further these objectives between Estonia, Latvia and Russia. It has given Estonia the opportunity to co-operate with Pskov and Leningrad regions as well as with the city of St. Petersburg. A good example of how common problems can be solved by cooperation in different fields, is the development project of the waterway from Lake Peipsi to the river Velikaja, in which preparation has been made for the development of small ports and for opening a waterway between Estonia and Russia. The creation of a common tourism area in the field of waterways should be a common interest. In addition, cooperation between conservationists of Estonia and Russia in cross-border natural conservation areas of Emajõe-Suursoo and Alam-Pedja is being developed. There is active cooperation also in the development of a tourism infrastructure between Vastseliina, Aluksne and Izborsk.

The possibilities to enhance cross-border cooperation will grow under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) of 2007 – 2013. This means an increased budget for cross-border cooperation and also better opportunities to enhance cooperation between the border regions of Estonia, Latvia and Russia. In the long run, this gives for Estonia and Russia the same kind of circumstances to develop their border regions that Estonia has with Latvia and Finland. There will be widened possibilities to solve several problems, like the problems related to the protection of the environment of Lake Peipsi and the development of the infrastructure in the border regions.

In order to use the new opportunities as effectively as possible, willingness to work together and to solve problems are needed. Cooperation can bring tangible improvement to the quality of life of the people living in the border regions, and it is our task to use the possibilities to do so. Estonia wishes to enhance cooperation between Estonian and Russian cross-border regions, local governments, NGOs and enterprises. Estonia is also willing to create circumstances for economic cooperation and to build long-lasting strategic needs for cooperation.
In 2007 Estonia wishes to reach agreement on concrete action between Estonia, Latvia and Russia and on the definition of the organisations engaged under the cross-border cooperation programme from all three countries. This is necessary for the implementation of the programme and for launching the common projects as soon as possible.
Commencing 1 January next year Russia, together with Norway and Iceland, will join EU member states as equal parties in the Northern Dimension policy. Therefore, this policy will be a common concern, which is welcomed by Sweden.

We hope to, together with Finland and Russia, be able to contribute to a tangible substance for increased cooperation. It is interesting to note that the guidelines clearly state that Northern Dimension should be seen as a regional expression of the four subjects of cooperation agreed by the EU and the Russian Federation.

We think that within the Northern Dimension-framework it is necessary to identify areas of cooperation where the regional bodies’ work can give increased value. The regional bodies already today play an important role in the implementation of the Northern Dimension policy. It is our intention during the Swedish CBSS Presidency to seek understanding with the Finnish EU-chairmanship. These will coincide during the last six months of this year. We hereby hope to get some added value to both chairmanships regarding the cooperation with Russia in the framework of Northern Dimension.

The special Northern Dimension partnerships have proven to be a successful way of cooperating. The value of the work within the environment and nuclear safety partnership cannot be overrated. Russia’s political and economical engagement in this partnership is essential. This gives a reason to continue the
efforts to convince further EU member states, for example Poland, to participate. It is essential that Russia participate in a new replenishment of the Northern Dimension EP’s fund. The other participating nations and the EU commission welcome an equal burden-sharing. The second Northern Dimension partnership proves the possibility of success for effectively coordinating the fight against the spreading of contagious diseases. A secretariat has been established in Stockholm, so far within the CBSS, and a database is being established.

The new common Northern Dimension policy, compared to the one we have today, has the potential to lead to further successes for cooperation between EU and Russia and for Sweden’s and Finland’s possibilities to co-operate with Russia – and vice versa of course. The Northern Dimension policy could be an important policy sphere for the CBSS to be involved in, as one of several key partner organisations. Within the CBSS we look forward to working with a new Northern Dimension policy and subsequently within such a common policy agreed between EU member states and the Russian Federation, Iceland and Norway.

The latest historic EU enlargement had an impact on the Baltic Sea regional cooperation, and on the CBSS. However, this impact should not be overstated. Political and practical cooperation on selected issues among a small group of states will always be important. The strength of regional cooperation in the Baltic Sea region, and consequently of the CBSS originates from this fact. The Baltic Sea region is already today recognised as an appropriate level and the CBSS as a relevant forum for such cooperation. During our CBSS Presidency we will concentrate our efforts to a limited number of areas, find the common interests and challenges, and address these with a result-oriented approach using the means perceived as the most appropriate by the collective of CBSS member states.

Sweden appreciates the efforts of the EU Commission to create a new and more flexible instrument for cooperation with EU neighbouring countries and especially the difficult task of bringing together different instruments to create better functioning cross-border cooperation (CBC). Sweden believes that allocations between countries and regions in the ENPI should be based on objective and transparent criteria where needs, absorption capacity and performance should be central factors. Progress in implementing Action Plans and reform agendas should be a main yardstick for the allocation of resources. To state beforehand which allocations will be made to which country or region would thus undermine a performance-based approach in relation to important EU Action Plans. Moreover, it would create unnecessary rigidity where
flexibility is called for in order to encompass new circumstances and needs during the next financial perspective.

Sweden has been a strong supporter of the development of the Neighbourhood Programmes (NP) and hence the preparation for the ENPI CBC component. In the last few years a lot of positive experience has been gained from the NP’s in our region. The programmes have performed well and are a qualitative step forward for partner countries to co-operate with the EU on an equal basis.

Sweden therefore notes with concern the latest suggested figures presented for the future CBC component of ENPI. Resource allocations seem to ignore absorption capacity and good performance. Instead, the Commission is proposing to decrease dramatically the allocations to programmes that have been well functioning and could serve as models for other regions. In the case of the Baltic Sea Region programme (BSR), the first call for proposals according to the NP procedures in 2005 indicated an absorption capacity well in excess of the 4 million euros allocated through the TACIS CBC action programme 2004 to projects with the external partners Russia and Belarus. On the basis of this positive experience the Commission first proposed to allocate 33 million euros for the participation of Russia and Belarus in the BSR programme 2007–2013. This proposal was subsequently reduced to 26 million euros and on April 21 dramatically reduced to 14.9 million euros – less than the average allocation per year during the TACIS period. This proposal is unacceptable as it reduces the possibilities for Russia and Belarus to participate in the BSR programme, and does not take into account absorption capacity and performance.

Sweden therefore urges the Commission to propose allocations to the BSR programme that will ensure the participation of Russia and Belarus at a reasonable level, which would correspond to the previous proposal of 26 million euros over the next seven-year period.

Taking all this into consideration, what would then be the future role of the CBSS and of the Baltic Sea multilateral regional cooperation? It should, generally speaking, be political and practical cooperation on substantive issues; suitable for the regional BSR format. It should be carried out, where relevant, in cooperation with the EU. And, it should, in particular be designed to narrow remaining gaps between members of the union and non-members, thereby continuing to do what the Baltic Sea regional cooperation and the CBSS set out to do when the latter was founded in 1992; namely to prevent the creation of new divisions in the region be these of political or economic nature. The possibility of extending, and enhancing even more our fruitful cooperation to
CBSS observer countries should additionally be contemplated within the council, as well as practical cooperation with also other states in the wider Baltic Sea area could and should be discussed.
Cross-border cooperation challenges

MĀRIS KUCINSKIS
MINISTER OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, LATVIA

One of the instruments in implementing the goals set by the 2007–2013 National Development Plan is cross-border cooperation between Latvia and its neighbouring states. Cross-border cooperation between Latvia and the Pskov region started in 1994 and has been financed by the PHARE programme. The cooperation has promoted the development of the border regions, protected the preparation of the implementation of INTERREG, and helped to establish contacts and partnership between the Baltic Countries and their neighbouring countries in the EU.

From 2004 cross-border cooperation between Latvia and Russia has been possible within the framework of the programme INTERREG IIIB. However, there are problems that hinder preparation of cross-border cooperation projects within the framework of the INTERREG programme. The main problem is the visa system and the process of getting a visa to both directions. There are also other problems. Cross-border cooperation projects are mainly “soft”. That is why the local governments are not very willing to support them. The local governments are more interested in supporting projects that are investments, and cross-border cooperation projects usually are not. The cross-border cooperation projects are usually planned in a hurry, and they lack the specialists that could plan and carry them out.

The employees of the local governments responsible for writing the applications are usually responsible also for other tasks. They have to participate...
in the process of implementation of the projects that get financing. The possibilities brought by the cross-border projects are not used in the work of the other departments of local governments. Sometimes problems are caused by the fact that there are three different approaches to the preparation and implementation of the projects: there are three different countries, three nationalities and three mentalities. Many times also a bad knowledge of the English language disturbs the preparation of the projects. Personal contacts between potential partners are lacking, and also, very few of the local governments, NGOs, enterprises etc. are engaged in the projects. There are not much concrete common interests at the moment, except for changing the experience. Sometimes only one side plans the project, and the search for a partner starts only after that. There is too little cooperation in the process of preparation of the projects, and there are problems in searching for co-financing. Sometimes it occurs, that the specialists don’t have the necessary information on the funds supporting the cross-border cooperation projects. The local governments do not pay enough attention to the development of the cooperation between the cross-border areas.

The European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) will replace all the current programmes including TACIS in 2007. Within this instrument it will be possible to finance cooperation on both sides of the external border of the EU. This will simplify the processes of implementation and administration of the projects. Cross-border cooperation between Latvia and Russia is being developed within ENPI for the period of 2007–2013.

One of the main tendencies of the cooperation between Latvia and Russia is to promote the development of market economy. Its objectives are to support entrepreneurship and the private sector, to get investments as well as to promote global trade and the establishment of economic contacts. Cooperation in the field of health, science, culture and education is also pursued. Likewise, supporting the social development and equality, employment and social security are among the objectives. Reducing imbalance in regional development and improving the possibilities of local development should also be common interests, as well as the development of common structures at the regional and local levels. The development of communicational and transportation connections and information technology is also important to develop international integration.
Pskov and cross-border work with neighbouring regions
Pskov in context

The City of Pskov (pop. 202,000 in 2005) is one of Russia’s oldest cities, dating back to 903. Situated at the meeting of the Pskova and Velikaya rivers, 12 kilometres away from Pskov-Chudskoye Lake, it lies by the 789 kilometre border of Latvia, Estonia and Byelorussia.

There are nearly 6,400 enterprises in Pskov, 35% of which are in the trade and food sectors, 15% in industry, and 11% in construction. 30% of all enterprises are small-sized. Some 250 enterprises receive foreign investments.

Pskov’s international ties are numerous, with partnerships with 17 cities in 12 countries. The first partnership was with Kuopio in Finland, established in 1946.

Pskov’s city administration runs transboundary cooperation for the environmental protection of the Pskov-Chudskoye Lake, most part of which is located in the Pskov region. Projects have received TACIS funding and project support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency and have involved efforts to improve sewage treatment and water quality. Preparations are also underway for an investment project with the Finnish Ministry of Environment for the reconstruction of the Pskov sewage system. Border region cooperation programmes are also being conducted through the Pskov-Livonia Euroregion.

The Pskov City Administration cooperates with non-governmental organizations working in the Pskov region via the Coordinating Council of NGOs. The administration has an agreement with the Chudskoye Project on cross-border cooperation and environmental protection.

From the speech to the Forum by
Valentin Ivanov, First Deputy of the Mayor of Pskov
Regional bases of collaboration

Sisko Kaarto  
Regional Development Manager, Regional Council of North Karelia, Finland

Regional councils in Finland are public regional authorities created in accordance with the Regional Development Act (national law) and the Land Use and Building Act (national law). There are 20 regional councils in Finland.

The goals of the Regional Councils are to promote regional development initiatives, the regional balance and environmentally sustainable development, in cooperation with the state and the local government, businesses, universities, research institutes and NGOs. The Regional Councils are the authorities responsible for the coordination and management of the regional funds and EU-programmes.

The regional councils of Kainuu, North Karelia and the Oulu region and Karelian Republic in Russia established Euregio Karelia in 2000. This region is also the main programme area in INTERREG Karelia and Neighbourhood Programme Karelia.

Euregio Karelia aims to promote social and economic equality and to increase people-to-people cooperation across the border. The Neighbourhood Programme is the most important financing instrument and it has enabled the implementation of projects contributing to the realisation of set objectives.

The projects financed under the INTERREG programme have already attained good results and increased interaction across the border. There are an
increasing number of enterprises, civil society organisations, educational institutions and municipalities, that take part in the cooperation on both sides of the border. Economic cooperation has started, and Finnish companies have made investments in Karelia, and some Russian companies have done so in Finland. New companies have been established and universities are taking part in research cooperation supporting economic life in the fields of optics and forestry.

We have had a good start in cross-border cooperation. Now when the Neighbourhood Programmes have started their operation, and good results have been received from the INTERREG Karelia programme, we have set high hopes for the upcoming ENPI programme to deepen the cooperation and to launch new cases.
Launched in autumn 2002, the project entitled “Euregio Karelia Regional Structure 2000+: Borders, Cultural Environment and Developing Traffic Connections” is implementing the priority theme of ‘everyday border-crossings’, which is one of the priorities of the INTERREG IIIA Karelia Programme. In addition to a general discussion of programme themes, the project provides a more detailed account of strategic planning with reference to the model employed in the City of Petrozavodsk. The intention is to use regional planning as a means for promoting cultural tourism in particular. With this in mind, the project vision is Euregio Karelia as a world-class tourism destination.

The borders section of the project describes the network of border crossing points from the point of view of regional structure and tourism. Special attention is paid to the international border crossing points of Niirala – Värttilä and Vartius – Lyttä, and to that of Kuusamo – Suoperä. Development projects on border station structures, approach roads and traffic flexibility are currently in progress on both sides of the border. Special effort is currently being taken to prepare for the adoption of the crossing point Kuusamo – Suoperä.

The project’s work on culture discusses the areas of influence of tourism routes. Attractions of interest in Karelia include the poetry villages in Viena Karelia, Karelian villages in Olonets, nature tourism and fishing sites, and towns
and churches. Of these, Kizhi, Solovetsk and Valamo symbolise the whole Russian cultural heritage. Of the cultural attractions in Finland, WWII battlefields and towns with their attractions are of interest to tourists, just to name a few.

In addition, the project concerns the development of traffic connections, to enhance the opportunities offered by the road, railway and channel networks and flight connections existing in the Euregio Karelia area. The railway connection Lietmajärvi-Kosthkoma also offers opportunities for passenger traffic, and there is interest to activate railway traffic between Joensuu and Petrozavodsk. The project theme of interaction between land use planning systems provides an introduction to the planning systems in use in Finland and Russia. There have been cross-border contacts between experts in regional planning, and the resulting exchange of ideas has helped them understand each other’s ways of action. Interaction through the Euregio Karelia scheme has also resulted in closer cooperation in regional planning between the Council of Oulu Region and the Regional Councils of Kainuu and North Karelia.

The project has proceeded in the form of negotiations and seminars. The main partners in the Karelian Republic have been the Karelian Science Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Ministry of Economic Development of the Karelian Republic, and State Committee for Physical Training, Sport and Tourism.

Cooperation in regional planning currently mainly involves investigating opportunities for pursuing joint regional planning and removing obstacles to practical planning cooperation in order to make mutual contacts a regular practise in the future. This means keeping the parties informed of such land use measures whose effects are reflected across the border.

The Association of European Border Regions (AEBR) issued a commendation to Euregio Karelia in the 2004 Sail of Papenburg competition for promoting humane regional planning across the EU’s external border within the Regional Structure 2000+ project.
In 2002 the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) started a project called “Cross-border cooperation in the Baltic countries and North-West Russia”, which aimed to facilitate a network of Euroregions in this area, with a special focus on transfer of Nordic experience to the new Euroregions in the Baltic countries and North-West Russia.

The successful implementation of this initiative gave start to a new larger project called “Baltic Euroregional Network” (BEN), which in June 2005 was approved by the Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme’s Steering Committee.

The BEN project started in July 2005 and will finish at the end of 2007. The lead partner of the project is the Nordic Council of Ministers Office in Lithuania, and the partnership comprises 35 partners from nine countries around the Baltic Sea representing 17 existing Euroregions. The total budget of the BEN is about 1.4 million euros. Its partners represent all major interest groups working in the field of cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea region: Pan-Baltic organizations (such as NCM and CBSS), national governments, regional and local authorities, Euroregions and NGOs.

The main objective of the project is to strengthen Euroregions in the Baltic Sea region as competent partners for national authorities and international institutions by creating a network of Euroregions for continuous capacity-building and sharing of experience.

The results of the previous project implemented by the NCM have demonstrated differences in the development and capacity of Euroregions in
the Nordic countries and in the Baltic States and Russia. Nordic Euroregions (or as they are usually called CBC committees), could be characterised as strong institutions with long traditions and strong support from local and regional governments. They take both a strategic and practical approach in trying to solve concrete border-related problems, include the strong involvement of regional development, use their own financial resources coming from their members, and have a broad involvement of different local institutions and community groups, universities and NGOs.

The Euroregions in the Baltic States and Russia/Belarus are often characterised by quite different features. They have small and unstable institutions and an unstable level of activities based on a project-level approach. There is small-scale involvement in regional development, a lack of long-term planning, little or no self-financing and too much dependence on external EU funding. Cooperation is still too politically loaded and there remain real border obstacles, such as check points, visas and lack of common infrastructure.

As a consequence, Euroregions in the new EU member states are still not considered as equal partners for national/international authorities, and they are little involved in spatial development of the Baltic Sea region. To address these problems the BEN project has divided all activities of the project into four work packages.

• “Thematic exchange of knowledge and experience”, with focus on increasing and deepening the institutional capacity of Euroregions through exchange of best practices in CBC issues (14 seminars on different topics);
• “Targeted capacity building for specific regions”, focusing on increase of the knowledge and capacity in specific Euroregions on issues arising directly from specific needs;
• “Strengthening the dialogue between Euroregions and central authorities”, focusing on increase of dialogue between the participating Euroregions and their central authorities for the development of the border areas (annual roundtables in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia);
• “Network durability tools”, ensuring the smooth flow of activities during the project, and guaranteeing the continuity of the network after the project, such as through the use of an electronic CBC library, best-practice handbook and project website.

For more information about the project please visit the project’s website: http://www.benproject.org
Robust ties with Sweden

GUNNAR KLINGA
CONSUL-GENERAL OF SWEDEN IN ST PETERSBURG

During the last century many Pskovians felt that they were living in a somewhat forgotten part of Russia. But times change and the location of Pskov is once again a very advantageous one, not least through the EU membership of its neighbours. If used in a wise way this advantage gives Pskov perhaps greater opportunities than other Russian cities to become a model city for cross-border cooperation. If I look at how this city and the region has taken good care of its cooperation with Sweden, I think that these new opportunities will also be well used.

Through SIDA, the Swedish public body for bilateral cooperation, Sweden has pursued activities in Pskov as well as in other parts of Northwest Russia since the beginning of the 1990s. As far as our cooperation with Pskov is concerned, priorities have been the social sector and the environment, but also economic development and cooperation between governmental institutions play an important role.

For several years, Sweden has pursued activities together with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Pskov, aiming at strengthening the competence of its staff to provide qualified business advisory services to local companies. This has been done with the objective to internationalise and facilitate in particular cross-border trade and cooperation.
The forestry sector plays an important role in both Russia and Sweden. How to use this natural resource in a sustainable way is the core idea of a project involving not only federal Russian and national Swedish forestry authorities but also the Swedish-Finnish company Stora-Enso and the WWF. The project, called “Pskov Model Forest”, has been positively received by both local people and the authorities. In April 2005 the second phase of the Pskov Model Forest Project started. During the second phase the project will also extend to other territories of Northwest Russia, including Leningrad, Vologda and Arkhangelsk oblasts.

So, experiences from Pskov are spread to other regions. Another project I know has been noticed in other areas of Russia is a result of the co-operation between Pskov oblast and the County of Dalarna in Sweden. Recently the Governor of Pskov, Mikhail Kuznetsov, visited Dalarna and there signed a new agreement on cooperation in the field of dental care. The aim is to prevent tooth decay in young people through the use of fluoride rinses in schools. Further in the social sector, our cooperation has included training of trainers in Sweden, and developing and producing new teaching materials for social workers.

Over the next few years, financing through SIDA for these types of projects will come to an end. But this does not mean an end to our cooperation. On the contrary, our ambition is to strengthen and develop sustainable bilateral contacts of long term interest for both our countries. We hope this will include commercial ties, cooperation between NGOs as well as cooperation between authorities. My expectation is that cooperation between Sweden and Northwest Russia will continue to grow as we move on.

As a member of the European Union, Sweden is actively contributing to the development of the Northern Dimension as well as the cross-border and other cooperation programmes underway, through the Interreg and Tacis programmes. In the future, we expect that in particular cross-border cooperation will get an even bigger boost through the new European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, ENPI. Sweden is working to ensure that this new programme, which should facilitate EU-funded cross-border cooperation, will get off to a good start in 2007 and will have sufficient funding.
Inter-regional and cross-border cooperation are becoming more valuable and important elements in the communication structure of Russia’s cooperation with other countries. Such cooperation not only expands the geographical frames of the cooperation taking it out of the capitals, but also transfers into a new qualitative condition.

Inter-regional cooperation is seen as a good school of partnership. In the framework of this school new models of international cooperation are being introduced. We think that regions do possess important innovative potential that is used for the testing of new forms of cooperation with international partners. This potential is valuable and can be used for further improvement on the inter-state level.

The Russian Foreign Ministry does everything possible to improve diplomatic support of inter-regional relations and cross-border cooperation, creating favourable conditions for international contacts for all subjects of the Federation.
Another important task of the ministry is coordination and expert evaluation of agreements on cooperation that have been signed by authorities with their foreign partners. There are more than 1,800 agreements signed with 94 countries, half of them signed with countries of CIS. Representative offices of the foreign ministry are involved in the solving of economic problems of the regions. They assist in conducting business talks on big agreements and contracts, support the participation of our companies in foreign tenders, and assist in attracting foreign investments and signing of inter-regional agreements.

Taking into consideration the fact that more than half of the subjects of Russia are border territories, the foreign ministry pays special attention to cross-border cooperation that facilitates further integration of the country into the European economic space. Lately a lot has been achieved in this sphere. First of all, the process of developing a legal base of cross-border cooperation is taking place. For Russia this sphere is relatively new. At the same time such associations are the most developed form of cross-border cooperation. There are 75 Euroregions active on the territory of Europe.

In October 2003, based on the Council on Cross-border Cooperation of Estonia, Latvia and Russia Euroregion decision, the Pskov – Livonia was created. In the framework of the Euroregion, cooperation of border territories takes place and a joint programme and projects are being developed and implemented. The potential of this Euroregion is quite big, but it needs to be used more effectively.

Since October 2003, when Russia ratified European Framework Convention on cross-border cooperation of territories and authorities, Russian local authorities have carried out border cooperation in accordance with a unified legal base. The document on Russia joining the Additional Protocol and Protocol II of the European Frame Convention on cross-border cooperation of territories and authorities stipulates the question of Euroregions’ formation, and questions of inter-regional cooperation of territories that are not neighbours. Russian experts in the framework of Council of Europe are working on the Convention draft that will describe the fundamental legal basis for the creation and functioning of Euroregions.

EU enlargement has changed the relations between Russia and the EU. Russia’s concern related to possible negative circumstances of this process are not eliminated automatically even in existing agreements. They will be applied to further development of inter-regional relations. EU plans to build the relations with Russia, including cross-border cooperation, by building ‘four common
spaces’ and the new European Neighbourhood Policy. To support cross-border cooperation a new mechanism will be developed: the European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument, which after 2006 will replace other programs such as INTERREG, PHARE and TACIS. The new Neighbourhood Instrument is aimed to promote active cooperation of several subjects of the Russian Federation, including the Pskov and Kaliningrad regions. But we think that international and economic relations of our regions with the EU should be broader than seen by the developers of the new programme.

A relatively new sphere of foreign ministry activities is the work with NGOs, the role of which in solving many problems of inter-regional, cross-border cooperation should be thoroughly studied and supported. We consider that in the future other non-governmental organizations will participate in the elaboration of local and regional strategies of the Russian Federation subjects’ development.
Cross-border cooperation involves by definition two or more countries. By tradition this has had some implications, namely a strong engagement of central government and diplomatic structures. Under the future European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) cross-border cooperation should, however, not be seen primarily as cooperation between neighbouring countries; it should be conducted by neighbouring regions divided by a border. The future ENPI CBC programmes shall be prepared and managed jointly by the regions concerned. Projects to be funded shall be generated at the regional level. The financial resources foreseen won’t allow funding of large investment projects although some groundwork can be laid towards such projects. The role of the central government authorities should be restricted to creating the legal, structural and financial framework for the cooperation. The responsibility shall be borne by the regions, which shall also reap the rewards from the closer contacts across the border. The foreign policy objective of the countries involved (and the European Union) should be increased cooperation across the Union’s external border. The
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content and substance of the cooperation shall be up to the regions. This is fully in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, which is one of the cornerstones of all European Union action.

The 2004 – 2006 Neighbourhood Programmes (NP’s) have provided much inspiration to the future ENPI CBC. There will also in the future be a single project selection procedure where the decisions will be taken by a committee consisting of representatives from both sides of the border. A total of almost 1.3 billion euros is reserved for funding the ENPI CBC in 2007 – 2013 with ca. 2/3 coming from the ERDF and 1/3 from the EU external relations funds. The draft ENPI Regulation which will provide the legal framework for the use of this funding has recently been de facto approved by the EU’s legislative bodies subject to final agreement on the whole external relations funding package. The Commission has indicated that the future programmes should concentrate on four overall objectives, although programme partners may choose to address only two or three of them, when this is deemed justified by the specific characteristics of the programme area. The Commission has presented the four overall objectives and some examples of possible activities under them as follows:

**Economic and social development:** Administrative capacity building and reform; local and regional development; joint planning efforts (e.g. spatial planning); research and technology; rural development and cross-border tourism; strengthening of regional identity; socially vulnerable groups; SME and business development; trade and investment promotion; cross-border labour market development; transport and energy cooperation.

**Common challenges:** Environmental protection; cross-border environmental challenges; waste management; management of natural resources; protection of national and cultural heritage; emergency preparedness; health and social development; prevention of communicable diseases; the fight against organised crime, illegal migration, trafficking.

**Efficient and secure borders:** Improvement of border management operations and customs procedures; increase of transparency and efficiency in trade and border passage; alleviation of administrative and institutional obstacles to free movement of people; improvement of infrastructure and equipment at border controls.

**People to people co-operation:** Support to civil society and local communities; support to administrative reform; local governance; education and cultural exchange; social sector cooperation; social and cultural integration of border areas.
Although the countries participating in programmes haven’t made their proposals on the future programme areas, the Commission has presented an indicative list. This list largely corresponds to the current Neighbourhood Programmes, at least in the Union’s North-East border regions: Kolarctic-Nord (Finland, Russia, Sweden, Norway), Karelia (Finland-Russia), SE Finland-Russia, Estonia-Latvia-Russia, Latvia-Lithuania-Belarus, and Lithuania-Poland-Russia (Kaliningrad).

The indicative Community funding from the ENPI to these six cross-border programmes and the Baltic Sea Region transnational programme is around 300 million euros for 2007 – 2013. The future funding for these programmes will consist of EU funding, national co-financing and partners’ self-financing, as explained above. The applicable co-financing rates will be separately determined in each programme document by the participating countries. The minimum requirement is 10% but credible commitment to the programmes requires a much higher rate, maybe 40 – 50 percent.

Ideally all the necessary prerequisites for launching the first calls for applications will be in place some time in the last quarter of 2007. Taking into account all the legislative and other adjustments in the different participating countries, even this timetable is relatively ambitious.

One of the lessons learnt from the Neighbourhood Programmes is that all relevant parties at regional and central level in the participating countries should be involved in the programming exercise. A sound groundwork will prevent unnecessary delays at later stages. Securing this commitment is the immediate challenge facing all of us working for the establishment of ENPI CBC Programmes.
Two years ago Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania joined NATO. Their accession has mostly been seen as increasing regional stability. This development has been followed by a major relaxation of their security debates compared with much of the pre-NATO period.

Russia’s reaction to the enlargement of NATO has been mild and pragmatic. It has not actually made any visible military rearrangements, which would signify a countermove in a traditional strategic assessment. On the contrary, Russia has reduced its countable forces in the region. The fact that the 76th Airborne Division in Pskov has been one of pilot formations in the Russian military reform does not change the overall picture. When transparency in military affairs has generally increased at the same time, it can be claimed that the overall exclusive defensiveness of Russian military strategy has continued. Russian military capacities even close to borders do not provoke worries, which would enter main public discussion, like they did only some 12–14 years ago. The rhetoric that NATO and Russia do not consider each other adversaries any more, appeared in political texts early. But now also those who are used to emphasise body-language instead of spoken language take it seriously. NATO does not pay such attention to the collective defence of territories as it did 15 years ago. The alliance has been
modest in pushing visible arrangements forward to its new member countries around the Baltic, even if it basically has that opportunity.

Cross-border and international military cooperation in the Baltic region has much grown within the last ten years. Militaries around the Baltic Sea cooperate largely in else but hard military security of states, or at least exercises are presented that way. But it would be also difficult to conceal actual aims of international exercises, where troops are involved. So trust has really developed. Increased cooperation over the former dividing line since 1995 deserves a special attention. Russia, though, has kept a relatively low profile in participating in international crisis management exercises, which have been conducted in northern Europe. On the other hand, Russia has been interested in cooperative antiterrorist exercises. One example is a joint exercise with Russian, American, British and French Special Forces in Pskov 2006. New interests apply also to the seminar programmes of security and international studies, for instance. Military-related topics are certainly the domain of several institutions. But the situation is different from the beginning of the 1990s, when hard politico-military security issues were usually main themes of any conferences in the field.

Legacies of the past such as uncompleted border arrangements or new issues such as the problems of energy flows have to do with geopolitics. But they have not evoked the old type of geostrategic debate of the kind they would have done only a short time ago. Collective defence in NATO expressed in broad political terms in the North Atlantic Treaty and in the Strategic Concept of the Alliance retains its character as glue to keep the alliance together. European countries usually like to see the United States stay committed to the defence of Europe. Along with that expectation, readiness for all types of collective defence cannot fade away in military planning.

The actual number of forces both in NATO and Russia but also in Finland and Sweden is much higher than could be expected for international crisis management or even robust tasks of internal security. In conditions of globalisation, hundreds of thousands of men would be hardly conscripted and trained to be soldiers, unless they would still be needed to defend their country in some situation, where having a large number of soldiers available is highly valued. The defence of territory remains relatively high in military doctrines of the states in the Baltic Sea region. Defence gets new meanings. It is turning to be largely dependable on statehood and on the central place that state still plays both in integration and globalisation. Societal roots of defence sustain
continuities even without major changes in the security environment. Military integration in Europe has reached a tempo, where it exceeds threat-based unifying developments. This is evidenced also in European defence policies. Internationalisation of defence continues also in northern Europe.

Military organisations are very flexible. In spite of relatively unified subcultures they easily ask and adopt new tasks on actional and moral grounds, if those tasks do not violate the basic tenets of their cultures. Militaries have hundreds of specific capacities, which are available for non-military emergencies or other types of security-related tasks. Attention should be paid on differences between the front-stage and backstages of military politics. Transparency has limits for those, who are responsible for preparing countries to those eventualities of security, which are not on a present agenda. In that sense, classical military strategy is not dead. It may be just resting.

Overall, the present development in Northern Europe reflects a new phase in the institutionalisation of the broad conception of security. Military security and the role of military forces come closer to everyday life in a new relation with other securities and tools. Security is not totally undivided. In some cases, it is also experienced to be too high and at odds with other important issues. But for cross-border cooperation around the Baltic Sea the present interlocking of securities is probably beneficial. It is really a change from defence to security on the regional level.
Relatively recent developments in the Pskov region have changed the situation of the population living in that area in a rather drastic manner. Only 15 years ago the whole region was part of the Soviet Union, a state that was federal, or even confederal, in form, but unitary in practice. Political borders existing in that area were of conventional character – they existed on the political maps of the region, but they were non-existing in practice, as they could be crossed at will. There were no border control posts between the regions of the Russian Federation and the three Baltic states that became rather unwillingly members of the Soviet Union in 1940 and were reincorporated in this state in 1945. In 2006 the situation in that region is completely different. The Soviet Union is no more; Belarus and Russia have launched a reintegration project that so far has brought little practical change, while Latvia and Estonia have become members of the two western clubs, NATO and the EU.

When the two states in 2004 obtained a full-fledged membership of NATO and the EU, it was the result of a long political process, that already before their entry into these two organizations had changed the political and the ‘practical’ map of the region in question. In 2006 the region consists therefore of units that belong to various international institutions and organizations, and this fact has had a huge impact on the way borders in that region started to matter, not only for the states in question, but also for those who live in that particular area.
One of the most important issues of EU enlargement was to address the problem of the existing welfare gaps in Europe. The realisation that Europe cannot remain divided into a zone of relative welfare in the West and a zone of insecurity and lack of basic welfare in the East has been a major factor influencing European integration policies. NATO and EU enlargement have been perceived as the most efficient ways of improving the security of the continent, as they were expected to result in a lessening of the welfare gaps.1 The list of requirements to be met by candidates to these two European clubs was largely a set of preconditions for building a system with smaller welfare gaps, than those existing today between the East and the West and within many of the countries in Eastern and Central Europe.

The political, economic and social instruments used by the enlarging EU change the political, social and economic landscape in Europe in a very definite way.2 On the one hand, EU enlargement results in the inclusion of states with relatively weak economies and great social problems, further deepening the welfare gap within the Union. This development confronts the EU with an ‘absorption dilemma’ – the new, poorer members will have to be absorbed in the enlarged Europe. On the other hand, those left outside may perceive the enlarged EU area as a potential provider of welfare and may try to adopt adaptation and survival strategies that challenge the EU and the existing border regime.

When it comes to internal challenges the EU has at its disposal a range of instruments, aimed at reducing the existing economic, social and political gaps in the new emerging European political, social and economic landscape and influencing choices made by the inhabitants of the enlarged union. The most powerful of these instruments are the EU’s cohesion policy3 and economic help

1 On the social goals and targets of this policy see Atkinson, A.B., Martlier, E. and Nolan, B. (2004). ‘Indicators and Targets for Social Inclusion in the EU’. Journal of Common Market Studies 42(1), pp.47–76. Also the conclusion that higher level of social inclusion and protection may have some long-term positive impact on economic performance was probably one reason why the EU formulated these targets. For more on this link see Arjona, R., Ladaique, M. and Pearson, M. (2003). ‘Social protection and growth’, OECD Economic Studies 2002(2), pp.7–46.
2 Even on the eve of enlargement the EU provided the candidate countries with support – for more on this phase of the process see Bailey, D. and De Propris, L. (2004). ‘EU Pre-Accession Aid and Capacity Building in the Candidate Countries’. Journal of Common Market Studies 42(1), pp.77–98.
3 For more information on cohesion policy and the Cohesion Fund see: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l60018.htm
to the underdeveloped areas within the Union, the EU common social and migration policy, and, finally, the EU’s policy towards countries remaining outside the Union.

Of all the decisions taken by the EU over the past ten years the most important is the decision on enlargement. This decision has changed the political and social map of the continent in a decisive way. Over the last 15 years the EU has spent huge amounts on various programmes aiming at improvement of the situation in the underdeveloped areas of the now enlarged union and the pace of transfers increased visibly after enlargement in 2004. According to a recently published study on the effects of enlargement the EU has transferred 10.3 billion euros to the new members already between 1990 and 2003 and an estimated sum of 17.7 billion euros in 2004 and 2005. In the 2007-2013 period the EU plans to spend almost 350 billion euros – out of its 864.3 billion euros planned to be spent in that period – on structural and cohesion funds, and much of this is to be spent in the new member countries.

To understand what challenges economic welfare gaps may pose in the EU neighbourhood it would be appropriate to start with mapping the problem. The table below contains an overview over the economic welfare gaps existing in what could be defined EU neighbourhood – the figures in the right column are obtained by dividing the GDP per capita of the country with a higher GDP per capita, by the GDP per capita of the country with a lower GDP per capita. In order to give a more proper picture of the real economic welfare gaps existing
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4 For more detailed information on the regional dimension of the European Union’s policy see: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/s24000.htm
5 Basic information on EU social and employment policy can be found at: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/s02000.htm
6 For an overview of EU policy on free movement of people see: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/s17000.htm
7 Basic information on the EU’s external relations and its instruments in this field can be found at: http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/s05000.htm
in Europe we use the Purchasing Power Parity approach to the measurement of GDP levels in various countries. This method takes into consideration differences in prices and incomes in the countries in question and is believed to measure economic gaps in a more proper way than the exchange rate method used widely earlier.

Table 1.
Economic welfare gaps in Europe: Russian and EU context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of gap: GDP per Capita 2001</th>
<th>PPP rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasvik River Gap, Norway–Russia</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland–Russia Gap</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia–Moldova Gap</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oder–Neisse Gap, Germany–Poland</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Gap, Finland–Estonia</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliningrad Gap, Poland–Russia</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia – Russia Gap</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia – Russia Gap</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia – Latvia Gap</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see from the table above, there are visible economic gaps in Europe, especially between the countries that used to be a part of the former Soviet bloc and the Western ones. However, even within the former Soviet bloc there exist clear economic dividing lines. With the EU enlargement and transfers, these gaps between the more and less developed parts of Europe may grow even further.

When looking at Russian-EU neighbourhood we see that the gaps are not that big between the two Baltic countries and Russia in general. However, in order to get a proper picture of the situation one has to look at the situation in the region and not in the whole Russia. According to Granberg and Zaitseva the level of economic development of Russian regions bordering on the enlarged EU differs, and the Pskov oblast seems to be the least developed of all six Russian regions they analyse. According to their findings Estonia has 2.3 times
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higher adjusted GDP per capita than the Pskov oblast, while Latvia’s GDP per capita is 1.8 times higher than in the Pskov oblast.

The situation is even worse if incomes in the Pskov oblast and in Latvia and Estonia are compared. According to official Russian data an average monthly salary in Pskov region was 4,672 roubles ($US160) in 2004, while in the same period the average gross salary in Estonia was 500 euros and the minimum monthly salary 192 euros, and in Latvia the minimum salary was 120 euros and the average monthly salary was 350 euros.

These economic gaps may compel people living on the other side of the EU border to embark on a number of survival and adaptation strategies with a certain ‘border’ component. The way people choose to respond to what they may treat as an objective or subjective welfare gap depends on which views they have on what can be done to overcome the gap, on the instruments they have at their disposal, and on the environment in which they operate. The 529 km long border between the enlarged EU and the Pskov oblast is today a border separating two regions, that used to form a part of a common state only 15 years ago, and a border between two different regions – one that not least due to its membership in the EU and access to the EU’s resources experiences rapid growth, and another one that is a remote periphery of the former empire facing huge economic and social problems. In that sense the EU-Pskov border is an important element of the environment in which the people of the region operate.

People living in the region in question may respond to the welfare gap challenge in various ways. For the purpose of this study I will focus on what I’ve decided to call ‘survival and adaptation strategies’, adopted by those who want to address their own welfare gap dilemma. I’ve defined these survival and adaptation strategies as adaptive measures, taken by groups and individuals in response to the new challenges of the transition in Central and Eastern Europe. These are strategies devised and implemented in a situation, where individuals and groups are faced with a deterioration of their social and economic position, and are challenged to adapt to a new social and economic reality, in order to counter the negative developments and maintain – and if possible, improve – their own position.15

Strategies, borders and high politics

Some of these strategies may have a strong border component. These can be everything from daily job commuting, through less and more permanent labour migration, to trans-border shuttling and smuggling and up to border-related petty and organized crime.\(^{16}\) The ability to implement various border-related strategies will depend on the legal and political framework people have to relate to. When a strategy is border-related, what is important is the existing border regime.

Depending on which border regime is in place, which are the formal – and informal – requirements for border crossing, what is the state of the border-related infrastructure and how this infrastructure is used by those who are set out to administer the border, the border may become either a friendly meeting point, a hostile and threatening zone or even a non-crossable dividing line.\(^{16}\) As an international border is a point where two states or even two systems meet, what is happening along the border and which strategies are available to the population wanting to address its own welfare dilemmas will depend on border policies of the political units meeting in the border zone. It is therefore not only the enlarged EU’s policy that matters, but also what the Russian authorities decide to do, how they address the issue of border and trans-border cooperation and how do they implement their own border regime, that will contribute to shaping the trans-border neighbourhood in this particular corner of Europe made up of the Pskov oblast and its international surroundings.

With the enlargement of the EU to Pskov’s borders, the way the border is managed is no longer an issue to be discussed only in bilateral talks between Russia and the two Baltic republics. With their entry into the EU, their border with Russia has become a part of the EU’s external border, and they have to play by the EU rules. The future of the border regime in the Pskov oblast will therefore to a very large extent depend on decisions on border regulations made in both Brussels and Moscow. The EU membership of Estonia and Latvia has

changed the nature and the formal and political status of the border, but also Moscow’s policy towards these two countries has had an impact on the functioning of the border. Especially two factors - Russian policy towards the Baltic states and towards their policies concerning their own ethnic minorities, and Putin’s Russia’s drive for recentralization – have probably contributed to transforming the Russian-Baltic (and since the EU enlargement the Russian) EU-border into what it is today: a rather unfriendly meeting point of two political systems that have to live side by side, but that are still in the search of their new political identity.

The choices made by political leaders in Brussels and Moscow – and in Tallin and Riga – have already changed the regional border and transformed it from an irrelevant line on a political map into a clear dividing line separating Russia from the enlarged Europe. This transformation of the border – combined with and caused by the total transformation of the political, social and economic system – has definitely changed the daily life of people living in the area. It still remains to be seen what will be the long-term effects of this change.
At the end of 2005 the groups of researchers of Centre of Cross-border Research at the Faculty of International Relations of St Petersburg State University, with the active support of the Administration of the Pskov region, conveyed a study of cross-border cooperation in municipalities of the Pskov region. In the course of the research several hypothesis were proven. First, the border factor has a negative impact on border territories’ development. The closer a settlement is to the border, the stronger this negative impact.

The second hypothesis states, that the presence of an international border crossing point influences the organisation of a communication system in the area. (The closer the settlement is to the international border crossing point; the stronger is the influence of this factor to the infrastructural development of the territory, and the socio-economic development, in general.) This is proven by economic and social effects that appeared after the opening of the international border crossing points in Pechory and Sebezh.

The third hypothesis is connected with the negative influence of not only the present border but also borders that existed in this territory before. The “older” the borders on limited territory, the stronger is their negative influence. The results of the research showed that in border territories of the Pskov region, the 1944 and 1920 borders have a negative effect.
There are more than two models of cross-border cooperation (barrier and contact). The two functions of the border interacting with local historic, social and political conditions create four models of cross-border cooperation. The heads of municipalities have different means of acting towards borders and the possibilities of their use:

The model of active contacts is characteristic of the Pechory, Pskov and Sebezh districts. The districts acknowledge the positive role of the border. The administration of Pechory actively participates in the development of the contact functions of the border. The administration tries to influence the visa process, but still states that proximity is a big problem (for entering the city it is necessary to have a special permit from the border department). Estonian businesses are quite active in the district. They have bought the municipal hotel building, and they control the Parme-Trans company, which deals with international cargo transportation.

The situation is similar in the Sebezh district. The powerful and eminent customs building there can be considered a symbol of cross-border cooperation, as the border in the district has become a factor of regional development. Housing, infrastructure and transport quality are features of the border’s contact function.

The administration of the Pskov district admits the positive role of the border in economic cooperation. In December 2005 the administration presented the International Centre of Intra-municipal Cooperation, in the framework of a conference on the role of municipalities in the development of cross-border initiatives. This was done in light of the reform of local self-government in Russia. The administration has a cooperation agreement with Gulbene in Latvia.

The model of passive contacts is characteristic of the Gdov district. The municipality has been involved in a project of cross-border cooperation, a project of international festival “Druzhba” (Friendship), in the context of EU borders’ extension. The participants of the project are Gdov secondary school, Russia, Tyrva gymnasium, Estonia, Salantai secondary school, Lithuania and Priekulskaya secondary school, Latvia. The project is unique. Since 1996, Gdov secondary school has maintained cooperation with secondary schools and gymnasiums of Lithuania (Salantai), Latvia (Priekule), Estonia (Tyrva) and Byelorussia (Vyvera). Once a year in May there is a 3-day festival where 30 schoolchildren and 6 teachers from each country participate. Every year the organisers change. The project was awarded in the contest “Professional prize of Council of Europe in cross-border cooperation of North-west Russia in 2005”.
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Passive contacts are also present in the Nevel and Pytalovo districts. The Pytalovo district is not interested in cooperation with Estonians, and vice versa. But the district administration considers that “Baltic business interests are being slowly shaped”. The border is considered a burden. The model of Euroregion “Livonia” used in the Pytalovo district is one of the most widespread forms of cross-border cooperation. The objective importance of Euroregions for Russia lies in the promotion of dialogue and institutional innovations, new quality of regional development and new economic characteristics of the region.

The model of barriers is present, for example, in the Krasnogorodsky district. The district is wooded, the border is situated along marshes, and there are no border crossing points nor joint business projects. There is some circumspection in the development of relations with neighbours. The border is seen as a frontier and a barrier. The Model “indifference” is characteristic of the Usvyaty district. In this case the border is seen as an absolutely neutral notion that does not help nor prevent the economic development.

Cross-border cooperation is called upon to solve many tasks and problems. In our country the attention is given to economic aspects of cross-border cooperation while in European practice this aspect is not a major one. Cooperation more often covers the problems of emergencies and joint cultural programs. And still the most important thing is to form mutually favourable cross-border spaces at the level of municipalities. This is the level where cross-border cooperation provides ultimate chances for economy and society.
The venue of the conference, the Pskov City Cultural Center

STETE member Arto Nokkala at the registration
The High-level opening session, Minister Lehtomäki speaking

Panel members Vice Governor Shakhov, Senator Margelov and Minister Lehtomäki
Inside the Cultural Center

Panel members Minister Õunapuu and Consul General Klinga
Ancient walls around the city of Pskov are still standing. In former times they protected the city from attacks.

The Kreml church holds many legends and stories. Inside you’ll find an unprecedentedly high iconostasis.
In medieval times, the Pskov citizens assembled at the Kreml courtyard in ‘early democratic’ gatherings.

The Pskov regional administration and the Finnish Consulate General in St.Petersburg hosted the Friday evening reception.
STETE people enjoying the company of Minister Kucinskis: Meri Kulmala, former Acting Secretary General and Vice-Chair Outi Ojala

STETE Vice-Chair Heikki Järvenpää
The servings were luxurious enough to satisfy even a demanding sweet tooth.

View of the city.
The participants visited the nearby Pechory monastery, a colourful place with an interesting history.
The Izborsk fortress is located near Pechory
The fountains at Izborsk were said to bring health, wealth and happiness to the lives of those who drank from them. The participants did not hesitate to test this.

The border-crossing Peipsi lake is important both for the unique ecological value and waterway infrastructure it offers.
Cross-border cases – challenges and problems
Ecological safety and transboundary waters – the example of Lake Chudskoye

NATALIA ALEXEEVA
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRE FOR TRANSBOUNDARY COOPERATION, ST. PETERSBURG, RUSSIA.

Ecological safety is an integral part of the general safety of the state in its broad definition. According to the Concept of National Safety of the Russian Federation of January 2000, national safety is construed as “the safety of its many-national people as the bearer of sovereignty and the sole source of the power in the Russian Federation”. National interests in Russia in the ecological sphere are dealt with here as the “preservation and enhancement of ecology”, and the document explains that “the threat of the worsening ecological situation in the country and the depletion of natural resources directly depend on the state of the economy and the readiness of the society to realise the global importance of the problems. The problem threatens the country due to the development of fuel and energy, the lack of development of environmental laws, the absence or limited use of nature-saving technologies, and low ecological culture”. The concept states, that to assure the national safety of the Russian Federation it is necessary “to improve the ecological situation of the country fundamentally”.

Transboundary territories are zones of special attention due to the combination of political, economic, and ecological national interests of two or more countries or supranational entities. For the Lake Chudskoye region the problems represent the interests of the Russian Federation and countries that recently became EU members (Latvia and Estonia) both at the level of 2 countries and in the context of Russian-European relations. Water resources play an important role as catalysts of cooperation in many transboundary regions, including the region of Lake Chudskoye.

The Peipsi region belongs to the category of transboundary water basins on the border of the EU and the countries of the EECCA component of the EU water initiative, the transboundary status of which is quite new due to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. New transboundary problems are serious challenges for the countries that share these water bodies (such as the rivers
Daugava/Zapadnaya Dvina and Neman, and the Aral and Kaspiyskoe seas). Basic transboundary problems include the non-coordination of activities and basic management, non-cooperation, the lack of resources as well as additional difficulties connected with the transboundary reality of border zones. To strengthen and develop cooperation in this sphere, there is the legal base of the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourse in International Lakes (UN ECE Water Convention), the EU Water Framework Directive and bilateral agreements. There are four bilateral Russian-Estonian agreements on fishery, cooperation in the sphere of ecology, rational use and protection of transboundary waters and water transport for the Lake Chudskoye region.

Concerning the regional transboundary problems in the sphere of ecological safety for the Russian-Estonian transboundary region, there are three key issues: transboundary air transfer connected with western transfer and emissions (including Estonian and Baltic thermoelectric power stations); the potential influence on biological resources (concerning fishing, the Ramsar territories, and endangered species) of transboundary waterworks and marshes; and the ecologically safe and sustainable use of water resources of the River Narva basin (including Lake Chudskoye).

One of the most vivid examples of providing ecological safety for transboundary water basins is the Joint Programme of transboundary Waters Management in the Lake Chudskoye, elaborated in 2003-2006 in the framework of the UNDP/GEF project on the development and implementation of the Lake Peipsi/Chudskoye basin management programme. This has the support of the Global Ecological Facility and UNDP in cooperation with Russian and Estonian partners. The document includes a short description of the water catchments, the identification of transboundary antropogenic impact, and a description of the monitoring network and system of water resources management in Estonia and Russia. The programme sets transboundary ecological aims according to four sub-programmes: support and improvement of water quality, water use, fishery management in Lake Chudskoye and transboundary sub-programme on biological diversity. The programme also offers activities that will lead to the aims stated above.

The programme identifies four priorities: the good status of transboundary surface waters; the good status of transboundary ground waters; the protection of the biological diversity of Lake Chudskoye; and the rational use of water resources.
The implementation of the programme implies a joint monitoring of environment, inspection, exchange of information, joint work with the public and scientific research. This is an important initiative that can be implemented as a transboundary endeavour to contribute to Russian-Estonian cooperation and the ecologically safe and sustainable development of the region.
Ecological state of the Russian side of Lake Pskov-Chudskoye

ZOJA KURBATOVA
PROFESSOR IN THE VELIKIE LUKI AGRICULTURAL ACADEMY, RUSSIA.

Lake Pskov-Chudskoye is Europe’s fourth largest lake and its largest transboundary lake. The research outlined here was conducted by Velikie Luki State Agricultural Academy at the request of the Pskov NGO Chudskoye Project and in the framework of the UNDP/GEF project, on the development and implementation of the Lake Peipsi/Chudskoye basin management programme on the Russian side. The area under consideration is the region of Lake Pskov-Chudskoye including the four following municipal entities of the Pskov Oblast - the districts of Gdov, Pechory, Pskov as well as the city of Pskov and the three following municipal entities of the Leningrad Oblast - the districts of Kingisepp and Slantsy and the town of Ivangorod.

Due to big fluctuations of climate factors, the region can be referred to as a region of ‘risk farming’. Agriculture is considered to be an unstable sector of the economy and its transition to sustainable development is a priority. Great changes in land use are taking place, but while the structure of land funds covers all categories of land use agriculture prevails in some regions (up to 60% in Pechory, Pskov), while in others forestry dominates (up to 50% in Gdov, Slantsy and Kingisepp). There is no agriculture in Pskov, while in Ivangorod 4.7% of land use is agricultural.

The amount of acidity in the soil shows the necessity to carry out liming on more than 50% of the area, especially in the districts of the Pskov region. The amount of nutritive materials (phosphorus and potassium) is average. The quality of soils in the Leningrad region, for instance, is higher than in the Pskov region. The index of ploughed cultivation varies in different districts to a maximum of 70%. All soils reveal the possible appearance of erosive processes and the washout of nutritive materials. At present many farms cannot cultivate all the ploughed fields, and some of them are transferred to the category of fallow lands. Such is the background for the tendency of reducing crop productivity...
and assortment. This in turn leads to a decreasing of quantities of domestic animals and birds and their by-products.

There is no active pollution from plant fertilisers, as the use of chemical elements is very low. In the districts of the Pskov region some 3-11 kg/ha of fertilisers are used, in Slantsy district 20 kg/ha and in Kingisepp 70-80 kg/ha. The amount of organic fertilizers has been decreased two-to-fourfold, especially in the Gdov and Pechory districts. Pesticides used on soils comprise 0.4 kg/ha and on ploughed fields 0.03 kg/ha.

Forests contribute to the sustainability of the landscape. They protect the soil from washout, drought and erosive processes, which is why they should be protected. This is particularly important in the Gdov, Slantsy and Kingisepp districts, where forests cover up to 60% of land. There are forests containing valuable conifers in all districts. In the Pskov and Kingisepp districts such forests cover almost half of all lands. There are protected types of forests along rivers, lakes and reservoirs. In the districts of the Pskov region potential and actual sources of pollution of water objects are changing. The structure of land use is changing too with cattle stock decreasing. There are large-scale farms (the Peredovik state farm, the Pobeda agro farm and the Pskov Agro Invest pig farm) all situated in the Pskov district.

In the last 10–15 years organic agriculture has become increasingly popular. The main disadvantage is the decrease of crop capacity. It is important to test the mechanism of the certification of agricultural products in the region, where all production is almost ecologically clean. But it is necessary to bring investments to the region, to develop different spheres of farms and the production of ecologically clean products, especially from the EU countries, if they are interested in the development of ecological farming and the clean state of transboundary waters, as Lake Pskov-Chudskoye is one of them. Taking into account the experience of ecological farming development, this process on the Russian side of the lake is possible, but it needs state support or a legal basis. Otherwise it will take many years.
Following the disintegration of the USSR, existing relations between organizations and institutions in the border Russian-Estonian territory were lost or stopped. Cooperation between Russian and Estonian organizations at that time was rare. In 1997 the non-governmental organization Chudskoye Project was established in Russia, and it had a partner organization in Estonia. Together, they have developed and implemented different projects in the course of almost 10 years, allowing for the establishment of partner relations between organizations of Russian-Estonian border territory. The organization was created to promote the principles of sustainable development and the improvement of the quality of life in the Lake Chudskoye region.

Several projects and programmes have been run with the participation of the Chudskoye Project. As Lake Pskov-Chudskoye is a transboundary waterway, a series of events have been held aimed at the improvement of interaction between nature-protection organizations in Russia and Estonia. Joint Russian-Estonian expeditions on water monitoring as well as seminars and study tours have been conducted, and support has been given to the work of the “Joint Russian-Estonian Commission on Water Protection and Rational Use of Transboundary Waters”.

NGO collaboration and the work of the Chudskoye Project

Olga Vasilenko
Chairperson of the Chudskoye Project, Russia.

Sergei Timofeev
Project Manager of the Chudskoye Project, Russia.
As the result of the project, the “Lake Peipsi/Chudskoye Basin Management Programme” was developed and a feasibility study and a concept for ecological farming and water, and ecological tourism around the lake were prepared. A demo project on ecological tourism called ‘Springs in Old Izborsk’ was run in the framework of the project. Several activities were done near the springs: info stands, benches and trash-bins were installed; a Russian style well was built; and the territory around the springs was improved. To promote Lake Pskov-Chudskoye and the region in general experts, historians, and employees of the NGO Chudskoye Project gathered materials and created a virtual museum about the lake. The museum contains basic information, the history of settlements around it, conservation areas and bio-diversity, the communities living in the area and traditional ways of life.

To raise awareness about the water resources of Lake Peipsi-Chudskoye and public participation in nature-protected activities, a small grants programme was implemented. In the framework of the programme 14 educational and cultural organizations received financial support. The Day of the Lake, a children’s expedition on lake research and the development of a board-game about the fish resources of the lake were carried out. Another initiative was the development of textbook and other materials on the ecology of the lake. The textbook was approved by the Expert Council of State Department on Education of Pskov region and recommended for use in secondary schools of the region. Analogous work was carried out on the Estonian side.

Transboundary projects of NGOs


The aim of the project was to enhance regional information sharing and cooperation between NGOs in the Chudskoye lake region, to promote common approaches to political, economic, and community reform issues and, through this, to develop civil society and democracy in both countries. The project held several conferences for NGOs, analysis and recommendations of NGOs of the Chudskoye region development and a database of Russian NGOs, and implemented projects in 2003-2004. The results of the project and the NGO database are available at http://ngo.lake-peipus.net.
Northern Dimension NGOs: Enhancing Trans-boundary Cooperation and Strengthening Environmental NGOs in the Pskov and St. Petersburg Regions (sponsorship: MFA of Finland, NATO Information office in Moscow, 2005-2006).

The project promotes trans-boundary cooperation between Finnish, North-west Russian and Estonian environmental NGOs, to support their networking and to strengthen the capacities of environmental NGOs especially in the regions of Pskov and St. Petersburg. The project was implemented by three NGOs from Finland, Russia and Estonia, under the management of the Baltic Institute of Finland. The first summer school for Russian, Finnish and Estonian Ecological NGOs was held in August 2005. Several joint projects between Eco-NGOs are being developed and an internet based information service was created: www.baltic.org/ngo/engo_database.

Transboundary ecological projects


The project was run jointly by NGOs from Russia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. The coordination of the project on the Russian side was done by the Chudskoye Project. The main aim of the project was for public participation in the development of river management plans, and the involvement of NGOs from the Baltic countries and North-west Russia in the process. The project resulted in national reports on public participation in river basins management, regional plans on public participation in line with the EU Water Framework Directive, and a series of training events and seminars for NGOs and state nature-protection organizations on public participation, in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive.

Transboundary projects in the sphere of education

Chudskoye Project is implementing several educational initiatives. One was the Finnish-Russian-Swedish-Estonian project called School Exchange in the Big Lakes Regions of Peipsi/Chudskoye (Estonia, Russia), Vänern (Sweden)
and South Päijänne-Vesijärvi (Finland) (2001 – 2003, 2005). The aim of the project was to establish international cooperation in the ecological and cultural curricula between schools and educational institutions in Russia, Finland, Sweden and Estonia. The project involved working meetings, thematic days, ecological-cultural camps in each of the countries, and the exchange of methods of teaching ecology.

5 2005 – 2006 – Northern Dimension and NGOs: Promoting Transboundary Cooperation between Russian, Estonian and Finnish Environmental NGOs (NATO office in Moscow, Finnish MFA)
6 2004 – 2006 – Peipsi and IJsselmeer: mutual Reference for Long-term Management (RWS-RIZA, RDIJ, the NL)
7 2001 – Development of Centre of Ecological Information (Civil Initiatives Foundation, SEPA)
The Baltic Sea Region encompasses a globally unique and sensitive environment, and therefore, it is particularly vulnerable to the effects of human activities. At the same time, all of the countries surrounding the Baltic Sea, including the islands within it, are strongly dependent upon clean air and a healthy marine environment. The same principle applies to Lake Peipsi or Chudskoe ozero.

Since the inception of the CBSS, environmental challenges have been an important issue. The declaration of the first CBSS Ministerial Meeting, held in 1992, expressed “deep concern about the pollution of the Baltic Sea” and that “the cleaning up of the Baltic Sea is a joint responsibility”. More recently, environmental cooperation as a priority was emphasised in the final document of the Baltic Sea States Summit held in 2004, and the communiqué of the 2005 CBSS Ministerial Session.

The CBSS follows closely the situation concerning the environmental condition of the Baltic Sea. This includes observing the activities of the Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership and the Helsinki Commission.
(HELCOM). The Informal Ministerial meeting on the Environment held in Stockholm underlined the clear need to strengthen actions that aim to tackle problems in the Baltic Sea, such as eutrophication, hazardous substances, the environmental impacts of shipping and threats to fish stocks. The CBSS strongly welcomes HELCOM’s efforts to develop a Baltic Sea Action Plan, which will facilitate the coordination of activities to improve the ecological status of the Baltic Sea.

Activities on pertaining to the environment protection, including those addressed by the HELCOM’s Baltic Sea Action Plan, require the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders in the Region. One of such important partners is the Agenda 21 for the Baltic Sea Region – also known as Baltic 21. Having the objective to realise an Eco-region for sustainable development, the Baltic 21 process has proved to be definitive in terms of our region’s effort to develop in a sustainable and thus responsible manner. Baltic 21 offers a credible and capable framework for integrating the principles of sustainable development into policy-making by all relevant stakeholders, including those active on the sub-regional level. Its continued – and even accelerating – development, and the implementation of cross-sectoral Lighthouse Projects are prime examples of its valuable function, in this respect. Notably, the Baltic 21 Lighthouse Project concept encompasses the objectives of ensuring high project visibility, the participation of as many countries as possible and the broader implementation of existing and new solutions.

In addition to Lighthouse Projects, evaluating key trends in Baltic Sea regional and sustainable development is also an important priority for Baltic 21. Soon Baltic 21 will publish its latest Triennial Report covering the period 2003–2005. In this Report, Baltic 21 examines regional trends in sustainable development and provides a number of concrete recommendations concerning the way ahead.

Another important and tangible aspect of CBSS environmental cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region – and one which cannot be overlooked – relates to the activities of the CBSS “Working Group on Nuclear and Radiation Safety” (WGNRS). The WGNRS made considerable progress over the past years in ensuring nuclear and radiation safety in the Baltic Sea Region. These efforts were recognised and applauded by the signing of a CBSS “Agreement on the Exchange of Radiation Monitoring Data” in June 2001, as well as a “Joint Declaration on the Exchange of Air Radiation Monitoring Data” (which was signed on the basis of 2001 Agreement). The Heads of Government in the region were to take note of this Joint Declaration at the upcoming Baltic Sea States
Summit held in June 2006 in Reykjavik. Other relevant WGNRS activities include the harmonisation of external dose rate measurements; limits and reference levels for emergency preparedness; the handling and control of strong radioactive sources; as well as illicit trafficking and others.

Cross-border cooperation has always been among the top priorities of the CBSS, not least because it provides a valuable tool with which we can work to overcome divisions and increase regional cohesion. Cross-border cooperation within the region, as well as cross-border cooperation extending beyond the region’s external EU-border, is indeed a very practical issue for the CBSS to include on its agenda. Already, actions are underway through the joint BSR INTERREG III B-project of the Nordic Council of Ministers and the CBSS, called “Baltic Euroregional Network” (BEN). Notably, the Chudskoye Project (Pskov) and the Peipsi Centre for Transboundary Cooperation (Tartu) are partners in the BEN-project, which began in 2005 and ends in 2007.

In the future, the CBSS will continue to explore possible synergies and to address issues of common concern through intensified cooperation with other regional initiatives and interested stakeholders, including non-governmental organisations as well as parliamentarians, represented by the Baltic Sea Parliamentary Conference.
Northern Dimension Partnership in Public Health and Social Wellbeing

VIKTORAS MEIŽIŠ
HEAD OF THE DIVISION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH, LITHUANIA.

There are large differences in the quality of health in the area covered by the EU Northern Dimension Region. From about 1990 such differences rapidly increased in the Baltic Sea region. The challenges in public health are too great to be handled by any single country or organization, which is why we need to jointly accomplish the task of promoting the development of national and regional strategies for sustainable development through improving human health and social wellbeing.

Numerous development and cooperation projects and programmes have been started, and many countries and regional and international organisations have taken part in these. A well-known example was the CBSS’ “Task Force on Communicable Disease Control”, the mandate of which expired in 2004.

In October 2003, the “ND Partnership in Public Health and Social Wellbeing” (NDPHS) was established at a meeting in Oslo of the respective partner countries’ health ministers, and partner organizations’ high representatives. The partners comprise 13 countries (the 11 CBSS countries plus France and Canada) and
eight international organizations (EUC, WHO, ILO, IOM, UNAIDS, CBSS, NCM, BEAC).

The point of the partnership is to promote sustainable development in the EU Northern Dimension area through improving human health and social wellbeing. The partnership aims at contributing to intensified cooperation in social and health development, to assist partners and participants in improving their capacity to set priorities in health and social wellbeing, and to enhance coordination of international activities within the ND area. The activities should contribute to a narrowing of social and economic differences, and to a general improvement of the quality of life and of the demographic situation. The two main priority areas are the reduction of major communicable diseases, and the enhancement and promotion of healthy and socially rewarding lifestyles.

The partnership is a framework for continuous dialogue on priorities for cooperation and coordination. The main aim is to add value by promoting coherent actions. Our goal as the chairing country is to make the partnership efficient and constructive. It’s important for each partner to take its share of responsibilities and practical tasks.

The structure of the partnership works only if the participants are sufficiently committed. This comprises: a Partnership Annual Conference (PAC), the highest (ministerial) cooperation structure; a Committee of Senior Representatives (CSR), the partnership’s regular coordination mechanism meeting usually three times a year; a Secretariat, providing administrative, analytic and other support to the CSR. The secretariat is run by a head official and senior adviser located in St. Petersburg and seconded to the secretariat by the Nordic Council of Ministers. There are also Expert groups on HIV, Primary Healthcare, Prison Health, Social Inclusion, Healthy Lifestyles and Work Ability. These groups have an advisory role and provide professional input on the preparation and implementation of joint activities, including work programmes. Their main role is to facilitate networking among partners, and as such they are the backbone of the partnership.

The 2006–2007 work programme makes the fight against HIV/AIDS a major concern and a core activity promoted by the partnership. The partnership will encourage an HIV/AIDS perspective to be applied in all activities implemented in the Northern Dimension region. It will also support national/federal, regional and local programmes and projects aimed at the systematic reform and strengthening of societal structures.
The new working group on social inclusion, healthy lifestyles and work ability will assist in coordinating and further developing the partnership, and will focus on alcohol and binge drinking, young people’s lifestyles and occupational health.

The programme’s future work highlights six broad areas:

- To act as an umbrella organisation and clearing house
- To introduce result-based management in the partnership
- To coordinate on CSR level and expert group level
- To improve the commitment of each partner
- To investigate more all the accessible global resource in the health and social arenas
- To improve coordination in the region while working in public health and social wellbeing
The NGO sector in post-Soviet Russia has undergone a rapid development and growth amidst the very disadvantageous historical, political and cultural background of centuries of authoritarian tradition, a centralised state and disrespect for individual autonomy. The non-profit sector in Russia is neither the perestroika phenomenon nor one imported from the West. Charity, philanthropy, group activity and voluntarism have long been part of our history and are now being revived.

The domination of the state, which has maintained the structure and quality of services and the policy of social exclusion from the previous regime, represents a great danger to the development of the third sector. Funding for citizens’ activities and services provided by NGOs in social inclusion work remains the biggest problem in Russia and is crucial for the further development of NGOs in Russia. It means that the third sector in Russia remains a fragile ecosystem, vulnerable to external threats and unsure of the sources of its financial support.

In the traditionally highly professional sector of social welfare and healthcare finding a role for NGOs has taken long. The inability of the public sector to shoulder the responsibility of ever-increasing social and health problems has lead to the emergence of totally new possibilities for coping with these problems. Trans-national cooperation has proved to be the most important factor in the developing of the Russian third sector. One example is the Finnish-Russian Network of Social and Health NGOs. In Finland, the central organizations in the field of social welfare and health launched a cooperation project in 1996, in order to advance organisational activities in Russia. The activities during the project phase were concentrated in St. Petersburg, where building a support network for citizens was only beginning to take shape.

During the project phase, the foundation was laid for a Finnish - St. Petersburg cooperation network of organizations operating in the different sectors of social

---

**Finnish-Russian Network of Social and Health NGOs**

**Anna Skvortsova**

Coordinator of the Finnish-Russian Network of Social and Health NGOs, Russia.
welfare and health. The organizations’ special expertise in their specific fields was used in creating a cooperation plan for the organization of pairs and clusters. For example, training in the different operating fields, joint seminars and exchange of expertise were included in the plan. The organizations involved have become more internationally oriented and gained new opportunities to learn about different cultures. Operations in the form of a project funded by the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Finland’s Slot Machine Association ended in June 1999.

After the end of the project, the Finnish-Russian Network of Social and Health NGOs was established to carry on operations and to maintain and develop contacts. Some 40 organizations from Finland and 50 from the Northwest region of Russia are actively involved in the network, covering several sectors in the field of social welfare and health:

- child welfare
- homelessness and social exclusion
- public health promotion (diabetes, mental health, epilepsy, cancer)
- substance abuse and the promotion of healthy lifestyles
- welfare for the aged
- welfare for the disabled (the mentally handicapped, the visually impaired, the deaf, the physically disabled)

The purpose of the network is to advance collaboration among the NGOs and other sectors of society in order to strengthen the prerequisites for improving the social and health conditions of individual citizens. Our goal is to create sustainable cooperation of organisations in the field of social welfare and health by learning from each other and by identifying new courses of action. The network provides the participants with the possibility to attain information on the overall social situation and on the activities of NGOs in both countries. The organisations are supported in maintaining mutual contacts and in planning and implementing joint projects. The aim is also to strengthen cooperation and the exchange of knowledge and experience beyond the organisations’ own operating fields.

The network has offices in Helsinki (in conjunction with the Finnish Centre for Health Promotion) and St. Petersburg (in conjunction with the Information and Analyses Centre for Social and Health NGOs) and a contact person in Petrozavodsk. Since 1999 the network has been publishing a monthly
Information Bulletin in St. Petersburg for the organizations involved in the network, and also those who are interested in activities of the social and health sector NGOs in St. Petersburg and in Finland. The Finnish organizations have set up a board to coordinate mutual cooperation.

Several models of cooperation have been worked out in the course of the project. The question is, which model is optimal, suitable and sufficient for the Russia of today? For instance, St. Petersburg and Finnish child care organizations have different conditions for their activities in their own countries. The main conclusions are:

- First, a universal model of international cooperation in child welfare is hardly possible.
- Second, each NGO applies its own “ad hoc” model appropriate to a social situation.
- Third, in the child care sub-sector of the Finnish-St Petersburg cooperation network, an optimal model of cooperation is based on coherent activities of working groups in both countries. Working groups consist of representatives of child welfare organizations and experts from the public sector and NGOs, and are coordinated from cooperation activity centres in Helsinki and St. Petersburg. They have an expert role in developing the cooperation programme. This is especially important for St. Petersburg, as there are no bigger umbrella organisations or regular forums for child care specialists neither from public nor the NGO sector for exchanging the information and experience. They are also a guarantee that a proper perspective of cooperation is chosen.
An innovative model of business education

EDUARD MOPPEL
RECTOR OF THE PSKOV VOLNY INSTITUTE, RUSSIA.

The processes of European integration increase interest in international activities in the systematization and update of cross-border cooperation. In Russia relations with foreign partners are traditionally based on the intermediate function of governments at all levels. Contacts via the authorities are assured but not always effective. Direct, mutually beneficial relations have proven more effective, and so the authorities have declared their readiness to adopt the international experience of business and NGOs.

Direct partnership management and the flexible lobbying of agreed proposals require special communicative skills. These can be mastered to improve professional education to satisfy the needs of sectoral (business/authorities/NGOs) and intra-sectoral levels of implementing the cross-border projects. The creation of adequate models of education predetermines specialist skills to use professional knowledge not only in the profile sphere, but to interact in any professional, training or consulting teams - to develop new courses/programs according to the needs of a concrete customer. Business education is opposed to academic and static education; it should be developed as a synthetic product of inter-corporative and sub-national features.

The international integrative E-MECHANO GROUP could become an efficient model of business education. The creation of this group was initiated by the autonomous non-commercial organization, the Pskov Volny Institute. It was established to develop and implement technologies of cross-border partnerships on intra-sectoral levels, and to further the effective interaction of professional communities.

The E-MECHANO GROUP comprises business people, authorities and NGOs. There are no quotas of representatives. The ‘entrance’ criteria for any candidate are their interest to participate in the group, and motivation for effective professional activity. When developing educational courses and programmes
the E-MECHANO GROUP must proceed from the principles of variety, actuality, and integrated knowledge. Variety provides the possibility of multi-level preparation and retraining of specialists, increases the degree of adequacy of elective courses, and calls for the synergy of joint activities by teachers.

Actuality induces a concentration on the tasks of the present and future of cross-border cooperation, to support the sustainable interest of representatives of the target groups (business, authorities or NGOs). Integrated knowledge guarantees the provision of broad specialization and assists in forming interdisciplinary self-teaching teams. Observance of mentioned parameters is possible in the module format, which is kept within the problem-oriented approach and which presupposes experimentation.

The work of the E-MECHANO GROUP is divided into three stages: staffing, setting up a platform and assembly. At the staffing stage the following processes take place:

- Forming the staff of the E-MECHANO GROUP
- Planning and organization of E-MECHANO GROUP members’ education.
- Conducting a study to discover actual needs for professional spheres (business, authorities or NGOs) necessary for the development of cross-border cooperation.
- Attracting adequate specialists necessary to satisfy needs.
- Developing educational courses or programs.
- Testing of educational courses or programs.

Setting up a platform means tuning the thinking of all students to the globalization processes. This takes place while studying the educational module on increasing the effectiveness of cross-cultural communications. Assembly takes place at all levels of activity.

With the E-MECHANO GROUP model the dissemination of developed technologies is performed in accordance with know-how, where the difference of education, experience and the points of view of students at the entrance are transformed into the differentiation of participants’ roles in joint activities. The result is that the representatives of professional communities of business, authorities and NGOs develop variants of cross-border interaction at the platform of effective communications.
Developing business cooperation

Slava T. Khodko
Chairman of the Board of the North-West Development and Investment Promotion Agency, Russia.

Business cooperation of different states is carried out through external trade, mutual investment and the creation of transnational corporations. International cooperation provides potentially attractive strategies both for enterprises and regional development, while it assumes entrance to the new markets and capacity expansion. Interregional economic cooperation may be developed in a similar way. The experience of many states with developed economies shows that efficient public administration provides some benefits for adjacent regions from investments in a neighbouring region. In placing production in one of the regions, the investor usually plans to attract the work force, suppliers, sub-suppliers, subcontractors, and other companies that provide different services from other regions. This development may become a basis for socio-economic cooperation between regions, contribute to the creation of interregional industrial clusters, and engage developed, underdeveloped or depressed regions in international investment process.

Inter-sectoral economic cooperation also plays an important role. The business activities of large companies may become a platform for a wide range of supply company activity, and this creates favourable conditions for SMEs.
Through industry associations and trade unions, companies are able to have an influence on state policy and to achieve beneficial decisions for them.

One of the fields of high priority in border cooperation is transport. The joint development of car, railway, port and aircraft infrastructure is a basic condition for business cooperation in other areas. For example, the Pskov region could play an important role in transit, due to its location and border with the European Union. Today, St. Petersburg is the main logistical centre in Northwest Russia. Several significant projects are being planned or implemented, such as the city ring road, and projects for high-speed traffic between St. Petersburg and Helsinki, with a possible further extension to Moscow. On the agenda is also the creation of two new navigation ways for deep-sea vessels and shallow-water vessels, and the construction of Mobidik port in Kronstadt. It is essential that these projects serve not only St. Petersburg but most Baltic Sea states. This is why business cooperation and the participation of foreign investors can provide developed transport infrastructure in the Northwest region.

Cooperation in the protection of the environment is another business priority within cross-border cooperation. The environment has neither state borders nor administrative limits. The EU enlargement has led to significant political and economic shifts in Europe and has radically influenced ecological and nature matters due to the unification of legislation. There is some shift too in the exploitation of forest in the European regions of Russia. Of course, there are several differences between countries due to historical and cultural traditions. For example, in Finland there is a developed institution of the private ownership of forestry. For Russia this transition lies ahead and probably will be the business of future generations.

There were difficult problems in Russian Karelia two or three years ago, when the price of standing wood was $4.5 a cubic metre, while across the border in Finland the price was $60. Partly owing to the cooperation of business, price policy is flattening out and prices are approaching the European level. We have to do a lot yet in transferring experience of Finland and Sweden in the joint exploitation of forests.

Specialists in power energy have long-standing cooperation with border states. Trade in power energy, to provide a reliable power supply to border regions is the subject of close cooperation between businesses representing the Northwest region and the border states. There is significant interest by Norway in the energy potential of the Kola Peninsula, and there are opportunities for the construction of a power line from Russia to Norway, contributing to the increase in energy exports.
Cooperation between the public and private sectors is one of the most effective instruments of implementing large economic projects. The program is a good example of public-private partnership organisation at an international level. Concrete results are being achieved in the following areas: the creation of conditions for enterprises cooperation; recommendations on the optimization of customs procedures for speeding up the transportation of goods across the Russian-Finish border; the creation of effective funding and investment attraction in important regional projects, especially in industry; and the improvement of Russian enterprise management.

Business activity in the solution of vital problems is a precondition for the successful implementation of interregional and international projects. But business alone cannot solve problems without engaging state bodies. This is why the idea of private-public partnerships is becoming a necessity. The prosperity of our states and sustainable development in all spheres hinges on cooperation between business and public authorities.
Developing forestry sustainably and productively

ELENA YABLOCHKINA
COORDINATOR OF PUBLIC RELATIONS OF WWF RUSSIA PROJECT
PSKOV MODEL FOREST.

The aim of the Pskov Model Forest WWF project is the introduction of the sustainable management of forests in the Northwest of Russia. The main task is the creation of a working model of economically effective, ecologically acceptable and socially grounded forestry on the territory of Strugi Krasnye, with subsequent dissemination of experience on other territories of the Northwest region.

In the first phase, 2000–2004, the aim was to develop models of economic, ecologic and socially effective and sustainable forestry, and to demonstrate these models in practice. The model of the intensive and sustainable management of forestry involves technologies of forestry management based on the growth and constant care of forest, which is aimed at getting high quality, expensive timber while maintaining the forest eco-system and bio-diversity. A comparison would be a well-groomed garden where both plants and the garden itself are tended.

It is important to note that for six years the project has participated in cross-border cooperation by means of involving Swedish experts on bio-diversity and the development and carrying out of forestry activities, and by social work. The project specialists have managed to transfer major techniques of intensive forestry to Russian conditions.

The Pskov intensive forestry model increases economic forestry efficiency, plans forestry parameters and provides a real non-exhaustible forestry base. It also allows the use of landscape planning, which helps maintain bio-diversity while also being an instrument for felling and providing certification. Such intensive forestry allows reducing the areas of commercial forest management in Russia by increasing the areas of non-exploitable or weak-exploitable forests.

The second phase of the project aimed to complete the work on the creation of sustainable forestry and dissemination of these techniques in Northwest
Russia. Between 2000 and 2005 the specialists of Pskov Model Forest project conducted 30 international seminars devoted to the techniques of sustainable intensive forestry in the Northwest of Russia. About 600 people participated in the seminars.

The Pskov Model Forest project has also organized six study trips to Sweden, Estonia and Latvia for the specialists of forestry, timber specialists and representatives of executive and legislative branches of Pskov and Leningrad regions. The aim of the study trips has been to get acquainted with leading foreign experiences of intensive sustainable forestry, modern models of forest management and new automated technologies in timber processing.

Since 2005 the Pskov Model Forest project has been integrated into the programme of Russian-Swedish cooperation in the forestry sector. The Pskov project is responsible for the realization of disseminating the sustainable experience of forestry on the territory of the four administrative regions in Northwest Russia (Pskov, Archangelsk, Vologda and Leningrad). The project’s experts have developed the model of sustainable intensive forest management, which allows for an increased economic return from forestry.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Kucinskius Maris</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kulmala Meri</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Kurbatova Zoya</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Kurkinne Pauli</td>
<td>Director of Administration and Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kurttakko Kyosti</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Kuznetsov Boris</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Kuznetsov Vladimir</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kästik Toomas</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Kordysh Yulia</td>
<td>Specialist of Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kötschau Gabriele</td>
<td>Director of The Council of the Baltic Sea States Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Laanamäe Mart</td>
<td>Under-secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Larsen Hans-Peter</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Lassinantti Gunnar</td>
<td>Special Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Lehtomäki Paula</td>
<td>Minister of Foreign Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Lepojärvi Kati</td>
<td>Secretary general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Lindestam Åsa</td>
<td>Member of the Swedish Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Lodenius Peter</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Lopatin Vladimir</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Lääne Sulev</td>
<td>Adviser to Ministry of the Interior, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Makarov Evgeniy</td>
<td>Adviser of the Presidential Plenipotentiary Representative to the North-west Federal District,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivanovich</td>
<td>Presidential Office of Plenipotentiary Representative to the North-west Federal District, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Marchenko Oleg</td>
<td>Adviser Russian Embassy in Latvian Republic, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vyacheslavovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Margelov Mikhail</td>
<td>Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Council of Federation, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitalievich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mashkarin</td>
<td>Deputy head of the Committee on Youth Policy and Sport Administration of Pskov region, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aleksandr Yurievich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Meizäis Viktoras</td>
<td>Head of Foreign Affairs Division Ministry of Health of the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Mezhievich Nikolay</td>
<td>Professor St. Petersburg State University, Chair of World Politics, Faculty of International Relations, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maratovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mikhailov Vladimir</td>
<td>Second Secretary Representative Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of RF in Pskov, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gennadyevich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mikhailov Nikolay</td>
<td>Head Representative of Minister for Economic Development and Trade in Pskov, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivanovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Milen Anneli</td>
<td>Senior expert National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, STAKES, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mironov Nikolay</td>
<td>Head Gdov District Administration, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mikhailovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mjalitsina Natalja</td>
<td>Head of Foreign Relations and European Affairs Ministry of the Interior of Estonia, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Moppel Eduard</td>
<td>Rector Pskov Volny Institute, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Morozov Andrei</td>
<td>Vice-governor Administration of Pskov region, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolievich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Nokkala Arto</td>
<td>Senior Researcher University of Tampere, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nousiainen Minna</td>
<td>Project Coordinator Finnbarents, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Öberg Maria</td>
<td>Member of Swedish Parliament Swedish Parliament, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Ojala Outi</td>
<td>Vice-chair of STETE’s board, Member of Finnish Parliament STETE, Finland Parliament of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Orechov Vladimir</td>
<td>Member of Lithuanian Parliament Lithuanian Parliament, Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Öun Aivar</td>
<td>Member of Estonian Parliament Vice-chairman of Environment Committee, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Öunapuu Jaan</td>
<td>Minister of Regional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Paananen Kai</td>
<td>General Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Panina Galina Anatolyevna</td>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Patrikainen Salla</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Pelto Elina</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Persson Christer</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Petrov Pavel Viktorovich</td>
<td>Head of the NCM Information Centre in Petrozavodsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Petrukhin Vadim Vladimirovich</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Petruše Ieva</td>
<td>Assistant of State Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Plyushch Lyudmila Vladimirovna</td>
<td>Expert, assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Polozov Boris Gennadyevich</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Popova Tatjana Ivanovna</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Püvi Peeter</td>
<td>Consul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Radvilavičius Sarūnas</td>
<td>Main Coordinator of BEN-project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Rantaniemi Mare</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Redkina Raisa Egorovna</td>
<td>1st Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ristolainen Mari</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Rodionova Natalya Mikhailovna</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Röpelinen Anja</td>
<td>Architect/Project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Rymyantseva Tatiana Yakovlevna</td>
<td>Head of International Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ryasentseva Maya Borisovna</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Savko Vera Anatolyevna</td>
<td>Assistant in Press and Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Sehovtsov Juri</td>
<td>Member of Estonian Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Selivanov Aleksandr</td>
<td>Federal Chief Inspector of the Pskov Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vladimirovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Semenova Larisa</td>
<td>General Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albinovna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Serafinovics Gints</td>
<td>Consul of Latvia in Pskov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Sergunin Aleksandr</td>
<td>Head of Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolievich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Skorokhodov Vladimir</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolyevich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Skvortsova Anna</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yanovna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Sobol Nikolay</td>
<td>Head Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivanovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Shakhov Dmitriy</td>
<td>Vice-Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vladimirovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Shkrebets Aleksandr</td>
<td>Co-director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evgenyevich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Shlosberg Lev</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markovich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Shuraev Vladimir</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vasilyevich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Slobodova Anna</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Stenarv Gunnar</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Taipale Ilka</td>
<td>Member of Finnish Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baltic Sea Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Teckenberg Jaana</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Timofeev Sergei</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evgenievich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Toivanen Pasi</td>
<td>Vice Consul (Customs Issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position &amp; Department</th>
<th>Organization/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Traat Andres</td>
<td>2nd Secretary, 3rd Political Department</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Trifonov Leonid Nikolaevich</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Pskov City Duma, Pskov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Tsvetkov Nikolay Yuriyevich</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Pskov Regional Administration, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Vaigur Kristjan</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Baltic Sea Trade Union Network, BASTUN, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Vasilenko Olga Viktovorina</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>NGO &quot;Chudskoye Project&quot;, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Vasilyev Gennady Nikolayevich</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Palkino Rayon Administration, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Vasiliev Vadim Gennadievich</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Department of Federal Migration Service, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Vänskä Juha</td>
<td>Consul</td>
<td>Consulate General of Finland in SPB, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Yablochkina Elena Mikhailovna</td>
<td>Coordinator of Public Relations</td>
<td>Project &quot;Pskov Model Forest&quot;, WWF Russia, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Yarmushichev Elena Genrikhovna</td>
<td>Specialist of Directorate</td>
<td>Directorate of Euroregion “Lake’s region”, Braslav, Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Zakharova Vera Valentinovna</td>
<td>Assistant, Political and Economic Department</td>
<td>Consulate General of the USA in St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Zubov Vladimir Anatolievich</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce of the Pskov Region, Russia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>