



MASTER THESIS  
INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

---

# Global Governance and Sustainable Development

An analysis of some examples for global, EU and  
national policies and strategies

Author: Natalia Stepanova  
Advisor: Karl Bruckmeier

Number of words: 19119

2011-05-25



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

## **Abstract**

This thesis has been motivated by a desire to understand how sustainable development on the national level fits into global relationships. Ideas of sustainable development may affect all countries; play an important role in terminating national priorities, strategies, socio-economic development and prospects for further reforms. The chapters introduce theoretical aspects of concepts sustainable development and global governance and an overview and analysis of sustainable development policies on the global, EU and national levels. The thesis investigates national sustainable development strategies in three Scandinavian countries: Sweden, Denmark and Norway; and their interactions with the global and EU policies.

In order to answer the research questions and to prove the hypothesis several methods were used: secondary analysis of data gained from the policies and strategies, literature review, analysis of videos produced for spreading information about EU policies, and interviews with experts in the field of SD. The interviews helped to receive views of people who are involved in the implementation, developing or analyzing the sustainable development.

The thesis came to the conclusion of synergies between SD strategies on the three levels of governance. Influence of EU and global concerns is visible on the national level. However national sustainable development strategies in Scandinavian countries, built on the fundamental principles of the SD concept, are not identical.

**Key words:** sustainable development, global governance, strategies, global policies, Agenda 21, Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, EU, Sweden, Denmark, Norway.

## **Acknowledgments**

It is a pleasure to thank those who made this thesis possible. Foremost I would like to show my gratitude to my advisor Pr. Karl Bruckmeier for the continuous support, comments and patience. This thesis would not have been possible without his knowledge and help.

I am also very grateful for all survey respondents: Bengt Kriström, Gerald Berger, William Lafferty, Göran Broman, Anne Meldgaard, Charles Berkow and Audun Ruud. It was a big honor for me to be in contact with the people mentioned above.

Finally, I am indebted to many of my friends who supported me during the last months.

# Table of contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	5
Aim of the thesis.....	6
Research questions .....	7
Hypothesis.....	7
Disposition .....	8
<b>1. Conceptual framework</b> .....	9
1.1. Overview of the concept “Global governance” .....	10
1.2. Overview of the concept “Sustainable development” .....	13
<b>2. Methodological approach and design</b> .....	20
<b>3. From global policies to the European Union strategies</b> .....	22
3.1. The role of global policies.....	22
3.1.1. Agenda 21 as a milestone document.....	22
3.1.2. Johannesburg Plan of Implementation .....	25
3.2. The European Union’s role and strategy for sustainable development .....	27
3.2.1. Assessment of the EU as an actor.....	27
3.2.2. The EU strategy for sustainable development.....	29
3.2.3. The EU and sustainable development: content-based video analysis.....	31
<b>4. National strategies for sustainable development</b> .....	34
4.1. Sweden .....	36
4.1.1. The challenge in Sweden: from environmental documents to SD strategies..	36
4.1.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government	37
4.1.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in the Sweden's	
objectives.....	39
4.2. Denmark.....	43
4.2.1. The challenge in Denmark: from environmental documents to SD strategies	43
4.2.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government	44
4.2.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in the Denmark’s	
objectives.....	45
4.3. Norway .....	49
4.3.1. The challenge in Norway: from environmental documents to SD strategies..	49
4.3.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government	50
4.3.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in the Norway’s	
objectives.....	52
<b>Concluding discussion</b> .....	55
References.....	58
Appendix A. Request for answering questions.....	62
Appendix B. Questionnaire for expert interviews.....	63
Appendix C. List of respondents.....	64
Appendix D. Table 5. ....	65

## Tables

Table 1. NSDS and occasion for their developing. (Modified from ESDN Quarterly Report December 2007) .....	35
Table 2. Swedish objectives linked to global and EU key challenges. ....	40
Table 3. Danish objectives linked to global and EU key challenges. ....	46
Table 4. Norwegian objectives linked to global and EU key challenges. ....	53

## Figures

Figure 1.a. Three pillars of sustainable development in theory .....	16
Figure 1.b. Three pillars of sustainable development now .....	16
Figure 1.c. Three pillars of sustainable development – the change needed. ....	17

## **Abbreviations**

EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
CEC	Commission of the European Communities
CEU	Council of the European Union
GG	Global Governance
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
NSDS	National Strategy for Sustainable Development
MoE	Ministry of the Environment
MoEE	Ministry of Environment and Energy
MoF	Ministry of Finance
SD	Sustainable Development
SDS	Sustainable Development Strategies
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCHE	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

## **Introduction**

*“Our biggest challenge in this new century is to take an idea that seems abstract - sustainable development - and turn it into a reality for all the world's people”*

*- Kofi Annan (2001), Secretary General  
of the United Nations*

When the industrial period started about 200 years ago, growth and technological development were accompanied by a rapid increase in environmental pollution, damage to ecosystems, and overuse of natural resources. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century these processes were accelerating and accumulating (Haberl, 2006; Rockström et al., 2009). Science and culture have developed enormously, whereas the biosphere is threatened by these processes. The environmental crisis has reached global proportions by the end of XX century. It is a result of the actions based on the strategy for getting economic benefits without paying attention to the environment.

It was after the Brundtland report (1987), when it became clear that if environmental problems were not solved, then the biosphere and future generations would be endangered. It became necessary to change fundamentally the model of human development towards one, which does not destroy natural basis, but ensures the survival of humanity and continuing and sustainable development. In this regard, the concept of sustainable development started to be in the center of discussions on the various governmental levels.

The most important contributions of the international cooperation in the field of nature protection are based on universally recognized principles and norms, especially principles developed at the International Conference in Rio de Janeiro (1992) by United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. The most important question of this forum was to promote understanding of the relationship between international economic and environmental problems in the framework of sustainable development. It was noted that humanity should learn to use natural resources without undermining their future availability, to invest money and finance programs aiming at preventing the catastrophic consequences of human resource use activities (UNCED, 1992).

## **Aim of the thesis**

This thesis has been motivated by a desire to understand how sustainable development on the national level fits into global relationships. Ideas of sustainable development may affect all countries; play an important role in terminating national priorities, strategies, socio-economic development and prospects for further reforms. The aim of the thesis is to explore the sustainable development policies and the interactions among them from the global, EU and to national levels. I would like to mention that a very small number of publications are made on the topic which covers global, EU and national levels of implementing sustainable development strategies. The main purpose of the thesis, thus, is revelation and analysis of these connections. As these correlations haven't been studied enough, I would like to investigate how the policies are designed. In that way a contribution to new knowledge will be made. Moreover, the topic of the thesis is on the agenda due to the upcoming the UN Conference on Sustainable Development 2012.

In the accelerating processes of globalization any analysis requires perspectives from several regions or countries (Marten, Raza, 2010). In the works of scholars working on sustainable development one can find assertions that in today's geopolitics Scandinavia occupies one of the most important places as a region which is constantly working on the promotion of sustainable development (Nensen, Strand, 2008; Clement, 2005). Given the fact that in Nordic countries there is since long time professional interest in issues of sustainable development (Clement, 2005), the need to investigate their practices should be noted. These countries have gained good and bad practices in promoting and achieving sustainable development (Swedish National Reporting to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, 2007). Hence the Scandinavian failures and successes should be taken into account when developing models or strategies for sustainable development in other countries. These experiences can be important and useful with the extension of the European Union, when the youngest EU countries require significant attention for implementing the sustainable development policies into life.

The thesis investigates the national sustainable development strategies in three Scandinavian countries: Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The reasons for choosing particularly this region are the similarities of nature, attitudes towards the protection of environment and social development. According to the Development Index 2010 (Center for Global Development, 2010), Sweden, Denmark and Norway have the most effective development policies. For example, in the category of environmental policies Norway shows the smallest green house emissions. Talking about Sweden, it was one of the first countries

which started to support the idea of sustainable development. Since that times Sweden has been constantly fighting for promotion of a better environment. That is why particularly Scandinavian countries were chosen to explore the good practice of sustainable development, to underline what could be improved and by this to make a contribution for future progress.

## **Research questions**

1. *What are the meanings of “global governance” (GG) and “sustainable development” (SD)?*
2. *How does global governance influence sustainable development?*
3. *What are the synergies between GG and SD on the global, EU and national levels?*
4. *How are the SD strategies composed in the selected countries: Sweden, Denmark and Norway? What are the differences in their contents?*

Although sustainable development is regulated by policies on three institutional levels, the full implementation has not been successfully proved in the world’s history. Even when the European Union set common sustainable development strategies, Scandinavian countries and also other member states have different paths. By answering the research questions, the main differences will be highlighted.

## **Hypothesis**

The hypothesis of the study indicates and is based on the assumptions that:

- National SD policies will not be implemented effectively in the absence of global environmental governance.
- A productive and continuously monitored interaction and two-way communication between different government levels leads to a good implementation of SD policies.
- Global environmental governance has an impact on the national governance and positively influences the efficient development and of SD.

I expect to prove or disapprove the following hypothesis: *“A national SD strategy in a country X requires linkages with global and EU policies and is a useful and cohesive SD tool only when global and EU objectives are considered”.*



## **Disposition**

Given the purpose of the thesis, the structure of work is following. The first chapter includes the conceptual framework of the thesis; it is constructed from two concepts which guide the research – global governance and sustainable development. The chapter contains a study of the theoretical aspects of the two concepts mentioned above. Scholars have already highlighted how important sustainable development policies are in the present-day world and society (Gamage, Boyle, 2008; Seghezzi, 2009; Spangenberg, 2010). And still despite its relevance and significance, the subject “sustainable development” requires specification and conceptual exactness. The thesis will be conducted in order to determine some limitations and gaps in existing research. Hundreds of papers are devoted to the definition of sustainability. The purpose of this thesis is not to cover the entire number of them, but to critically overview few of them. Few key texts were chosen due to their foundational aims and results, such as Brundtland Report “Our Common Future” and the outcomes of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

Chapter two includes the methodological approaches and design. It describes the methods to answer research questions, as well as provide the information concerning the data and sources which were used. Limitations of data are also stated and argued.

Chapter three introduces the overview and analysis of sustainable development policies on the global and EU levels, including Agenda 21, the Rio Declaration, and the European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development. The national policies in Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark and Norway) will be described in the forth chapter. Being a core part of the thesis, this chapter directs attention toward three national strategies of selected countries and the assessment of target settings in accordance to global and EU governance. Sub-topics are devoted to the following issues: challenges from environmental documents to SD strategies, linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government and content assessment. The research will conclude not only the written literature but also the opinions of people who are involved in the implementation, developing or analyzing the sustainable development.

The conclusion shows the results and discusses how the hypothesis was proven.

# **1. Conceptual framework**

The first chapter of the thesis defines a conceptual framework that would structure the analysis. The analysis is composed from two concepts that guide the research: global governance and sustainable development. The reason for choosing these concepts is the recent increase in the linkage between them. In order to understand better the relationship between these concepts, it is essential to define and review them. The interpretations are discussed in the following overviews of the concepts.

Gerald Berger, a senior researcher and project manager at the Research Institute for Managing Sustainability at the Vienna University of Economics and Business, in the interview conducted for the thesis, explains the importance of SD to be discussed: *“Problems, or rather challenges of SD, are always important. Nowadays, with several grand challenges looming large (like economic crisis, resource management – e.g. energy resources, environmental degradation, poverty, etc), SD as a concept and approach for policy-making is of extraordinary importance. However, the influence of the SD concept or SD thinking in day-to-day policy-making is still small and underutilized. Therefore, the importance of the challenges of SD are not adequately addressed and/or managed on the policy side”*.

Moreover, in the context of sustainable development, the plan of implementation of the 2002 World Summit on sustainable development stated that “good governance within each country and at the international level is essential for sustainable development” and in order to achieve sustainable development “governments should accept the effective legislative acts for the environment” (WSSD, 2002). Good governance in this context refers to a step towards sustainability and includes efficiency, openness and “greater sensitivity to the immediate context that is promised by subsidiarity” (Kemp, Parto, 2005, p.18). More concretely the idea of governance includes that of participation of citizen, stakeholders and non-governmental organizations in decision-making. Furthermore, according to Blin and Marin (2008) global governance in this context does not contrast the variations on the global, EU and national levels. Indeed the idea refers to multi-level governance relationships and their advantages among which are the international openness, linkages and integration of global and national policies (Smith, Stirling, 2010).

By combining two concepts it is easier to structure the following analytical part. For example, sub-chapters in the “National Strategies for Sustainable Development” part “Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government” and “Linkages with global, EU policies in the Swedish objectives” are constructed with the intention to follow the links between global governance and sustainable development on the national level.

The framework should help to allocate the synergies between objectives from national and global policies concerning sustainable development. The global governance concept is a tool to combine common objectives in different SD strategies. Both concepts which will be discussed are useful while analyzing decision-making processes on the three policy levels. As we will see in the analysis the decisions of individuals, groups or organizations concerning sustainable development as a collective good are influenced by global governance.

### **1.1. Overview of the concept “Global governance”**

The term “governance” was initially used in the business context. Global governance is an extremely broad term which includes a system of international institutions and organizations (Haas, 2004), regimes and national administrations (Weiss, 2000), with an engagement of a society. Global governance is a mechanism necessitated by globalization, the powerful transformative force, responsible for changing societies and world order (Haas, 2004). Rapid changes happening due to globalization emerged not only contradictory, but also conflicting processes. Globalization with its negative and positive impacts started to challenge “the traditional capacity of national governments to regulate and control” (Esty, Ivanova, 2005, p.2).

On the one hand, there was a further democratization of social life, the deepening interdependence among nations and people, extension of technical and information capacity of mankind. The global revolution in information and communication brought the world into a qualitatively new state. It still squeezes space and time, changes the conditions of social existence of people and accelerates the pace of these changes. As a result, globalization increased the number of actors involved in the communication process of global governance (Forman, Segaar, 2006)

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the threats, challenges and risks of globalization which take place, such as growing inequality and poverty, the growth of terrorism, environmental problems and illegal migration. Globalization has become a leading trend of world development in contradiction with the principle of a national sovereignty and national interests (Haas, 2004).

The realities of globalization indicated the need for a quick change of the existing system of international relations. It is evident that globalization cannot be detained, or prevented. And since it has begun to permeate more spheres of human activity, the question of its institutionalization endowed with an appropriate amount of authority and legitimacy started to be important in all spheres. Talking about management, effective governance was

essential for the establishing of sustainable development policies (Haas, 2004). Such institutionalization varied in several forms. The main ones were global co-operation, in which the coordinated global policy could play a crucial role, and global governance, in which international organizations would be autonomous from states in decision-making (Haas, 2002).

The need to build global governance was based on the belief that humanity, after a number of global wars and global conflicts, had been provided with a unique opportunity to establish an order, which should be based on a set of fundamental values that can unite people, set environmental standards and harmonize political situations (Esty, Ivanova, 2005). It is also noted by scholars (Esty, Ivanova, 2005; Dingwerth, Pattberg, 2006) that such management could include democratic principles implemented in accordance with established rules of law binding for all without exception.

The term global governance was in the focus of extensive scientific debates mainly because of Brandt and the UN Commission on Global Governance, which was created to find solutions to global problems facing humanity: environmental pollution, poverty, infectious diseases etc. In 1995 the Commission produced a report entitled “Our Global Neighborhood”. The report was a justification for the need of global governance as a part of the evolution in the rational organization of life on the planet and as a paradigm, based on priorities of cooperation and mutual assistance, which would guide and frame globalization (Commission on Global Governance, 1995).

Global governance is a special type of political governance, an integrated concept, which specifies activities related to the regulation of international relations, accounting, harmonization and coordination of the diverse and often different interests of participants in international relations. Dingwerth and Pattberg (2006) argue that such an integrated concept was transformed to a new term which is different from “international” relations and has another perspective. Biermann (2004, p.6) summarizes the concept in two definitions as “an emerging new phenomenon of world politics” and as “a political programme or project that is needed to cope with various problems of modernity”, describing the multiple functions of global governance which are present nowadays (Haas, 2004).

Usually the decisions are discussed by agents of global governance, which are the governments, international bodies, NGOs, multinational corporations, epistemic communities and even individuals possessing the necessary resources for this purpose.

One of the key actors in global governance is the state and the state plays also an important role on the way to sustainable development. The national governments have to

share the global arena with international organizations, multinational corporations and non-governmental social and political movements. Theoretical and empirical statements about the role of nation states in terms of contemporary globalization were expressed by Martinelli (2003). While agreeing that the state still remains the main contender for the lawful execution of the supreme authority within its own borders, they argue that nation states are not the only centers or the main organs of power in the world. The main components of global governance are intergovernmental organizations. The problem of control and ability to manage is, in fact, central. As a result of these efforts a complex institutional framework for the future world society was produced.

The first experience with the League of Nations, for obvious reasons, was unsuccessful, but the United Nations, with all shortcomings is ranking high because of the necessity of a coordinating and integrating institution in contemporary international relations and as a collective instrument for maintaining peace, development and security on the planet. Few disputed the indispensable role of the UN and their specialized agencies, which perform various functions associated with the solution of common economic, social and cultural problems of the modern world, especially the problems facing the developing and least developed countries (Weiss, 2000). The UN worked out the principles of global governance, which include collective decision-making by governments and nongovernmental organizations, and consensus as a way of this collective decision. According to Weiss (2000, p. 810) the UN have “a special role, albeit not a monopoly, on future leadership for global governance”.

Various attempts to develop a common strategy for world development were undertaken by UN. The most famous of these is a program of mankind's transition to sustainable development - social development compatible with the preservation of the environment and the interests of future generations (Agenda 21, 1992). Most recommendations were focused on the development of the international climate regime and its implementation (Okereke et al. 2009).

Outstanding contributions to global governance can be regarded as regional intergovernmental institutions, which are a mechanism of cooperation of member countries in various spheres of public life and the concentration of intellectual and material resources to achieve common goals. Multi-level governance faces today big challenges due to global change processes (Rauschmayer et al. 2009). A pioneer in the field of transnational governance is the European Union with its deeply integrated regional structure. Member States of the Union, creating a community of unlimited duration and institutions with real

power, thus limited their sovereign rights. Integration of the European Union appears as a form and method of regional responses to global challenges, and involvement as a method of dissemination of transnational governance by broadening its subjects and objects (Vogler, 2005). In the context of European integration, multilevel governance directly affects the citizens in their daily lives.

To sum up, global governance as a multi-level concept has strong objectives and aims in a world without a central power; still weaknesses together with concerns are present. If we analyze the component parts of this concept, we may conclude that institutions established to promote global aims in the reality serve their own interests. Moreover, the objectives of such global institutions were written by public servants or policy makers who actually cannot be aware of the position and situation in every country in the world. It results in promoting objectives covering the average ideas and the states are forced to “resolve problems that are beyond their competence and even their comprehension” (Blin, Marin, 2008, p. 16). Thus individual’s rights can be infringed. Another question is the utopian idealism of global governance. It expresses the occurrence of weak national institutions and failure to design a perfect global institution in such conditions: *“How can states, with institutions poorly designed to solve even their domestic problems, be expected to solve problems that go beyond their political framework?”* (Blin, Marin, 2008, p.16)”.

## **1.2. Overview of the concept “Sustainable development”**

Sustainable development, which is often used as a “trademark” for “promoting environmentally sound approaches to economic development” (Pezzoli, 1997, p. 549), is interpreted ambiguously and the debates on definitions deserve special attention. The concept of sustainable development is the outcome of scientifically influenced and socio-economic development, the discussion beginning in the 1970's, when a large number of papers were devoted to the issues of natural resources and environmental pollution. The analysis of national sustainable strategies and other policies in the following chapters would be more efficient with background knowledge of the historical roots of the concept. Thus the chapter analyses different perspectives on the concept; it concentrates on the political discussion of sustainable development and gives less attention to the scientific research on the changes in the concept. It would be necessary to assess the first explanations of sustainable development as well as the latest state of the term. This will be made by reviewing the selected literature.

Several major milestones, which were made within the UN system, could be identified as important ones in the forming of the concept of sustainable development: United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972), World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) that spread the term, Rio Conference on Environment and Development (1992) and finally the Johannesburg Earth Summit (2002).

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which took place in June 1972 in Stockholm (Sweden), has played the decisive role in the primary formation of the concept of sustainable development. The principles of Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment contained a set of “soft laws” for international conservation efforts. The Stockholm conference formulated the right of people to live “in the environment of a quality that suggests a life of dignity and prosperity” (UNCHE, 1972). Since that time, a significant number of international organizations and governments of various countries have adopted the basic documents and national constitutions that recognize the basic human right to a healthy environment. Moreover, the environment was included in the list of priorities at regional and national levels. The conference confirmed the necessity of a long-term development strategy, taking into account the interconnection and interdependence of contemporary issues.

The term sustainable development became widespread in 1987, when a report “Our Common Future” was published by the World Commission on Environment and Development. Steurer and Martinuzzi (2007, p.149) evaluated the report as “the first global sustainable development program or strategy in a broader sense that explored the future of both “what?” and “how?” of policy making”. Hopkins (2007) argues that the report helped to promote the expression “sustainable development” in general, but he estimates that the impact materialized only in this century.

The definition of sustainable development stated in "Our Common Future" can be summarized as the “development that meets the needs of the present time, but does not jeopardize the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987). The definition of “sustainable development” proposed by the Brundtland Commission is widely used. However, it reflects only the strategic objective, rather than pointing the way for concrete action and can also be criticized for its vagueness as it should explicitly include the idea of preserving the environment.

Official recognition of the sustainable development view was made at the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, when a new principle of development of the world's productive forces was set. According to Elkington (2007), the globalization processes turned the ideas of policy-makers towards the necessity of

sustainable development. Together with globalization changes in social, economic and environmental areas started to happen in step and these processes resulted in the competitive relations between “environmental protection” and “economic development” (Martens, Raza, 2010; Gamage, Boyle, 2008).

The adopted document “Agenda 21” starts with a point that “integration of environment and development concerns (...) will lead to the fulfillment of basic needs, improved living standards for all and (...) more prosperous future” (UNCED, 1992). Hopkins (2007) agrees with the point that sustainability itself is developed to improve human lives but argues that nowadays it is more devoted to the future.

The Earth Summit, or the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), held in September 2002 in Johannesburg (South Africa), reaffirmed the devotion to the ideas of sustainable development. Whereas at the conference in Rio de Janeiro the problem was dominated by the environment to achieve sustainable development, in Johannesburg this problem has been given the same attention as the discussion of social and economic issues. It was noted that the problem of global degradation of nature was exacerbated by poverty and unequal distribution of benefits; the task of "environment for development" was committed in the first place.

Therefore, in the two documents adopted by the Johannesburg Summit (The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development), priority has been given to social issues for achieving sustainable development, particularly poverty eradication, promotion of health and, especially, sanitation, including provision of clean drinking water. It is important to notice that not only governments but also non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations and commercial structures took part in the Johannesburg commitment. These organizations came up with initiatives for greater access to water and sanitation, energy development, increase agricultural production, the proper use of toxic chemicals, maintenance of biological diversity and better management of ecosystems.

It was seen that environmental and economic aspects of sustainability are not sufficient to implement the concept of sustainable development in practice: they must now be complemented by other aspects: social, information, management (The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development, 2002). Environmental issues started to be seen in the context of sustainability and were discussed, e.g. the maintenance of the natural resource's base for economic and social development and management, stating the impossibility to separate solutions for environmental, economic and social problems (ibid). Thus, global



actors accepted a new paradigm of development. It was mentioned for the first time that measures to address degradation of the environment should be adopted at the governmental level. This note is important for this thesis as it supports the proving of the hypothesis.

Guiding principles of SD include balance between nature and society, balance within the society at the present stage of development, balance between current and future state of mankind as a "target function" of development ("Our common future", 1987). Such definitions were transformed into the three-pillar approach, which shows the links and interconnections between economic, social and environmental parts. Some authors as Elkington (1994, 2007) give this approach another name - "triple bottom line" which still has the same meaning and includes "environmental responsibility, social awareness and economic profitability".

A visual example of a pillar-approach could be drawn from the IUCN Report "The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-first Century" (2006) (see Figure 1). It includes the integration of three pillars as the "interlocking circles" (IUCN, 2006).



**Figure 1.a. Three pillars of sustainable development in theory.**



**Figure 1.b. Three pillars of sustainable development now.**



**Figure 1.c. Three pillars of sustainable development – the change needed.**

Figure 1.a. shows the WCED model “as it should be”. It highlights that the economic, social and ecological components of sustainable development are closely related to each other, and as a model it exaggerates the tight connections between three areas (Kates et al. 2005). According to Gamage and Boyle (2008, p.48) all three components together “must be taken into account when taking actions”.

Seghezzeo (2009, p.540) calls this WCED model too anthropocentric, where human welfare is estimated as the bottom cause “for the protection of natural capital”. He adds that the Brundtland report paid too much attention to the economy as a driving force for sustainability. This led to the dominance of the economic dimension (Figure 1.b.), as it is argued by Pezzey (2004). It can also be argued more critically: the conceptual advances of integrating social, economic and environmental sustainability, still representing abstract ideas, happens under conditions of further rapid deterioration of the environment and ecosystem functions and services – very few of the important changes and improvements to be achieved under the guiding idea of sustainable development happened so far (see Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005).

The third interlocking circle is based on the idea that the current sustainable development needs further extension and growth, as the environment should be considered as the vital and equally important issue. This perspective was explored by Kates et al. (2005). The authors identify a model of sustainable development (including environmental, economic and social imperatives) as a set of clear principles of social and natural approaches to development, including the protection of natural resources and awareness of the responsibility for future generations.

Referring to the scientific debates, sustainable development can be characterized as a controversial but an effective concept which is on the agenda of different governmental institutions. The guiding idea of collective cooperation towards sustainability is still an ongoing process of building efficient cooperative structures. However, the new scientific

debates have changed significantly the meaning of sustainable development since the Brundtland report. It is worth mentioning, that some scholars nowadays are trying to avoid this three-pillar approach and transform it into the more comprehensive theory (Ott, Thapa, 2003). Seghezze (2009, p. 540) underlines limitations of the Brundtland definition and invents an “alternative sustainability triangle formed by “Place”, “Permanence” and “Persons”. He demonstrates the higher sensitivity of the new approach and explains how the exploration of space, time and persons could help to improve the formulation of regional or national policies.

Pezzoli (1997, p. 558), for example, points out the ideas of scholars from political ecology, where “societies and environments are the mutually interactive co-evolving systems”. According to that the impact of human action and the emerging climate change and other global environmental problems are interconnected, thus sustainable development requires environmental learning, planning and research of “human understandings”. From this point of view authors in Pezzoli’s overview blame the Brundtland Commission for expanding world’s attention on the economic growth to “provide sustainable solutions to interlocking problems of environment and development” (Pezzoli, 1997, p. 566).

Smith and Stirling (2010) emphasize the role of socio-technical solutions to sustainability problems. They argue that technologies with positive effects are considered to be useful instruments for sustainable development. In this case new green technologies bring results to the “social, economic, and political systems” (Smith, Stirling, 2010, p. 2). With the example of carbon emissions, authors highlight the need of overall changes in the energy infrastructure worldwide. However, the issue is controversial.

Gamage and Boyle (2008) outline sustainable development from the consumerist point of view. In regard to globalization and growing use of resources negative outcomes appear in the globalized economy. Consumerist changes and threats are connected with sustainable development and with “the welfare of the social and environmental dimensions” (Gamage, Boyle, 2008, p. 55).

That is why national strategies for sustainable development could not be created on the basis of the traditional universal ideas and values, patterns of thinking. They require the development of new scientific, political skills and philosophical approaches that are appropriate not only to modern realities, but also the prospects for the development in the new millennium.

Concluding the overview it can be said, the relations between global governance and sustainable development appeared to be strong and interrelated. Global governance is attributed to specific arrangements of cooperative measures aiming at solving specific problems of sustainable development. Such arrangements are formally enshrined in laws or officially recognized institutions, which are capable of solving these problems through a variety of actors. An effective decision-making is as a “central question of global governance, one that is being put to the test in the broad range of innovative arrangements that now characterize the multilateral system” by Forman and Segaar (2006, p. 216). By adding social and environmental interactions to the term (Santi, Grenna, 2003) the concept of global governance as a mechanism of social regulation could help to understand the on-going transformations on the world arena and increase the effectiveness of management at the global level (Dingwerth, Pattberg, 2006).

The broad dimension of environmental governance within UN system helped to pursue in-depth knowledge about pursuing sustainable development in society (Haas, 2002) and set institutionalized arrangements for sustainable development policies (Santi, Grenna, 2003). Newig and Fritsch (2009) found such governance as a way to more effective environmental policies.

So, in general terms, sustainable development due to the global governance actions started to be defined as a strategy for socio-natural development, which includes co-evolution of nature and society, ensures the survival and continued progress of society and does not destroy the environment, especially the biosphere, being “a fundamental element in the global strategy for change” (WCED, 1987).

## **2. Methodological approach and design**

The role of methodology is to identify which methods are empirically important in order to answer the research questions and to test the hypothesis. The thesis gives an evaluation of the influence of global governance on the national strategies of sustainable development.

The research method, first and foremost, is a method of analysis of literature, documents, content analysis. The policy analysis will refer to the framework made by Runhaar et al (2005) "Policy analysis for sustainable development", where authors propose to use the data from the current policies for secondary analysis. Such analysis is used primarily in the qualitative research. A document analysis will be done to achieve a contextual understanding of the sustainable development policies, particularly how the context and references to the global objectives influence the sustainable thinking and concrete aims on the national level in the selected countries. This phase of the study is based on a secondary data analysis of such sources as global, EU and national policies, strategies. Also relevant articles, focused on global governance and sustainable development, are reviewed. These relevant documents are listed in the part "References".

The decision to choose interviews as a second method to obtain information is based on the assumption that it is generally safe way to obtain specific information. E-mails introducing the thesis writer and topic were sent out; an example of such request for an interview is attached in the appendices, where also the questionnaire and the list of respondents could be found. The questions were designed to find the opinions and points of view of various experts. Respondents are researchers, project managers, councillors, policy advisors, working with sustainable development on the national levels.

Study findings are based on the answers of 7 respondents. Swedish respondents are *Charles Berkow*, Environmental Policy Adviser in Green Party, Sweden; *Bengt Kriström*, member of the Commission on Sustainable Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Science; *Göran Broman*, Research Director, Sustainability Assessments and Sustainable Product and Service Innovation, School of Engineering, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden. Danish case was commented by the expert *Anne Meldgaard*, councillor in the Department of Environment, Energy and Climate Change in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Norwegian representatives include *Audun Ruud*, research manager at Sintef Energy Research; *William Lafferty*, Earlier Director of the Programme for Research and

Documentation for a Sustainable Society, Research Council of Norway; *Gerald Berger*, A senior researcher and project manager at the Research Institute for Managing Sustainability at the Vienna University of Economics and Business.

Limitations of this methodological approach appear in the number of experts being interviewed. Some experts did not respond to the introducing mail. Approximately 10 experts refused to take part in the survey due to time problems. Finally, 7 experts who were interviewed showed a high motivation to share their aggregated knowledge.

Various videos (“The Climate and Energy Package – Involving the People of Europe”, “Sustainable Production and Consumption: the way to a greener world” etc.) from the web site [www.tvlink.org](http://www.tvlink.org) were used as additional data source. The TVLINK Europe site is designed to provide journalists or interested people in the subjects related to European issues and policies. The covered areas are: environment, transport, energy, water, employment, social affairs etc., which are parts of the implementation process for sustainable development. Videos are qualified due to availability of the “ready-to-use material produced by TV professionals for TV professionals” (TVLINK Europe). Thus this web-site is essential for the ongoing analysis. As sustainable development consists of environmental, social and economic pillars, videos containing these spheres were chosen. Each video coincides with one topic mentioned above; however as these topics have great synergies among each other, the content of videos touches upon their interrelations.

Such a combined method of document analysis, interviews and analysis of videos helped to prove the hypothesis and provided a larger data base.

## **3. From global policies to the European Union strategies**

### **3.1. The role of global policies**

Sustainable development needs effective policies which help to integrate decision making from global environmental governance to regional or national levels for promoting common aims (Kemp, Parto, 2005). Thus global governance is in need of cooperation between all organizations for making challenges in managing sustainable development. The United Nations played a key role in the development of the first fundamental documents and approaches to address sustainable development. This feature of the UN opens the opportunity to carry out the necessary coordination of efforts to achieve sustainable development of dozens of states. In this part of the thesis global policies will be discussed, including Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. By analyzing these documents we will come closer to one of the following chapters devoted to national strategies. The results made in this chapter will reconnect the relationship between national and global policies.

#### **3.1.1. Agenda 21 as a milestone document**

The UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro was a next step for discussing topics after the conference in Stockholm. However there was a significant difference: if the Stockholm conference was called the World UN Conference on *Environment*, Rio hosted the United Nations Conference on Environment and *Development*. It was a big bound towards new attitudes to sustainable development, considering a number of different socio-economic and environmental problems.

#### Agenda 21

The underlying program of action of the international community to achieve sustainable development contains a package of 40 chapters and recommendations which are divided into four main directions.

The first section is called "Social and Economic Dimensions". This section examines the international relations of cooperation to achieve global economic order that will help all countries, both developed and developing, to take the path of sustainable development. One of the main reasons for continuing environmental degradation around the world recognizes the unsustainable pattern of consumption and production. Therefore the section carefully considers the question of rationalization of production and changing consumption patterns. It describes what should be done to "reduce wasteful and inefficient consumption patterns in

some parts of the world, while promoting accelerated and sustainable development in other parts” (UNCED, Agenda 21, 1992).

Section Two - "Conservation and Management of Resources for Development" – is devoted to the consideration of global environmental issues such as protection of the atmosphere, land resources, combating deforestation, combating desertification and drought, protection and rational use of the oceans, conservation and sustainable use of freshwater resources.

The third section - "Strengthening the Role of Major Groups"- addresses the need to increase “the role of women, children and youth in sustainable development, strengthening the role of indigenous people, cooperation with NGOs, local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technical community, as well as on strengthening the role of farmers” (ibid). It explains population, consumption and technology as the driving forces of environmental change.

The fourth section - "Means of Implementation"- illuminates the issues of financing sustainable development, technology transfer from developed countries to developing countries. It also addresses the need to conduct “education, training and public awareness, capacity building for sustainable development” (ibid). It underlines the need to revise international law in regard to sustainable environmental development and proposes measures and programs to achieve a sustainable balance between consumption and the ability of Earth to sustain life. Also some methods and technologies are described for the development to meet “the needs of people with a rational use of natural resources” (ibid).

By the year 1992 environmental plans have been already in practice, but most of them were weak and even not working (Steurer, Martinuzzi, 2007). By adopting the Agenda for the XXI century, countries recognized that they must play a more active role in improving the environment. The only way to ensure humanity a safer future was the solution of environmental problems and economic development in a complex and concerted manner, in a worldwide collaboration (UNCED, Agenda 21, 1992). The role of governments was underlined in the international partnership. The document demanded them to make actions in order to prevent a global catastrophe. In addition, it was stated that states' efforts should be coordinated through international organizations (ibid).

The biggest role for such new development played the 8th chapter of Agenda 21 “Integrating environment and development in decision-making” (ibid). According to it, “governments, in cooperation, where appropriate, with international organizations, should



adopt a national strategy for sustainable development based on, inter alia, the implementation of decisions taken at the Conference, particularly in respect of Agenda 21” (ibid).

All countries were called to begin developing national strategies, to establish national councils for sustainable development and to implement the principles of sustainable development through economic, social and environmental plans, ensuring their consistency (ibid). By generating and constructing national strategies for sustainable development countries could start to create new approaches to environmental policy. Member States, acting through the respective governing bodies, could ensure the proper implementation of sustainable development. In addition, reviews of their policies, programs and activities related to the implementation of Agenda 21 were seen as a method to facilitate the evaluation.

Unfortunately, as Agenda 21 didn't set any deadline for submitting NSDS, only a few countries started to develop them immediately, among them UK in 1994 (Steurer, Martinuzzi, 2007). This could be explained by the fact that the political impact of Agenda 21 was weak and unspecific (Steurer, Martinuzzi, 2005) or that it was perceived as the set of overall ideas, not policy implications (Meadowcroft, 2000). The document combined more or less all the modern world's problems (environment, poverty, differentiation of the standard of living, lack of resources, gender problems, education etc), but they were not systematized. Thus effective approaches to solving these problems were not found.

But as it was stated in the Agenda itself, it was just a “positive long-term vision” of sustainable development. Therefore we can assume that the aim was not to set strict recommendations, but to start the collaboration of global governance and a promotion of sustainable development values top-down. And from my point of view, Agenda 21 succeeded in this. It confronted governments, international organizations and civil society with the task of solving a number of complex interrelated global issues, impossible without a fundamental change in individual and social behavior.

Later on the deadline of NSDS's formulation was proposed. After that EU member states started to develop their own strategies in late 2002 (Steurer, 2007). Moreover, Norway made a report to the national Parliament on UNCED decisions and their consequences for the country. In Sweden, a law was passed on decisions of UNCED. Norway and Sweden have formed national commissions to Sustainable Development in 1994.

To resume, certainly Agenda 21 included more points than the activities following but there were several attempts to convert its goals and perspectives into concrete policies and actions. EU strategy for SD was one of those initiatives.

### **3.1.2. Johannesburg Plan of Implementation**

The next conference (or the World Summit) on Sustainable Development (WSSD) was held in Johannesburg in September 2002. The commitment to sustainable development has been reconfirmed and was stated in official documents, reports and presentations of delegations of 191 countries. The SD idea was more concretized in the official document of the WSSD - Implementation Plan of decisions at the highest level. It was the plan, which set a timeline of interrelated movements of the world community towards sustainable development.

It was noted at the WSSD, that “in order to achieve the common goals, the developed countries that have not yet made specific efforts to achieve the internationally agreed levels of official development assistance, should take them” (WSSD, 2002). Global threat and negative trends in socio-ecological, socio-economic and socio-political spheres exacerbated global problems and increased the risk of further movement to an anthropological catastrophe. In this regard, the world states were obliged to well prepare conceptual, strategic, organizational and management plans to be implemented as new paradigms for the socio-economic development. Moreover, according to WSSD a decade of 2005-2014 became a decade of onset of the international community moving towards sustainable development.

Skeptics have argued that the conference failed and process which has begun in Rio has degenerated (Vina et al., 2003). These authors believe that the global action plan was not clearly defined and there was a vague attention concerning financing of projects for the achievement of stated goals. Optimists, on the contrary, said that the idea of sustainable development has become more urgent (Witte et al., 2002). Perhaps the most adequate reflection is that of a compromise view.

In my point of view, the Summit in Johannesburg does not represent a complete failure of ideas of sustainable development. However, at the same time, it showed how controversial and difficult is the path of the world community to the goals of survival and sustainable development. If a new course in global development has been defined, "a new agenda for sustainable development" (ibid) was proclaimed and produced "a common vision of the future awaiting humanity" (ibid) in Rio de Janeiro, then at the WSSD the evaluation of the international community's readiness was made in order to build a sustainable future.

Among the positive aspects of the Summit in Johannesburg the constructive search for the way to implement the idea of sustainable development worldwide can be named. WSSD also confirmed that significant progress was made “towards achieving a global consensus and partnership among all peoples on the planet” (ibid). All the work of the WSSD, including its outcome, showed that economic growth, social development and environmental protection at

local, national, regional and global level must focus on realization of the goals of our common sustainable future (WSSD, JPOI, 2002).

In many ways the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation represented progress in the area of the institutional framework for sustainable development. Chapter 10 of the JPOI on “Institutional Frameworks for Sustainable Development” deals exclusively with “issues of governance, with commitments that support the enhancement of governance systems for sustainable development at all levels” (ibid). This includes the identification of some broad commitments for institutional enhancement: institutional strengthening and capacity building, integrated management and ecosystem approach, legal and regulatory frameworks, partnerships, coordination and cooperation, and what is mostly important - good governance.

However, despite the complexity and the more than modest success in the implementation concept of SD, most researchers of sustainable development believe that the global transition to sustainable development is rational, without alternative, and that work in this direction must continue (Kemp, Parto, 2005; Vogler, 2005; Steurer, Martinuzzi, 2007).

The common thing for the documents of UNCED and WSSD is that they still largely declare at the political level the model for sustainable development, the conceptual forms and outlines of which are not sufficiently clear. And just as the implementation of Agenda 21 and WSSD Plan of Implementation become clear, humanity would begin to move away from an impending global catastrophe to a better future.

In order to look how these policies are processed into the regional level, let's turn to the next chapter talking about European Union.

## **3.2. The European Union's role and strategy for sustainable development**

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part provides an overview of the EU role as an actor in global governance and predominantly the question of EU leadership, the second part presents the European Union strategies for sustainable development, the last part includes video analysis.

### **3.2.1. Assessment of the EU as an actor**

Undoubtedly, the EU as no other regional organization plays a significant role for sustainable development strategies and policies (Vogler, 2005). It recognizes the need for promoting overall implementation of sustainable development and set it as a global objective (COM, 2001a). However sustainable development activities of the Community are inextricably linked to global policies, in particular the ones carried out under the auspices of the UN. The EU is involved in the work of international institutions and global environmental governance.

The EU conducted a significant legal framework to regulate and coordinate SD activities of Member States, developed and implemented new approaches to protect and improve environmental quality, and social and economical changes. By these means and by its credibility the EU called itself a leader in promoting sustainable development (Kilian, Elgström, 2010). The credibility to contribute to global governance is seen in EU as a “capacity to implement its commitments” (Vogler, 2005, p. 847). However scholars have different opinions about the EU leadership in sustainable development.

Initially, what is leadership? There are different explanations of this term, though I agree with one made by Dee (2011). By leadership the author means “an influence over others in achieving common purpose and in reaching a certain goal”, where “a leader must lead others” (Dee, 2011, p. 4). The EU, being a union of individual states, needs a strong coordination especially in such broad policy area as sustainable development (Baker, 2009). European governance faces the problems connected with a big cultural diversity of nations (Farrel et al., 2005). Thus, the EU uses collective actions while promoting and acting for sustainable development. According to Dee (2011) the collective actions approach started to be a leading one in EU policy making for international and national levels. This way of spreading responsibilities made the EU a “directional” leader (Parker, Karlsson, 2010) who takes the first decisions and solutions.

Falkner (2006) argues that the efforts of the EU to become a leader had only limited success. Vogler and Stephan (2007) emphasize that these actions are made for better public relations. As an example, they talk about few parts of EU agricultural policy which still are negative towards developing countries. However the EU still does a lot to be a leading actor in SD even if some disagreeable facts show up (Parker, Karlsson, 2010).

Gerald Berger (responding expert) indicates that *“since many years, sustainable development plays a very minor role in the EU. The EU is largely driven by economic growth and employment issues. SD is seen as a nice “by-product”, but is not the main objective as it is outlined/argued in many policy papers. Currently, the Europe 2020 strategy is seen by many in the European Commission (and probably by many national reps in the Council) as the “SD strategy” because it includes several SD/environmental issues. This is generally right, but the whole strategy approach is very much on growth and employment, very sectoral and short-term (only 10 year focus); what is missing is an integrative approach, a long-term perspective (until 2050 at least), and a questioning of the growth paradigm. So the “potential” is there to spread ideas, but potential will be not sufficient to steer the EU towards a more sustainable path that is the basis for policy design and implementation”*.

But not only decisions and promotions play a crucial role. The EU needed to set a process of policymaking to commit to sustainable development (Meadowcroft et al., 2005). While the EU succeeds with the integration, a lot of problems remain: environmental issues, managing integrated economy and harmonization of national interests of EU member states. In this regard, the role of policy significantly increases. The emergence of creating a centralized, structured sustainable development policy (shared by all European countries) was natural.

The EU strategy on sustainable development was developed in order to proceed the EU ideas to national governments to change the way they deal with sustainability (Rauschmayer et al., 2009). However it seems obvious to Holzinger et al. (2006) that even if there was a huge leap in sustainable development ideas, the changes in governance were hardly seen. Stirling (2006) and Rauschmayer et al. (2009) still support the idea that EU's good processes of developing, implementation and evaluation of sustainability improves outputs and results in the member states. Thus it is necessary to analyze EU SD policies to prove one of these points of views.

### **3.2.2. The EU strategy for sustainable development**

Since the mid 70's, environmental protection became a priority policy of the European Community both at national and supra-national levels. However, in practice it was limited to command and control functions, and it was sharply criticized by its limitations (Vogler, 2005; Holzinger et al., 2006; Killian, Elgström, 2010). This is due to two main reasons: firstly, the obtained negative results of economic regulation and fierce industrial competition, and secondly, ineffective command and control mechanisms in practice (Holzinger et al., 2006).

In May 2001 the Commission adopted the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development "Sustainable Europe for a better world". Commitment was reaffirmed later at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2002). The Strategy was based on mean for appropriate use of resources, sustainable and competitive economy, using the leadership of Europe in the development of new processes and technologies, including environmentally sound technologies. The strategy provided a high level of environmental protection, social justice and harmony, economic prosperity and active promotion of global sustainable development. Among these key links, there were many options - the use of renewable energy and climate change, climate change and poverty, poverty and environment-friendly technologies and practices (COM, 2001a). As a project the Strategy was aiming at involving all parts of the society to carry out sustainable development to bring it from paper to life (Baker, 2009).

The Strategy promoted the adoption of sustainable development policies in EU countries and candidate states, and was built on the transfer and implementation of the *acquis*. The following goals were declared for the long term: containment of climate change, alternative energy sources, improving people's health, responsible, management of natural resources, improving the transportation system and land administration (COM, 2001a).

The Strategy facilitated to make institutional changes for making proposals more efficient both at EU and member state levels (*ibid*). Moreover the European Unions role as a leading partner in protecting the environment at the global level and in achieving sustainable development was again underlined (*ibid*). The governing role of SDS included re-evaluating, monitoring and reviewing. The enlargement process was seen to support and protect the natural wealth of candidates. This was stated to be made by integrating the needs to candidate states, by establishing a dialogue with national administrations, by cooperation etc. (*ibid*). EU enlargement was seen as "the biggest single contribution to global sustainable development that the EU can make" (COM, 2001b, p.13). New members, by adopting new improved strategies and acts, had better chances to improve the situation in environmental and social

development, as well as in economic growth. Farrel et al. (2005) explains this by improvements in horizontal and multi-level governance.

The Commission continued the development of the SDS and as a result prepared the revised strategy for sustainable development taking into account the changes appeared since 2001. In June 2006, the Council of the European Union adopted a new strategy for sustainable development for 2005-2010. Regular peer reviews of the NSDS were recognized as important in monitoring the process (CEU, 2006).

Under a revision of previously agreed policies, two priority areas were added to the selected ones in 2001. They were social cohesion and the EU's role in promoting sustainable development at the global level. The positive change included a detailed way of key tasks in implementation, for EU institutions, and for member states. The revised strategy identified seven key tasks: climate change and clean energy, sustainable transport, sustainable production and consumption, threat to public health, more rational use of natural resources, social inclusion, demographic change and migration, fighting global poverty (CEU, 2006).

From a governance perspective, the EU SDS was an ambitious attempt to make European governance be oriented towards providing sustainable development “through a mixture of governance approaches and instruments” (Pallemaerts et al., 2007, p. 25). It tried to coordinate policies at national levels, at the same time giving the member states rights to develop reports and reviews voluntary. The implementation of SDS on the national level was strongly reliant on the European Commission actions and decisions taken by member states.

In 2009, the European Commission drew up a review of the Sustainable Development Strategy's goals. The review measured “the progress that has been made across areas such as climate change policy, sustainable transport, public health and natural resources, along with the introduction of environmental impact assessment of new policies” (Vogler, 2005, p. 844). The review showed that even if sustainable development is still weak, it has been included in a number of EU policies. It also gave incentives for future SDS development as it shared knowledge of sustainable development indicators and was supportive for reporting processes of member states.

In March 2010, the new European strategy for economic development was approved for the next 10 years – “Europe 2020: Strategy for a reasonable, sustainable and inclusive growth”. Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso commented:

*"EU 2020 means the EU working together over the next decade to overcome some of the toughest economic challenges that Europe has ever faced. A smart economy and a wise society based on strong European values go together. Growth, sustainable public finances, tackling climate change, social inclusion, a strengthened industrial base and a vibrant services sector are not alternatives. They reinforce each other."* (European Environmental Bureau, 2010).

Such an approach addressed fighting against unemployment and improving the quality of life for EU citizens. The European Commission offered five major activities, guided by European states: "employment, research and innovation, climate change and energy, education, poverty alleviation" (Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union, 2010). The strategy of "Europe 2020" revealed the European socio-economic concept of the 21st century. The strategy made clear how Europe is going to emerge from the crisis and how to turn the current instability in the direction of a reasonable, sustainable and inclusive growth and development. To achieve the necessary results strengthening Europe's management and stronger governance are needed.

Taken as a whole, the European Union did provide leadership in decision-making for sustainable development. Its efficiency, however, is doubtful and arguable. The effectiveness of SDS as a new challenge in European policies could be only tested by in-depth analysis of the situation in the member states.

### **3.2.3. The EU and sustainable development: content-based video analysis**

The video "The Climate and Energy Package – Involving the People of Europe" (12'00" min. long) includes comments of Swedish and Romanian interviewees with an English script. The video talks about differences within energy development and the environment in different European countries. The Romanian case shows progress in changing people's awareness of sustainable development; however these steps are quite small. The Swedish example which is important for our research topic shows a great involvement of citizens in the environmental problems, complementing with successful data in emissions and renewable energy. According to this video Swedish citizens are changing their attitudes and behaviour toward a sustainable model of thinking. As an example, Melinda Riedel talks about the "*future of (her) generation*" and adds that "*those who do not respect the future for (her) generation are squandering away the environment*". The



commentator provides supportive information concerning the role of Europe in combating global warming, where *“each member state has nevertheless been assigned its own specific objectives”*. The role of Sweden is also underlined as a pioneer *“in the area of renewable energy”*.

Another video “Time to Invest in Energy Efficiency” (7’00”) refers also to the energy topic. This video shows how actions made on the governmental level could be delivered to citizens and society. The commentator says: *“EU governments have pledged to reduce energy use by 20 percent by 2020”*. This line refers to one of the objectives stated in the strategy made by European Commission - “EUROPE 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth” (EC, 2010). The interviewee Catherine Pearce, European Environmental Bureau also argues for the strategy Europe 2020 and especially the objectives of *“the energy saving contributing to reducing CO2 emission”*. The video includes the statements from EU’s Sustainable Energy Europe initiative and highlights the need for *“reducing the amount of energy”*, where *“EU governments should insist on energy efficiency criteria”*. Moreover the video concentrates attention on the reaching targets and helping to reduce energy already on the national and local level, especially in the everyday life of Europeans.

“Creating Green Jobs” (8’53”) is placed in the Employment section on the web-site “TV LINK Europe”. Video provides an explanation of “green jobs” which mean jobs in “green” or sustainable work areas, for example wind turbine factories, solar panels companies, energy villages etc. According to the video the main challenges nowadays in all European member states are divided into three core parts, which are *“creating jobs, boosting the economy and protecting the environment”*. Renewable natural resources develop new spheres of business throughout EU. Arguments supporting this statement are revealed in the commentators speech: *“Up to one in ten jobs in the EU is already linked to the environment and the number of workers employed in the sector (wind turbines) is expected to soar (...) as the bloc strives to meet its ambitious goal of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by a fifth by 2020”*. Moreover this video mentions regional funds which support the continuous knowledge sharing and sustainable development in the member states, thus *“the EU is helping provide new skills for new jobs through its social and regional funds”*. Stan Crawford, Sherwood Energy Village, argues that the European Union as a community is a very strong instrument to spread ideas of sustainable development and *“to embrace the green agenda environmental issues”*, however according to her *“the EU's vision of secure, safe and clean energy for the future cannot be reached without local leadership and action on the ground”*.

“Sustainable Production and Consumption: the way to a greener world” (7’32”) is another video talking about sustainable development principles in Europe. It refers to the EU Sustainable Consumption and Production package (2008) and implies sustainability in the area of consumption for better environment. The most important issues discussed in this video include the completed ecological footprint of the European countries and the required “*minimum environmental impact*” for the future. The European Union understands the necessity to improve situation with consumption or rather with production. Thus “*life cycle thinking*” and “*environmental features through all the production process*” are encouraged on the European and national levels. Recycling and eco labels are the first steps on this way. Production according to the video should be designed consuming less energy and evolving less pollution.

The analyzed videos, their utilities and functions are supportive to the EU SD strategy and other European initiatives for creation the synergies between all dimensions of sustainable development on the national levels of the member countries. Many of the issues appeared in the videos that are discussed in this thesis both on the global, EU and national levels. Among them are sustainable model thinking, the strategy Europe 2020, the energy strategies and the role of renewable energy sector on the way to sustainable development. These videos present data which reflect the citizens’ attitudes to the global and local problems. Moreover, without being discussed in the media, these issues can’t reach the population and inhabitants of the EU. Thus the analyzed videos have an influence on the public and are a powerful instrument for propaganda.

## **4. National strategies for sustainable development**

The concept of sustainable development reflects a global problem. However, as it is emphasized in the major international instruments, it should be realized at all levels: global, national and regional. Much responsibility for implementing the recommendations of the world's leading institutions rests with national governments. Gerald Berger (the interviewed expert) commented to this issue: *“Over the last couple of years, many efforts have been made to establish institutional capacities for coordination among organizations or ministries (on the national level). So there is some movement in the right directions, but one measures “effectiveness” by how much has changed in reality, then the picture looks differently”*.

The driving goals announced at WSSD included strengthening the role of civil society and developing “more effective institutional frameworks for sustainable development at regional and sub-regional level” (EC, 2002), which means it was directed at binding relations between citizens and governmental authorities. In governments new changes included structural adjustments and creation of committees responsible for promoting sustainable development (Kemp, Parto, 2005).

The renewed European Union Strategy on Sustainable Development (2006) highlights the idea for “setting up multi-stakeholder national advisory councils on sustainable development to stimulate informed debate, assist in the preparation of National Sustainable Development Strategies and/or contribute to national and EU progress reviews” (CEU, 2006, p. 29).

Few scholars argue that central government on the national level still stays the most powerful and influencing actor while implementing new activities and gaining own advantages (Baker and Eckerberg, 2008; Rauschmayer, et al, 2009). In addition, the role and power of NGOs in decision-making could be also questioned due to the participatory limits, political weakness and the doubtful reliability (Baker, 2009).

As it was stated in the National Sustainable Development Strategy (Environmental Mainstreaming Initiative, 2002), “NSDS should focus on environmental, social, economic and institutional issues”. The institutional issue in this context includes political dimension as well as the concept of governance. Thus a NSDS is a necessary adjustment for policy integration (Kemp, Parto, 2005) and a part of governance on the national level (Meadowcroft, 2007).

National strategies have several advantages in practicing sustainable development. The possibility of higher operational management decisions, maneuver forces and means, and the relationship of economic, political and other management decisions with the social

processes are revealed more directly. Thereby government with a help of NSDSs build a set of values and mechanism which are major for integrating sustainable development. However according to Lafferty et al. (2007) sometimes NSDS could be described as a failure.

Gerald Berger, a senior researcher and project manager at the Research Institute for Managing Sustainability at the Vienna University of Economics and Business, one of the experts interviewed for this thesis argues that national governments are mainly interested in *“addressing their national problems and SD issues”*. Berger highlights that SD strategies *“should be learning documents that set out the SD governance process for the entire government”*. According to him *“guidance”* from the international level *“provides some incentive for the national level to do some strategic thinking on SD”*. As the examples he names the EU and the UN work. He underlines the bad communication between the EC and NSDS coordinators: *“I just know from the EU level, that communication between the European Commission and the national SD strategy coordinators is not very good; this has a lot to do with the fact the SD is considered as not very important at the Secretariat-General of the Commission and the fact the meetings among the SD coordinators have taken place only twice in 2007 and where never called since (official reason: there is nothing to talk about...)”*.

This chapter will be devoted to the national sustainable development thinking in the selected countries: Sweden, Denmark and Norway. Scandinavian countries adopted the first SD strategies in 2002, being influenced by WSSD. It is therefore interesting to analyze the well-established legislative experience of these countries in sphere of sustainable development. From the Table 1, we see that after few years the countries even adopted the revisions of NSDS.

**Table 1. NSDS and occasion for their developing. (Modified from ESDN Quarterly Report December 2007)**

Country	NSDS	Revision (s) of NSDS	Occasion for developing the NSDS
Denmark	2002	-	WSSD
Norway	2002	2004 (SD Action Plan), 2006	WSSD
Sweden	2002	2004, 2006	WSSD

## **4.1. Sweden**

### **4.1.1. The challenge in Sweden: from environmental documents to SD strategies**

Since the 1970's Sweden started to develop national understandings of sustainability and as a result hosted United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (1972). The systematic approach started in the early 1990s (Ministry of the Environment, 2006a). In this regard, it is important that in Sweden the problem of transition to sustainable development is closely linked with the state environmental policy. The formation of modern legislation on environmental protection in Sweden began largely with the adoption of comprehensive law on Environmental Protection (1969). On the basis of this law for a more detailed regulation in 1996, Sweden adopted a special law "On natural resource management", in which the use of land and water areas was described. Later in 1988 the Law on Environmental Policy Programme was created, when the Swedish industry was an active participant in national programs for reducing hazardous waste going into the air, soil and water.

Sweden has developed a number of governmental documents for the development of national strategies for sustainable development between Rio and Johannesburg-1992-2002, in particular: Electricity Act (1997), Ordinance on Land and Water Management (1998), The Swedish Environmental Code (1998), Ordinance concerning Environmentally Hazardous Activities and The Protection of Public Health (1998), Ordinance on Environmental Quality Standards on Ambient Air (2001) etc. The Swedish Environmental Code (1999) became the main legislative document.

And finally in 2002 Sweden's first national sustainable development strategy was created based on proposals of the Declaration of sustainable development (1997) and WSSD. Later on it was revised two times in 2004 and 2006.

Summing up, we can say that Sweden recognized its adherence to sustainability long before UN key conferences and was on the way to submit the legislative document. However the Agenda 21 and Plan of Implementation of the WSSD accelerated this process. Understanding the need of overall admission of national strategies, Sweden got involved in the processes supporting global transition to SD.

#### **4.1.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government**

Sweden started sustainable development activities quite early and still shows innovating ideas during institutionalization. Swedish transition has determined institutional changes in the Swedish environmental governance. The Ministry of Environment in Sweden is responsible for environmental issues as well as for coordinating the government's work on sustainable development. It emphasizes that “the riches of nature must be used in a way that will enable to hand over a world in balance to our children and grandchildren” (MoE, Sweden, 2010). The ministry was founded in 1987 as the Ministry of Environment and Energy. Later due to the different cabinets and changes in the world the ministry was renamed to the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, or even to the Ministry of Sustainable Development, but finally got back its original name. The Division of Sustainable Development is responsible for the Ministry’s national and international work on sustainable development. It coordinates relations between Sweden and global environmental organizations, however the goal of sustainable development is integrated into the activities of all ministries.

The Council for Sustainable Development was established to oversee the process of achieving environmental goals (16 Environmental Quality Objectives) and reporting to the government. The government, in turn, periodically reports to the Parliament. Reports are based on the evaluation system with indicators and are the beginning of a process based on the purpose and result. The Council is also responsible for the overall coordination of regional adaptation of the intermediate goals that require action at the regional level. Administrative councils are working in the regions within the multi-sectoral process of dialogue with the municipalities, businesses and other stakeholders.

The Commission on Sustainable Development consists of different social actors, who were gathered together for making contributions to NSDS, the EU strategy for sustainable development and “international cooperation on sustainable development”, including “cooperation in the Nordic and Baltic regions” (Government Offices of Sweden, 2010). The presidency of Sweden in European Union (2001) led to the adoption of EU SDS and made Swedish NSDS a complement to it. It is important that the Swedish Government facilitated environmental management and environmental protection, ensuring the principles of Sweden's transition to sustainable development (Ahlberg, 2009). The Swedish presidency in 2009 made sustainable development a core aim for EU future policies.

Charles Berkow, Environmental Policy Adviser in the Green Party, Sweden, expert interviewed for this thesis, emphasizes that the Swedish presidency in EU in 2009 made challenges to SD on global, EU and national levels, but “not consistently or sufficiently”. He adds that: *“Sometimes the government favored the positions of national interest groups at the expense of sustainable development policy at the EU level. The push for eco-efficient economy was on the other hand positive”*.

He comments on the question if Swedish government needs the *supervision* from the global governance or it can manage implementation of SD itself: *“National governments can and should manage implementation themselves, with cooperation on higher levels when needed and suitable. In practice the current government has demonstrated time and time again that it does not manage to implement environmentally sustainable development. This should be remedied, however, by national debate and elections. In the long run, imposition of sustainable development from the outside will not be sufficient or successful”*.

The Member of the Commission on Sustainable Development - Professor Bengt Kriström, Swedish University of Agricultural Science - took part in the expert interviews conducted for this master thesis. He finds the problems of sustainable development *“very important”*. However, Kriström says that communication between global organizations and national governments in the process of policy-making for SD *“in some cases is crucial, in others not important”* and that *“some problems do need co-operation”*. Taking into the account the proverb “when in Rome, do as the Romans do” it seems logical, that the Swedish government knows what is better for Sweden and in some cases do not need the supervision from the international organizations. Although a long-term orientation towards sustainable development and institutionalization in government is needed.

In Sweden ministries and agencies control and regulate activities in the field of SD, make the appropriate changes in legislation and public administration system in this area. The Swedish Government faces tasks coming from Plan of Implementation from Johannesburg and situation in Sweden (SusNord, 2005). Civil society by taking part in national NGOs develops suggestions. Thus the role of government in this context refers mainly to integration and adaptation, while the roles of agencies and bodies include recommendations and information.

To sum up, the Swedish example shows that institutions working with sustainable development are necessary for mobilizing capacities of SD. They play a decisive role for promoting ideas and strategies both on the global and national levels. The need of a certain

institutionalization is an advantage of a country while administration and coordination of NSDS.

#### **4.1.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in the Sweden's objectives**

The current national strategy “Strategic Challenges – A further Elaboration of the Swedish Strategy for Sustainable Development” (2006) - addresses the most important areas of Sweden's transition to sustainable development. The basis for constructing the structure of NSDS is following. The first section discusses the initial trends of sustainable development on global and EU level, role of Sweden in the context of world economic development trends. The sections that follow discuss strategic objectives, milestones, and scripts for moving the country towards sustainable development and tools. The Swedish National Strategy shows a model of organizing and functioning of society, government, economy on the principles of sustainability. In Sweden passing a long way to sustainable development national strategies are built on problematic lines and directly aimed at eliminating global threats and the transition to sustainable development.

Throughout the National Strategies a lot of comments are made upon meeting in Johannesburg, thus one of them include the use of national and global politics in the favor of future development. “Cooperation in both the EU and the UN system is very important. Nevertheless, it is essential for Sweden to maintain a high national profile” (MoE, Sweden, 2002, p. 8).

On the web-site of the Ministry of the Environment it is stated that Swedish communication “also deals with the international sustainable development effort, including UN initiatives and the EU's strategy in the area” (MoE, Sweden, 2006b). That is why one of the key premises states that “sustainable development in Sweden can only be achieved within the context of global and regional co-operation” (MoE, Sweden, 2006a).

In global perspective the Swedish priorities (Table 2) cover the Millennium Development Goals and “encourage other countries to step up their own efforts” (MoE, Sweden, 2006a). This proactive measure is seen to be reached by participation in global organizations and EC. Sustainable development is regarded as an element of the international community and national objectives, as the realization of common goals and objectives outlined in the Agenda 21, Millennium Declaration, the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and other documents UN.



**Table 2. Swedish objectives linked to global and EU key challenges.**

Global and EU key challenges	Swedish strategic new challenges since 2006
Climate Change and clean energy Sustainable transport Conservation and management of natural resources Education and training	Building sustainable communities
Public health Global poverty and SD challenges	Encouraging good health on equal terms
Social inclusion, demography and migration	Meeting the demographic challenge
Financing aid and economic instruments Communication, mobilizing actors and multiplying success Research and development Sustainable consumption and production	Encouraging sustainable growth.

By introducing guiding objectives the national government seeks to achieve sustainable development. The objectives are not divided into a clear three-pillar approach, but include four challenges important for Sweden, they also match issues from global and EU key challenges (Table 2).

“Building sustainable communities” - this part is designed to create an effective social policy for living in communities, infrastructure and the necessary conditions for a dignified life. In addition, attention is given to natural resources, protection measures. Objectives in accordance to Agenda 21, emphasize the need for government and municipalities to promote building, planning and housing. For example, rural development is planned to be held in conjunction with EU. “Sustainable cities” project can be named as an example of international partnership in this area (MoE, Sweden, 2006a), moreover Sweden takes part in the EU meetings on Sustainable Communities. 16 Environmental Objectives were also taken into the account while developing these objectives. Special attention is given to “the adaptation of energy and transport systems, the creation of a non-toxic environment and efficient recycling and proper stewardship of natural resources”. According to the NSDS, Sweden engaged in the global commitments “shares its experience and knowledge in the areas of environmental technology, infrastructure and urban development with the rest of the world” (MoE, Sweden, 2006a, p. 29).

The part about public health received a similar approach and meets the requirements of UN. Within this part of NSDS indicated problems are given as for Sweden, as well as for Europe. However, the global problems as undernourishment and obesity are not excluded, and

the role of Sweden in the problem solving process is characterized. For example, the country has a task of monitoring and cooperating with other states on the development aid. “The Governments objective in encouraging good health on equal terms is to create social conditions that permit good health on equal terms for everyone” (MoE, Sweden, 2006, p. 3). The parallel with the Millenium Development Goals in this objective is obvious.

“Meeting the demographic challenge”- objectives are linked with global and European ones referring to “social inclusion, demography and migration”. However this part is devoted mainly to problems and challenges in Sweden itself, it doesn’t include global objectives and measures. The mentioned EU action plan on migration and the EU Stability and Growth Pact are the only documents discussed linking with EU policies. The Swedish NSDS is aware of international challenge in migration and supports sharing the experience on this topic. Migration as a part of demographic challenge, but mostly as a challenge in social and economic spheres, remains the leading on the EU agenda.

Sustainable growth in Swedish national economy is aiming to be efficient, but at the same time resource- and energy-saving. In this connection the strategy provides ideas for ways to improved production and consumption patterns. The most important tool for sustainable national economic development and solving social problems is the continued growth of gross domestic product. Moreover, the energy sector is of great importance for Sweden, the objectives of which were taken from Europe 2020. Thus “within the EU, Sweden promotes increased use of bioenergy”, but does not deprive the need to sustainable management of global energy use (MoE, Sweden, 2006a, p.48). One of the important points written in NSDS is that: *“by means of negotiations on the Doha Development Agenda, Sweden will work to ensure that trade policy and the WTO promote sustainable development that accords a central role to poverty reduction, environmental protection and the improvement of social conditions”* (ibid, p. 55).

Summing up, Sweden took the international enthusiasm for national strategies and sustainable thinking, without forgetting own roots of the process. Swedish objectives only partly contain exact dates for implementation, which deprives fractionally their relevancy. Given the fact that the strategy is called “national”, Sweden also aims at using it as a tool for promoting sustainable development globally. Swedish objectives develop a mechanism for extending the scope of services and elements of environmental, economic and social resources.

Implementation of the strategy is linked with support and cooperation on the global, EU and national levels. Most goals of the current strategy are related to the similar ones

specified in the EU SD and EU's guideline for developing SD strategies. For example, the part "sustainable consumption and production" promotes identical aims. Moreover, talking about Sweden's role in the Nordic region, SD strategy adverts to the specific measures in this region. Since 2006, Sweden started to be ready to promote its objectives with an incentive of receiving global positive effects, for example (as Sweden is more oriented on the environmental dimension) in national projects for combating global environmental threats.

The strategy can be described as an ambitious one and it is reasonable to say that it still requires further development due to internal and external factors. However even the present linkages with global and EU aims contribute to it in positive way. Multi-ethnic and international ideas which are included in the strategy, as well as global experience giving advantages to the strategy and involving lasting interactions.

## **4.2. Denmark**

### **4.2.1. The challenge in Denmark: from environmental documents to SD strategies**

Denmark, being a highly modernized industrial-agrarian country, is a typical example how a knowledge and skillful use of the development can adjust to sustainability and progress the environmental preservation. The establishment of a special committee responsible for environmental issues was announced in 1971, it was called the Ministry of Environment. After that the Danish legislative base has changed almost completely, creating a legal basis for sustainable development and a new path of development. However, there were no serious institutional changes. The Environmental Protection Act (1973) played a big role in dealing with the environmental issues, later it was the Law on Environmental Protection (1974). These legislations made the legal basis of state policy on environmental protection. For example, the Environmental Protection Act was crucial while determining further environmental policies in Denmark and became a part of legislative reforms in 1991. The new changes in policies established a procedure for the environmental administration, implemented by state authorities, as well as basic rules for the implementation of environmental activities by enterprises and organizations.

The inclusion of responsibility for the energy sector created the Ministry for Environment and Energy (1994 - 2005). This transformation guided the transition from pollution issues to energy issues in the connection to environment. Since that times Denmark pays a lot of attention on renewable resources, including wind power and biomass energy, and is active and efficient in the energy sector.

In the late 90's the Danish Ministry for Environment and Energy realized the need to develop a national sustainable development strategy. The aim was to take into the account also social and economic spheres of life and to promote sustainable development as a common international goal. The pulse was made by WSSD and its statement for overall development of strategies. As a result Denmark's NSDS "A Shared Future - Balanced Development" was prepared under the supervision of Danish Environmental Protection Agency. The strategy was approved for implementation by the Danish Government in 2002. It is worth mentioning that WSSD happened during the Danish EU Presidency (MoEE, Denmark, 2002). That is why Denmark had a strong desire to be a leader in contributing to SD on the global level.

Furthermore, by a desire to prevent the negative effects of the economic crisis Denmark introduced sustainable development in the economic goals and principles of the program “Wisdom, growth, welfare”. The ambitious program aims to increase economic growth in Denmark without doing harm to the society or environment.

Thus the way of Denmark for developing its sustainable development strategy was actually pushed by United Nations actions: both in the 70s for establishing the Ministry of Environment and in the 90’s for preparation to the WSSD. However the country made a big effort to sustainable development on the national and global level. Climate and energy issues started to be a question of serious discussions, as an indicative result Denmark hosted UN Climate Change Conference in 2009.

#### **4.2.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government**

The Ministry of Environment plays an important role for the sustainable development policies, but it is the Danish Agency for Environmental Protection which coordinates NSDS. It makes reports to the Minister of Environment and is responsible for implementing environmental legislation. Another task of Agency for Environmental Protection is to develop draft laws, which are sent to the Ministry of Environment and Energy for approval after the discussion at the regional level.

The importance of the NSDS content has increased within the regional and local levels, where a large amount of administrative powers are delegated to the administration of districts and municipalities, but also societal actors take part in the communication processes. The main work for regulation sustainable development lies on the local authorities in the communes. This work includes monitoring legislation compliance, environmental certification of enterprises, as well as regular analysis related to this issue. The majority of the population and business leaders in Denmark are interested in sustainable development issues, which are driven by a system and measures that make more profitable use of clean technologies in business activities and prudent use of resources at home.

Another agency which was important in the work connected with sustainable development was the Nature Council. It was formed by the Minister of Environment and Energy in the late 90’s, but then was dissolved in 2002, at the time when the Danish NSDS was signed. As we will see later forestry in Denmark is essential, thus a special agency - Danish Forest and Nature Agency – is in charge of forest conservation and stability.

Denmark's success in achieving its national interests in sustainable development depends on international cooperation in this field. Denmark is a member of numerous international organizations and its position in relation to the global relations and European integration process is influenced by its membership in organizations such as the Nordic Council and Nordic Council of Ministers, as well as other institutions determining the sustainable development role of Denmark in trade and economic regulation. Special attention is given to Danish linkages with the EU institutions, where the country every way supports goals of EU policies and encourages them nationally. Denmark is constantly working with climate policies and in reverse proposes them to EU (for example, the National Allocation Plan, 2004).

In the beginning of 90s a special group called the Danish 92 Group was formed before the United Nation's Conference on Environment and Development, and then it covered trainings and meetings before WSSD. Nowadays it interlinks several NGO's and governments on both national and global levels.

Therefore, Denmark tries to make an impact on the EU and global policies; usually it happens through the membership in regional groups or organizations. The situation on the national level includes actions made by sub-agencies of the Ministry of Environment, less the Ministry itself.

#### **4.2.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in the Denmark's objectives**

In Denmark, a country which has gone before some other countries in sustainable development, a national strategy (as a document and as a process) was built on the identification of problematic issues. Issues were directly aiming at eliminating global threats and supporting the transition to sustainable development. However the development priorities of today could vary due to a decade of system changes and improved understanding global problems. The Danish NSDS after almost 10 years since its approval is still under the revision. The latest revision was planned for the year 2008, but wasn't brought into life.

The Danish NSDS has a number of positive developments on the national and global levels. This is mirrored in the current strategy. Public awareness and government management is the priority in the development of processes and structures. All ministries recognize sustainable development and implicate ideas and objectives into new policies.

The cross-sector cooperation is declared. The prime minister of Denmark, Rasmussen in the foreword of Denmark's NSDS mentions Brudtland's three dimensions of sustainable

development: “economic growth, socially balanced development and protection of nature and the environment and human health” (MoEE, Denmark, 2002, p.1). Moreover, the initiatives of citizens and businesses to move towards sustainable development are recognized.

Mrs Anne Meldgaard, councillor in the Department of Environment, Energy and Climate Change in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, took part as expert in the interviews. She was one of the persons who estimated sustainable development as very important, “*not only as an environmental challenge but also as an area that demands attention in regard to economic, foreign, trade and development policy etc*”. She also expressed the hope and belief that the UN Conference on Sustainable Development 2012 will help to renew the commitment of global actors to sustainable development.

The 8 objectives reflected in the Danish NSDS are similar to ones in a Swedish NSDS, but have different focus. Moreover, all the objectives are linked with EU and global areas of sustainable development and enclose challenges mentioned in Table 3. Denmark’s NSDS reports that “activities aimed at promoting sustainable development nationally are closely linked to the global challenges for sustainable development - and vice versa” (ibid, p.33).

**Table 3. Danish objectives linked to global and EU key challenges.**

Global and EU key challenges	Danish objectives, 2002
Social inclusion, demography and migration	The welfare society must be developed and economic growth must be decoupled from environmental impacts.
Public health Conservation and management of natural resources	There must be a safe and healthy environment for everyone, and we must maintain a high level of protection.
Conservation and management of natural resources	We must secure a high degree of biodiversity and protect ecosystems.
Climate Change and clean energy Research and development Sustainable consumption and production	Resources must be used more efficiently.
Global poverty and SD challenges Financing aid and economic instruments	We must take action at an international level.
Conservation and management of natural resources Sustainable transport	Environmental considerations must be taken into account in all sectors.
Sustainable consumption and production	The market must support sustainable development.
Education and training	Sustainable development is a shared

Research and development Communication, mobilizing actors and multiplying success	responsibility and we must measure progress.
--	--

Characterizing the objectives from Table 3, in the economic dimension targets including changes in consumption attitudes and production received a broad space and came from the existing EU and Agenda 21 objectives (discussed in the previous chapters). Denmark is encouraged to work deeply on the “obtaining international agreement on environmental taxes” (MoEE, Denmark, 2002, p. 7), starting with cooperation with EU as a regional economic union. Partnership in the economic area is of importance to Danish government. The economic part is very linked with the environmental sphere in the strategy. The proposed initiatives are pointed at improving stability in both areas, without degradation any of them.

On the environmental level Denmark supports the precautionary principle, which was widely used in Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992) and for EC’s documents (for example “Cardiff Process”). The synergy is outstanding both with economic and social sphere, because it matters them as well. Sufficient management together with a respect to biodiversity is seen as “an important element in future initiatives (MoEE, Denmark, 2002, p. 20). Thus Denmark’s NSDS possess a strong involvement in this issue, not only in the objectives, but also in the cross-cutting activities.

It is formulated in the strategy: “Denmark is working actively to improve European and international environmental protection through EU cooperation” (MoEE, Denmark, 2002, p. 34). Agenda 21 together with Johannesburg Plan of Implementation comprised the conservation of natural resources. Moreover it refers to one of the keys of EU SSD - Conservation and management of natural resources (Table 4). It is designed by means of stabilizing climate change and the biggest contributions could be regarded from the energy sector. Based on the vision that EU and global governance stress the need of energy savings, Denmark attaches significance to them as “a cost-effective means of fulfilling environmental goals” (MoEE, Denmark, 2002, p. 65). If WSSD discussed renewable energy and failed in attaining an overall treaty, Denmark is seriously working on this issue.

Regarding the social part, Denmark understands the necessity of the joint labour market and social benefits for the society. A number of aims in this area are directed to the EU candidate countries, to help them develop necessary social standard by making research and further educational training based on SD. Food safety and health as a core parts are related to the global aims mentioned in WSSD. Denmark uses the Millennium Development



Goals (for example goal 5: improve maternal health) to further develop the social conditions for citizens.

A better picture is painted when we look on the part “Denmark’s international activities”. The three dimensions mentioned above were a starting point for a discussion on the global and EU levels. Through the EU Denmark is assisting developing countries with SD. The development aid which remains demandable to these countries is included in the sustainable development cluster. Mrs Meldgaard described the European Unions’ role in spreading ideas of SD, and she underlined the good position of EU in this sphere due to *“the cooperation on various areas related to SD”* and the linkages *“with compliance mechanisms”*. Being one of the policy makers in Scandinavian countries Mrs Anne stated that they support changes towards sustainability not only in Europe but in the whole world. Particularly in Denmark policy makers *“are already assisting a number of developing countries in attaining a greener policy”*.

The general conclusion is that Denmark has absorbed the objectives suggested by the international community. Objectives in the strategy are related to global sustainable development and Agenda 21; they are mentioned in the context of overall integration, adherence to an environmental agenda and a prosperous society. Moreover, membership in the EU and the presidency in 2002 played a decisive role in the Danish SD progress. Shortcoming, however, could be depicted in the relative obsolescence of the strategy. The example of Sweden that is continually improving its national strategy shows that it is advantageous and responds to the changes in other policy areas.

## **4.3. Norway**

### **4.3.1. The challenge in Norway: from environmental documents to SD strategies**

As in the previously reviewed countries the process for developing a SD strategy in Norway began from the environmental documents for the recognition to preserve nature. The distinctive feature of Norway consisted in a relatively quick start, which appeared with the chairmanship of Gro Harlem Brundtland, prime minister of Norway, in the WSED (1987). According to the survey with Audun Ruud, research manager at Sintef Energy Research, the importance of *“having the chairman for the WCED Gro Harlem Brundtland the communication between the UN and Norway was very good”*. According to him, *“as one of few countries Norway also initiated specific R&D initiative to follow-up the WCED by establishing several Centers for Development and Environment”*. Brudtland expressed the Norwegian views on sustainable development and set the definition which is still in use nowadays (from the previous chapters, we know that the definition requires changes and is controversially discussed by social or political scholars).

Environmental issues in Norway were discussed in various policy documents and white papers. “White paper 46 (1988-89): Environment and Development: the Norwegian follow-up of the Report from the World Commission on Environment and Development” was one of the environmental documents which was actually “a strategy in practice” or “a green plan” (Lafferty, et al, 2007). According to SusNord this white paper was also a pioneer in institutional changes for sustainability (SusNord, 2005). The “White Paper 13 (1992-93): On the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro” summarized objectives of UNCED. According to the White Paper 13 Norway had different from UNCED priorities for SD. The aim to submit a national strategy was however put into effect only 10 years later.

In 1997 the Government of Norway presented a “White Paper 58: Environmental Policy for a Sustainable Development. Joint Efforts for the Future”. The policy clarified and strengthened the long-term environmental program by recalling sustainable development concept as the way to leave heritage of the environment to the future generation (Brundtland report, 1997). The white paper was aiming to build an environmentally sustainable society and recognized the necessity to make efforts for fitting the production and consumption into the constraints of the natural environment. This can be explained as the first steps towards connecting environment with economic issues in the Norwegian policies and society.

The up-coming “White Paper 8 (1999-2000): The Environmental Policy of the Government and the State of the Environment in Norway” and “White Paper 42 (2000-01): Biological Diversity. Sector Responsibility and Coordination” argued for the trends for sustainable development both achieved and aimed for the future, which included “political ambitions for SD” (Lafferty, et al. 2007, p. 177). Reports also presented the progress which had been achieved.

This brief overview of the white papers helped us to understand and prove the speed of the expansion of SD in Norway. They led to the adoption of the national strategy for sustainable development (2002) and the National Action Plan (2003). Few years later the documents were revised into Norway’s Strategy for Sustainable Development (2008). Scholars researching Norway’s SD are quite skeptical about the issue related to the NSDS and argue that it improved the situation, but failed to set and manage the objectives in the long term (Ruud, 2009; Lafferty, et al, 2007; Steurer, Martinuzzi, 2007), keeping in mind that Norway had a good basis and conditions for sustainable development.

#### **4.3.2. Participation. Linkages between national and global, EU tiers of government**

The part begins with explanations of linkages between Norway and EU. Being a non-EU country, Norway as a member of the EEA (European Economic Area), still complies with EU directives, including not only trade and barter, but also areas of social conditions, environmental issues and the production of certain goods and services.

William Lafferty, Earlier Director of the Programme for Research and Documentation for a Sustainable Society, Research Council of Norway, the interviewed expert, expresses his views on the relations between Norway and EU. He argues that “*Norway is tied to the EU by the European Economic Area treaty. Norway has proved to be one of the most comprehensive adopter of EU legislation*”. Bengt Kriström, another consulted expert, points out that Norway “*can afford it. There might be a strategic advantage if they want to enter EU in the future*”. Gerald Berger, the interviewed expert, is sure that “*Norway has such close ties with the EU that it is oriented towards the work of the EU, like Switzerland. But as the work of the EU regarding SD is rather underdeveloped, countries could do much better if they apply stricter SD approaches in their national context*”.

Referring to global supervision and the Norwegian government Lafferty comments that “*everything indicates that Norway needs greater incentives and international regulations to make progress on SD*”. Ruud (expert responding) indicates that “*every nation needs*

*supervision in terms of guidance, but the question is whether Norway as other sovereign countries will accept mandatory international commitments. The economic structures are also different (Norwegian petroleum activities). The case of combating climate change, however, indicates that supervision still is needed".* He admits that linking Norway's NSDS with global and EU SD policies in the objectives and mechanisms of implementation is "ok, but it still could be very vague as it involves a number of different challenges".

Norway's SD strategy is coordinated by the Ministry of Finance which differs from other analyzed above countries. Roger Schjerva, secretary of the Ministry of Finance in his welcome speech to Baltic 21 representatives recognizes SD as a "central policy to government" (MoF, Norway, 2011) and explains the reason for choosing the Ministry of Finance for coordinating SD as the only one which could coordinate "between different policy areas (...) and with civic society". The main authority in the area of SD in Norway and in coordinating activities with global and EU governments is the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry is also responsible for economic policy and national budget. The Norway's NSDS was a part of the national budget for the year 2008 and was again included in the budget for the year 2011. Previously the Ministry had established a special national committee for sustainable development, which was in charge of monitoring the implementation of the SD strategy and coordinating the Norwegian Agenda 21 process, but never succeeded in the results and was abolished (O'Riordan, Voisey, 1997). Sub-national activities include the intercommunication between the Ministry of Finance and local levels of governance. The government makes a significant contribution to facilitating development at the regional level. Implementation of SD on the local level is reflected in fulfilling aims and processes of Local Agenda 21.

Norway has a strong synergy with global and EU institutions. The country is an active participant in the international organizations. Norway precedes the environmental thinking in the socioeconomic issues, in the exercise of goods and services, and it increases the attention to the three pillars in the world trade. The economic and development cooperation is one of the most important tasks on the Norway's agenda. Norway's orientation in SD could be characterized by the responsible ministry's function: in Norway decisions on SD are made by the Ministry of Finance instead of the Ministry of Environment. An important role is devoted to the economic pillar. The relationships with the EU also reflect economic sphere, correlations between the situation with petroleum and Norway's entry to EU. Disadvantages in the whole managerial system for sustainable development in Norway include the lack of a

special Council for Sustainable Development and the weak collaboration of other important ministers as the Ministry of Environment or the Ministry of Health (Ruud, 2009).

### **4.3.3. Content assessment: Linkages with global, EU policies in Norway's objectives**

Norway has submitted two strategies for sustainable development (2002 and 2008), the last one according to the Ministry of Finance was discussed as a chapter in the Norwegian National Budget (MoF, 2008). On the web-site of the Ministry of Finance it is stated that “poverty and threats to the earth’s environment are the main challenges for a sustainable development” (MoF, 2007). Poverty appears when economic and social policies in the society are weak and have various gaps. Linking poverty and environment in this case explains Norway’s position for connecting economy and ecology. Strategy includes three pillar approach and recognizes importance of stable society with a developed economy and natural biodiversity.

Ruud, research manager at Sintef Energy Research, argues that the Norwegian SD targets are not well integrated through all ministries and policies in Norway. He refers that *“a set of indicators are published annually as part of the budgetary affairs. However, these targets are more oriented towards pressures and the state and less on actual policy responses. This is at least the case of domestic affairs. Coordination between different ministries is also weak due to strong delegation of political power to various sectoral domains”*.

Lafferty (the interviewed expert) points out that Norway implements the SD strategy, because it is *“traditionally a strong supporter of international treaties, agreements and organizations (...) and find it in their national interest to strongly support international agreements”*. According to him Norway is *“relatively unaffected by the global financial and economic crisis, and thus in better economic shape to make continued contributions to SD-related international goals”*.

As we see from the Table 4 Norwegian objectives are linked with global key challenges, they also coincide with the EU SD aims. The paradigm of sustainable development included in the global policies (Agenda 21 and the Implementation Plan) was adapted in Norway’s NSDS considering specific features of Norway. Therefore it is notable from the table that Norway has added two particularities: “hazardous chemicals” and “Sami perspectives on environmental and natural resource management”. Chemicals were discussed previously under natural resources part in both EU and global policies, but didn’t receive the

separate header in their priority areas. The second particularity is determined by Norway's recognition of Sami's rights and their views on sustainable development. The Norwegian Government encourages Sami's government to control local issues and preserve its environment (MoF, Norway, 2008).

**Table 4. Norwegian objectives linked to global and EU key challenges.**

Global and EU key challenges	Norwegian priority areas, 2002, 2008
Global poverty and SD challenges Communication, mobilizing actors and multiplying success Education and training	International cooperation to promote sustainable development and combat poverty
Climate Change and clean energy Sustainable transport Education and training	Climate change, the ozone layer and long-range air pollution
Conservation and management of natural resources Research and development	Biodiversity and cultural heritage
Conservation and management of natural resources	Natural resources
---	Hazardous chemicals
Social inclusion, demography and migration Financing aid and economic instruments Sustainable consumption and production Public health	Sustainable economic and social development
---	Sami perspectives on environmental and natural resource management.

Looking at three pillars approach, Norway's NSDS relates to it in the priority areas. Most of policy aims in the strategy could be viewed from both global and national perspective involving the interconnections of economic, social and environment are described.

The economic dimension stipulates development of sustainable production and consumption. The transition to sustainable development requires improving the mechanism of state regulation of Norwegian foreign economic relations, but also changes of economic and political tools for improving standards of life. Balance between social stability and environmental quality while making economic decisions plays a crucial role in Norway. Moreover, objectives related to poverty reduction emphasize these conditions and are related to the international cooperation, which refers to the tasks raised in Agenda 21.

The effective management of oil production contains economic benefits as well as less pollution, which is of interest for Norwegian citizens and future generations ("Conservation

and management of natural resources” objective). In addition Norway’s NSDS encourages technological changes, environmentally-friendly energy production, renewable energy and initiatives for combating unemployment by the creation of new companies and work places. Problems and solutions in the energy sector are discussed also in the environmental part. Proper aims corresponding to the use of natural energy resources refer to the global aim of ecological preservation. The preservation of the environment on the national and global levels was one of the general aims declared on the first UN Conferences on Environment and Development.

Norway’s SD goals in the area of environment coincide with global goals. Particularly the “Climate change, the ozone layer and long-range air pollution” objective advises to meet the commitments of EU regulations and the Gothenburg Protocol. According to NSDS, Norway keeps to the Implementation Plan (Johannesburg Summit) especially in respect to biological diversity. Norway’s strategy highlights the “initiative in the work of international agreements and cooperation to address global and regional environmental issue” (MoF, Norway, 2008). Obligations of Norway in this area turn to the promotion of the UN Millennium Development Goals and their successful realization.

Beyond the social issues the Government of Norway perceives the aims of social benefits, sustainable pensions, improved education sector and welfare (MoF, Norway, 2008). Unfortunately, the social part of the strategy is contrasting with two previous ones, as it received less attention and is quite short. Better quality of life is rather promoted through the economic dimension and is partly discussed in the framework of environmental measures.

The ambition of the strategy is to link global policies with Norwegian ones, the goal has been partly reached; the linkages are clearly seen through the whole strategy. However, sometimes it is hard to follow the connections and to assess the transition process when following the chapters of the strategy.

## **Concluding discussion**

The thesis has discussed the topic of global governance and sustainable development analyzing some examples for global, EU and national policies and strategies. It was discussed that in today's world it is necessary to take into account any national vision and strategy for the transition to a sustainable path.

In the thesis I have identified two concepts which presented the core elements for a framework. These concepts of sustainable development and global governance have a strong interconnection and take an important place among other tools that have enabled to realize the structure of the thesis. However, as it was shown by the analysis of the scientific literature, different authors have different definitions for these terms. The research came to the conclusion that there are still many doubts for interpreting such broad concepts which are mentioned above, thus there is a continuous debate on the international arena. As a basis I took the following definitions: *Sustainable development* includes an eco-centric vision regarding decision-making in the areas of economic, social and environmental areas; it includes a fair division of natural resources among the generations without priorities and promotion of renewable resources; *global governance* is a complex system including international and national, public and private parties.

The relations between global governance and sustainable development appeared to be strong. Global governance is attributed to the specific arrangements of cooperative measures aiming at solving specific problems of sustainable development. Global governance has already influenced the process of recognition sustainable development as a fundamental issue. The main role was played by the UN during the Rio and Johannesburg conferences to provide synergies between economic, social and environmental dimensions on the global and national levels. Agenda 21 could be named as the core document for promoting national sustainable development strategies. However even if global governance promotes sustainable development, the current situation underlines a big gap between the fundamental definitions of sustainable development and the political methods of its realization. Global governance has a number of weaknesses and in the reality serves own interests rather than promoting global aims. Thus the system, structure and mechanisms of global governance responsible for managing sustainable development are in need of transformation.

The overview of global and EU concerns on SD has been reached in the third chapter of the thesis, where special attention was given to Agenda 21, Plan of Implementation and EU SDS. The research questions were investigated from three sources due to the combined



method of analysis (literature review, interviews and video analysis), receiving independent data. Synergies have been found on the three levels of governance.

Agenda 21 succeeded in developing an overall strategic plan aimed at addressing vital problems of mankind, and translating sustainable development into concrete national and international obligations. Johannesburg Plan of Implementation declared sustainable development to be discussed and implemented. The European Union moved to construct SD strategy for the member states in order to serve the goal of global policies and promote decision-making in this area. The analysis has shown however that the overall leadership of the EU is doubtful.

The thesis studied the way of approaching SD on the national level by discussing Scandinavian countries as the front-runners. The aim was to systematically review how the SD strategies are composed in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The overview included the challenges from environmental policies to SD strategies, linkages with global and EU key aims, as well as the participation of national ministries in the selected Scandinavian countries. Differences have been detected.

First of all, Sweden, Denmark and Norway have developed their strategies focusing on environmental priorities in the beginning, but later on included more dimensions to the updated strategies. This could be explained by having Environment ministries as the first coordinated organs for the strategies. Exception is Norway, where the Ministry of Finance is responsible for SD. Another challenge is the difference in inter-ministerial bodies, for example, in Norway there is no Council which is responsible for sustainable development, in Sweden and Denmark – they do have it.

Secondly, national sustainable development strategies in the selected countries, building on the fundamental principles of the SD concept, are not identical. Specificity of Scandinavia's transition to sustainable development differs substantially from the same characteristics of other countries, both developed and developing countries. Scandinavian countries have shown similar aims, objectives and approach with a varied focus and goals (Appendix D. Table 5). I could say that three dimensions are generally covered in the researched strategies. But the studied national sustainable development strategies have different accents. Thus, Denmark's strategy is more based on the preservation of the environment and the basic human needs, Swedish strategy also prioritize environmental issues, whereas Norwegian strategy has a number of different priority themes. Every country has taken into the account the global and EU priorities, which are mentioned in the document texts. The reason for variation is the difference in geographic, cultural and thematic parts.

In addition to general achievements, Scandinavia's transition to sustainable development is, in particular, equating the priorities of the global and national development on the goals and criteria for maintaining survival of humanity and environment. In this sense the appearance of the priorities and objectives of sustainable development shifts the national interests in the direction of global interest, but does not lead to a leveling of the specifics of their own interests, goals or values. This situation is typical for Scandinavia, where a gradual harmonization of national and global interests and related objectives is related to the global transition to sustainable development.

Looking forward, the thesis could be considered as a first step towards research for a critical assessment of results, impacts and monitoring of national sustainable development strategies. The further discussion could include the evaluation of indicators, reviews and analysis on how far the SD strategies have contributed to the improvement of the environmental quality. Moreover, interviews with members of environmental movements may give other critical results. As the countries are constantly dealing with issues on global governance and sustainable development, the future research should update and analyze the changes in up-coming strategies and policies referring to the results in this thesis.

Finally, the hypothesis together with the research questions was verified with special methodological approach, combining several methods. However as it was found in the thesis no single country in the world could deal with problems of sustainability alone. National strategies and actions would be less useful, if the rest of the world does not take appropriate common and coordinated actions by the supervision of global governance.

## References

### Articles&Literature

- Babarenda Gamage, G., Boyle, C. (2008). *Sustainable development: a review of progress, stagnation and potential*. Int. J. Sustainable Development, Vol. 11, No. 1.
- Baker, S., Eckerberg, K. (2008). eds., *In Pursuit of Sustainable Development: New Governance Practices at the Sub-National Level in Europe*, (London: Routledge).
- Dee, M. (2011). *Evaluating European Union leadership in multilateral negotiations: A framework for Analysis*. European Union Studies Association (EUSA) Biennial Conference.
- Deere-Birkbeck, C. (2009). *Global governance in the context of climate change: the challenges of increasingly complex risk parameters*. International Affairs. Volume 85, Issue 6.
- Esty, D.C., Ivanova, M.H. (2005). *Globalization and Environmental Protection: a Global Governance Perspective*. In A Handbook of Globalisation and Environmental Policy: National Government Interventions in a Global Arena (ed. with (Frank Wijen et al, eds.)
- Falkner, R. (2006). *The European Union as a 'Green Normative Power'? EU Leadership in International Biotechnology Regulation*. Center for European Studies Working Paper Series 140.
- Forman, S., Segaar, D. (2006). *New Coalitions for Global Governance: The Changing Dynamics of Multilateralism*. Global Governance 12(2): 205–226
- Haas, P.M. (2004). *Addressing the global governance deficit*. Global Environmental Politics 4:4.
- Haberl, H., (2006). *The global socioeconomic energetic metabolism as a sustainability problem*. Energy, 31, pp. 87-99.
- Holzinger, K., Knill, C., Schäfer (2006). *A Rhetoric or Reality? 'New Governance' in EU Environmental Policy*. European Law Journal, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 403–420.
- Kemp, R., Parto, S. (2005). *Governance for sustainable development: moving from theory to practice*. International Journal Sustainable Development. Vol 8, Nos. 1/2.
- Kilian, B., Elgström, O. (2010). *Still a green leader? The European Union's role in international climate*. Cooperation and Conflict 45: 255.
- Lafferty, W.M., Knudsen, J. and Larsen, O.M. (2007). *Pursuing Sustainable Development in Norway: the Challenge of Living Up To Brundtland at Home*. European Environment. 17, 177–188.
- Martinelli, A. (2003). *Markets, governments, communities and global governance*. International Sociology 18(2), 291-323.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2000). *Sustainable Development: a New(ish) Idea for a New Century?* Political Studies. Volume 48, 370-387.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2007). *National Sustainable Development Strategies: Features, Challenges and Reflexivity*. European Environment. 17, 152–163.
- Newig, J., Fritsch, O. (2009). *Environmental governance: participatory, multi-level – and effective?* Environmental Policy and Governance 19, 197-214.
- Okereke, C., Bulkeley, H., Schroeder, H. (2009). *Conceptualizing climate governance beyond the international regime*. Global Environmental Politics 9:1.
- Pallemaerts, M., Heroedes, M., and Adele, C. (2007). *Does the EU Sustainable Development Strategy Contribute to Environmental Policy Integration?*. EPIGOV Paper No. 9, Berlin: Ecologic – Institute for International and European Environmental policy.
- Pezzey, J.C.V. and Toman, M.A. (2002). *The Economics of Sustainability: A Review of Journal Articles*. Resources for the Future. Discussion Paper 02-03. January.

Pezzoli, K. (1997). *Sustainable Development: A Transdisciplinary Overview of the Literature*. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 40: 5, 549 — 574.

Rauschmayer, F., Berghöfer, A., Omann, I. and Zikos, D. (2009). *Examining Processes or/and Outcomes? Evaluation Concepts in European Governance of Natural Resources*. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 19, 159–173

Rauschmayer, F., Paavola, J., Wittmer, H. (2009). *European governance of natural resources and participation in a multi-level context: an editorial*. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 19, 141-147.

Rockström, Johan, et al. (2009). *A safe operating space for humanity*. *Nature* 461, pp. 472-475.

Runhaar, H., Dieperink, C., Driessen, P. (2005). *Policy analysis for sustainable development. Complexities and methodological responses*. Paper for the Workshop on Complexity and Policy Analysis, Cork, Ireland, 22–24 June.

Santi, E., Grenna, L. (2003). *Environmental Communications Assessment: A framework of analysis for the environmental governance*. Paper presented at the 7Th Biennial Conference on Communication and the Environment (COCE 2003).

Seghezzi L., (2009). *The five dimensions of sustainability*. *Environmental Politics*, Volume 18, Number 4, pp. 539-556 (18).

Spangenberg, J.H. (2010). *A European Methodology for Sustainable Development Strategy Reviews*. *Environmental Policy and Governance*.. 20, 123–134.

Steurer, R. and Martinuzzi, A. (2005). *Towards a New Pattern of Strategy Formation in the Public Sector: First Experiences with National Strategies for Sustainable Development in Europe*. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 23/3, 455-472.

Steurer, R. and Martinuzzi, A. (2007). *From Environmental Plans to Sustainable Development Strategies*. *European Environment* 17, 147–151.

Vogler, J. (2005). *The European contribution to global environmental governance*. *International Affairs*. Volume 81, Issue 4.

Vogler, J., Stephan, H.R. (2007). *The European Union in global environmental governance: Leadership in the making?* *International Environmental Agreements*, 7:389–413.

Weiss, T.G. (2000). *Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges*. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 21, #5, pp.795-814.

## **Official Documents/Legislation**

Annan, K. (2001). “*Sustainable Development: Humanity’s biggest challenge in the new century*”, speech by the United Nations, Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, at the International Conference Centre, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 15 March 2001.

Commission on Global Governance (1995). *Our Global Neighborhood*. ISBN: 0-19-827998-1. Published by Oxford University Press.

CEU (2006). *Review of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy (EU SDS) – Renewed Strategy*. Brussels, 9 June 2006.

CEU (2009). *2009 Review of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy - Presidency Report*. Brussels, 1 December 2009

COM (2001a). Commission of the European Communities. *Communication from the Commission. A Sustainable Europe for a Better World: A European Union Strategy for Sustainable Development*. Brussels, 15.5.2001.

COM (2001b). *Ten years after Rio: preparing for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002*. Com 2001 53 final, 6.2.2001.

Ministry of Environment and Energy, Denmark (2002). *National Sustainable Development Strategy: A shared future - balanced development*. ISBN 87-7972-259-8.

Ministry of the Environment, Sweden (2002). *Sweden's National Strategy for Sustainable Development 2002*. Government Communication 2001/02:172.

Ministry of the Environment, Sweden (2004). *A Swedish Strategy for Sustainable Development*. Government communication 2003 / 04:129.

Ministry of the Environment, Sweden (2006a). *Strategic Challenges A Further Elaboration of the Swedish Strategy for Sustainable Development*. Government Communication 2005/06:126.

Nordic Council of Ministers (2009). *Sustainable Development – New Bearings for the Nordic Countries. Revised edition with goals and priorities 2009–2012*. 2009:727. ISBN 978-92-893-1863-1.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway (2002). *National Strategy for Sustainable Development*. ISBN: 82-7177-681-9.

Ministry of Finance, Norway (2008). *Norway's Strategy for Sustainable Development. Published as part of the National Budget 2008*. ISBN: 978-82-91092-65-2.

United Nations (2009). *Millennium Development Goals Report, 2009*. ISBN: 978-92-1-101196-8.

UNCED (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*. A/CONF.151/26 (Vol. I), Rio De Janeiro, Brazil. <http://www.un-documents.net/rio-dec.htm>

UNCED (1992). *Agenda 21, Chapter 8. Integrating Environment And Development In Decision-Making*. A/CONF.151/26 (Vol. I). Rio De Janeiro, Brazil. <http://www.un-documents.net/a21-08.htm>

UNCHE (1972). *Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*, Stockholm. <http://www.unngosustainability.org/documents/stockholm1972.pdf>

WCED (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future, Our Common Future, Chapter 2: Towards Sustainable Development*. A/42/427, Geneva, Switzerland. <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm>

WSSD (2002). *Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development*. A/CONF.199/20. Johannesburg, South Africa. <http://www.un-documents.net/jburgpln.htm>

WSSD (2002). *Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development*. A/CONF.199/20. Johannesburg, South Africa. <http://www.un-documents.net/jburgdec.htm>

## Media

TVLINK Europe. “Creating Green Jobs” (8’53”). Available at: <http://www.tvlink.org/mediadetails.php?key=61489feda9e3758486af&title=Creating+Green+Jobs&titleleft=Employment>

TVLINK Europe. “Sustainable Production and Consumption: the way to a greener world” (7’32”). Available at: <http://www.tvlink.org/mediadetails.php?key=e01e28bb7205d2f4cd42&title=Sustainable+Production+and+Consumption%3A+the+way+to+a+greener+world&titleleft=Environment>

TVLINK Europe. “The Climate and Energy Package – Involving the People of Europe” (12’00”). Available at: <http://www.tvlink.org/mediadetails.php?key=2ebd456c92685f7331d6&title=The+Climate+and+Energy+Package+--+Involving+the+People+of+Europe&titleleft=Environment>

TVLINK Europe. “Time to Invest in Energy Efficiency” (7’00”). Available at: <http://www.tvlink.org/mediadetails.php?key=b4cc1bea25894ee47bcd&title=Time+to+invest+in+energy+efficiency&titleleft=Environment>

## Internet sources

Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2010). *EU Regional Policy. Europe 2020 vision on Capitals Cities and Regions*. Available at: <http://www.eutrio.be/eu-regional-policy-europe-2020-vision-capitals-cities-and-regions>

Biermann, F. (2004). *Global Environmental Governance. Conceptualization and Examples*. Global Governance Working Paper No 12. Amsterdam, Berlin, Oldenburg, Potsdam: The Global Governance Project. Available at [www.glogov.org](http://www.glogov.org).

Blin A., Marin G., (2008). *Rethinking Global Governance*. Available at: <http://www.world-governance.org/spip.php?article15>.

Center for Global Development (2010). *Development Index 2010*. Available at: <http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/active/cdi/>.

EC (2002). *Good governance for sustainable development. The EU at the WSSD 2002*. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/wssd/pdf/good\\_governance.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/wssd/pdf/good_governance.pdf)

Elkington, J. (2007). *Brundtland and sustainability: history's balance-sheet*. Available at: <http://www.opendemocracy.net>

European Environmental Bureau (2010). *The EU 2020 (Lisbon strategy): Strategy for a reasonable, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Available at: <http://www.eeb.org/index.cfm/activities/sustainability/europe-2020-lisbon-strategy/>

Government Offices of Sweden (2010). *Tasks of Commission on Sustainable Development*. Available at <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/11018/a/111519>

Hopkins, M. (2007). *Sustainable development: from word to policy*. Available at: <http://www.opendemocracy.net>

IUCN (2006). *The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-first Century*. Available at: [http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn\\_future\\_of\\_sustainability.pdf](http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_future_of_sustainability.pdf).

Ministry of the Environment, Sweden (2006b). *Swedish strategy for sustainable development*. Available at <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/7023>.

Ministry of the Environment, Sweden (2010). *Ministry of the Environment – organisation and responsibility*. Available at: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/15/54/81/c3f1de1c.pdf>

MoF, Norway, (2007). *Sustainable Development*. Available at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/fin/Selected-topics/Sustainable-development.html?id=1333>

Ministry of Finance, Norway (2011). *Welcome speech to Baltic 21 representatives, Speech/article by State Secretary Roger Schjerva* Available at: [http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/fin/News/Speeches-and-articles/Speeches-and-articles-by-other-political/statssekretaer\\_schjerva/2011/welcome-speech-to-baltic-21-representati.html?id=636331](http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/fin/News/Speeches-and-articles/Speeches-and-articles-by-other-political/statssekretaer_schjerva/2011/welcome-speech-to-baltic-21-representati.html?id=636331)

SusNord (2005). *Governance for Sustainable Development in the Nordic Region*. Available at: [http://www.prosus.uio.no/susnord/sweden/national\\_authorities/](http://www.prosus.uio.no/susnord/sweden/national_authorities/)

## Appendix A. Request for answering questions

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Natalia Stepanova and I am a second-year master student at the Gothenburg University, Sweden. I am currently writing my Master thesis in International Administration and Global Governance. The thesis is devoted to the problems of Sustainable Development and examines the SD policies in Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark and Norway) and how they were affected by global policies (such as Agenda 21) and EU SD strategy.

I am writing to you to inquire whether you would be willing to answer a survey/take part in the interview about sustainable development. The survey would consist of several questions sent by e-mail.

Your contribution would be of great value as the SD is still requires more research.

Thank you for your understanding!

Kind regards,

Natalia Stepanova

Student at the Master's Programme

of International Administration and Global Governance,

Gothenburg University, Sweden

## Appendix B. Questionnaire for expert interviews

Topic	Questions
	How is your work connected with sustainable development (SD)?
<b>Overall about SD</b>	How important do you find the problems of SD nowadays?
<b>Global-National</b>	In your opinion, how effective is the coordination among various organizations which are developing strategies designed to achieve the SD goals?
	Do national governments need the supervision from the global governance or can they manage implementation of SD themselves?
	How important is the communication between global organizations and national governments in the process of policy-making for SD?
	In your opinion, will the UN Conference on Sustainable Development 2012 help to renew commitment of global actors to sustainable development?
<b>EU-National</b>	Based on your experience: How do you conceive the potential of the European Union to spread ideas and approaches such as sustainable development through the EU countries?
	Talking about non-EU states, from your opinion, why has Norway adopted EU rules and norms for SD? What were the reasons for doing so?
<b>National strategies</b>	What do Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark or Norway) seek to attain by implementing the SD strategy?
	Would it be possible for policy makers in Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark or Norway) to support changes towards sustainability? (How do you think they could help? Or what would make it difficult or impossible for them to help?)
<b>Concluding</b>	Thank you for taking the time!



## Appendix C. List of respondents

Name, Surname	Occupation, relation to SD
<b>Berger, Gerald</b>	A senior researcher and project manager at the Research Institute for Managing Sustainability at the Vienna University of Economics and Business. Work on the following projects: coordinating the European Sustainable Development Network (ESDN), Work Package leader in the FP7-funded project CORPUS (which is on sustainable consumption issues), and coordinating an expert group that advises the Serbian Government in the implementation of their national SD strategy.
<b>Berkow, Charles</b>	Environmental Policy Adviser, Green Party, Parliamentary Office, Sweden. Dealing with the ecological aspect of sustainable development, often also economic and social aspects.
<b>Broman, Göran</b>	Professor, Research Director, Sustainability Assessments and Sustainable Product and Service Innovation, School of Engineering, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden. Research and education on strategic sustainable development and sustainable product and service innovation.
<b>Kriström, Bengt</b>	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Member of the Government Commission on Sustainable Development. Relation to SD: Research on the husbandry of our natural environments & resources.
<b>Lafferty, William</b>	Earlier Director of the Programme for Research and Documentation for a Sustainable Society, Research Council of Norway. Current Professor of Strategic Research for Sustainable Development at the University of Twente, Netherlands
<b>Meldgaard, Anne</b>	Minister Councillor, Department of Environment, Energy and Climate Change in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
<b>Ruud, Audun</b>	Research Manager at Sintef Energy Research, Norway. Dr. Polit degree in Political Science. Research on politics for sustainable development, industry and energy.

## Appendix D. Table 5.

“NSDS structure and coverage of the 3 SD dimensions. (Modified from ESDN Quarterly Report December 2007)”

Country	NSDS structure	Coverage of the 3 SD dimensions	Details of the objectives/priority areas
<b>Denmark</b>	Mixed; 8 key objectives, plus 13 priority areas with actions/measures	Equally covered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The welfare society must be developed and economic growth must be decoupled from environmental impacts.</li> <li>2. There must be a safe and healthy environment for everyone, and we must maintain a high level of protection.</li> <li>3. We must secure a high degree of biodiversity and protect ecosystems.</li> <li>4. Resources must be used more efficiently.</li> <li>5. We must take action at an international level.</li> <li>6. Environmental considerations must be taken into account in all sectors.</li> <li>7. The market must support sustainable development.</li> <li>8. Sustainable development is a shared responsibility and we must measure progress.</li> </ol>
<b>Norway</b>	Hierarchical; 7 priority areas	Equally covered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. International cooperation to promote sustainable development and combat poverty</li> <li>2. Climate change, the ozone layer and long-range air pollution</li> <li>3. Biodiversity and cultural heritage</li> <li>4. Natural resources</li> <li>5. Hazardous chemicals</li> <li>6. Sustainable economic and social development</li> <li>7. Sami perspectives on environmental and natural resource management.</li> </ol>
<b>Sweden</b>	Hierarchical; 4 thematic “strategic challenges” plus further 4 priority areas (relating to implementation)	Emphasis of environmental dimension	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building sustainable communities</li> <li>2. Encouraging good health on equal terms</li> <li>3. Meeting the demographic challenge</li> <li>4. Encouraging sustainable growth.</li> </ol>