

Säästva arengu foorum 2007

14.30–16.15 Arutelu ja kokkuvõtte

Ettekandjad prof. Johan Rockström (SEI, Rootsi), prof. Joachim Spangenberg (UFZ, Saksamaa), prof. Martin O'Connor (C3ED, Prantsusmaa), Kaja Peterson (SEI Tallinna keskus), Tiit Kallaste (SEI Tallinna keskus) ning ettevõtjate esindaja Tõnis Meriste (Eesti Keskkonnajuhtimise Assotsiatsiooni juhatuse esimees) olid palutud vastama järgmistele küsimustele:

1. Säästva arengu põhimõtete rakendamine igapäevaelus riiklikul tasandil – millises seisus oleme?
2. Keskkonnakaitse integreerimine valdkondlikesse poliitikasse – head näited, probleemid.
3. Mida vajab otsusetegija, et arvestada säästva arengu põhimõtteid otsustamisel?
4. Eesti ja globaalsed probleemid – kuidas peaks Eesti nende lahendamisele kaasa aitama?

Arutelu juhtis Valdur Lahtvee, riigikogu roheliste fraktsiooni esimees.

Valdur Lahtvee:

Oleme kuulanud täna ettekandeid sellest, mida on globaalselt jätkusuutliku arendamise vallas tehtud, kuidas teadus on sellesse panustanud, et otsusetegijail oleks lihtsam otsuseid teha. Tahame ettekandjatega ja foorumil osalejatega jätkata arutelu, kuidas säästva arengu põhimõtteid ikkagi igapäeva elus rakendada. Need põhimõtted on kirja pandud näiteks ka Eesti keskkonnanstrateegias. Loen need ette:

- Majanduse arengu mõjutamine keskkonda säästvas suunas, kusjuures eesmärk on praeguse põlvkonna vajaduste rahuldamine tulevaste põlvkondade huve kahjustamata; selle saavutamiseks reguleeritakse looduskasutust ja seatakse tegevuspiiranguid keskkonna kaitseks.
- Keskkonnakahjustuste ennetamine ja vältimine, pöörates tähelepanu põhjustele, kuna tagajärgede likvideerimine on tunduvalt kallim ja mõnikord isegi võimatu.
- Ettevaatlikkus otsuste tegemisel: kui kavandatava tegevuse mõju ei ole selge, ei tohi otsuseid langetada.
- Keskkonnanõuete lülitamine teiste eluvaldkondade ja majandussektorite arengustrateegiatesse ning nende arvestamine iga üksiku loodusvara ja keskkonnakomponendi kasutamisel ja kaitsel; looduskeskkonna kui ühtse tervikliku kompleksi huvide arvestamine.
- Keskkonnanõuete kajastamine ka majandust ja sotsiaalelu käsitletavates seadustes.
- Keskkonna käsitlemine riigi elanike ühise rikkuse ja hoolena; keskkonnakaitse peab olema kõrgemal parteipoliitilistest huvidest ja momendi majandusprobleemidest; keskkonnakaitse ja loodusvarade säästliku kasutamise tagamiseks tuleb taotleda elanikkonna kõikide sotsiaalsete kihtide konsensust.

- Keskkonnanõuete järgimise saavutamine majandustegevuses põhimõttel, et saastaja/tarbija maksab; kõigil keskkonnakasutajatel ja kahjustajatel peab lasuma täielik vastutus oma tegevuse eest; ettevõtted peavad tagama oma tegevuse vastavuse keskkonnanõuetele.
- Kasutatud loodusvarade väärtus, kõik keskkonnakaitsekulutused ja keskkonnale tekitatud kahjud toote kogu olelutsükli (tootmise, jaotamise, kasutamise, lõpliku kõrvaldamise) vältel peavad kajastuma toote hinnas.
- Koostöö teiste riikidega globaalsete ja regionaalsete keskkonnaprobleemide lahendamisel ning riigipiiriülese negatiivse keskkonnamõju tõkestamine.
- Keskkonnameetmete rakendamine niisugusel poliitilisel ja haldustasandil, kus nad annavad parima tulemuse; jagatud vastutuse printsiibist lähtuvalt peavad riik, kohalikud omavalitsused, ettevõtted ja elanikud koostöös lahendama keskkonnaprobleeme vastavalt oma pädevusele.

Need on universaalsed põhimõtted. Küsimus on, kui efektiivselt oleme suutnud neid rakendada?

1. Säästva arengu põhimõtete rakendamine igapäevaelus riiklikul tasandil – millises seisus oleme? Eestis, Rootsis, Saksamaal, Prantsusmaal või Euroopa Liidus laiemalt.

Tiit Kallaste:

Riik hakkab peale inimesest. Kui inimene teeb kodus seda, mis on säästlik, teeb ta ka riigi tasandil seda ja võtab igapäevatoos vastu jätkusuutlikke otsuseid. Näiteks aktuaalne jäätmeteema. Kas teie sorteerite kodus prügi? Olen seda vist 25 aastat teinud. Peaksime seda tegema ka riigi tasandil ja kasutama ressursse ratsionaalselt. Soomes näiteks saadakse jäätmetest 1000 gigavatt-tundi elektrit aastas, see on päris suur arv.

Tõnis Meriste:

Ettevõtja seisukohalt vaadates on kindlasti säästva arengu põhimõtteid mõningal määral ka juba ellu rakendatud. On muutumas arvamus, et ühel pool on head ja teisel pahad. Pahade pool kipuvad olema ettevõtjad, sest kõigil, mis ettevõtjad teevad või toodavad, on mingisugune keskkonnamõju. Me kasutame loodusvarasid, energiat. Ettevõtluse aluseks on kasumi tootmine, kuid ettevõtjad on juba ette võtnud ka vabatahtlikke samme keskkonnanõuetele. Riik on andnud ka esimesi juhtnõure, kuidas käituda rohelisemalt – nt roheliste riigihangete põhimõtted. Parim ei ole see, kes pakub madalamat hinda, vaid pakkumiste juures tuleb välja tuua ka keskkonda puudutavad parameetrid.

Kaja Peterson:

Tooksin välja riigi tasandil planeerimistegevuse – valdkondade arengukavade koostamise, kus tahaksime rohkem näha säästva arengu põhimõtete arvestamist. Tänu seaduste muutumisele ja Euroopa Liidu direktiividele oleme sunnitud keskkonnamõju strateegilist hindamist läbi viima koos arengukavade koostamise menetlusega. See on üks võimalus tagada, et säästva arengu põhimõtted jõuavad arengukavadesse ja alternatiivide kaalumisel on need olulised kriteeriumid.

Teisalt on see protsess olnud suhteliselt vaevaline, võtab veel palju aega, enne kui jätkusuutlikkus muutub loomulikuks osaks arengu planeerimisel. Aga algus on tehtud.

Martin O'Connor:

The national level is in many cases in Europe and other parts of the world the level of the slowest innovation in making real progress towards sustainability. The role of the national level should be of providing leadership and legitimacy in advance of the capacity for citizens, businesses, organisations etc to develop strategies amongst themselves. At the national level we are not doing very well. It doesn't mean that nothing is happening.

The sustainability challenges are about the concept and practice of wealth and happiness in the modern world. The countries in Eastern Europe, who have recently made quite dramatic transitions, are in a situation where they can go faster to make a second transition if you have a clear vision and leadership. Some of you may feel tired – you have made one transition and now we suggest another, but you can move much faster than e.g. France where I work. France is very paralysed by a lot of historical package that has not changed very much for 200 years.

That may seem a paradoxical assessment, but what is required: at a national level the challenges are clearly and credibly admitted, the urgency of action is accepted. And it is presented as a social collective purpose, not as a constraint, as a cost, but as a goal and purpose. The word `credibility` is important. Because when in France the president and minister of ecology last week said that we want France to be a pioneer about saving the climate, planet and humanity, nobody took it seriously, because France for ten years has done nothing very serious about the subject apart from simple research.

Johan Rockström:

Given that this is a debate, I would be a bit provocative. Sweden is probably one of the few countries in the world that really took Agenda 21 seriously. In 1992 we set up our 15 environmental goals. We are probably the only country in the world, which took the 16th goal when the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was produced. We have the 16th goal to protect ecosystem services. Despite of this good action, very limited progress has done towards sustainability.

My provocative suggestion would be that we are camouflaging our lifestyles through the work we are doing on recycling waste, trying to package our lifestyle around a very thin wrapping to make this field more satisfied and defend our lifestyles. Sweden has Europe's oldest car park, the most polluting in the EU. With all the talks about environment, it's pathetic.

The truth is that we are not willing to give up our lifestyles; we are not ready to negotiate our lifestyles, not even in Sweden. We have started to see signs that this is cracking. The broader awareness around, the Al Gore phenomena, IPPC and climate avalanche might be the triggering factor that could start the change propelling us towards a new definition of happiness and wealth, what we value.

So far unfortunately we do not have much to celebrate. We started to have environmental accounting in Sweden – the national accounts is downgraded for environmental damages, but it is done at such a margin, that has insignificant impact so far. If we get satisfied with just

recycling waste we might get stuck for much longer than we really need. And we can move. Sweden has truly been able to disconnect energy and economic growth. The reason for that is the total transformation in energy supply to households. Today household energy supply is almost entirely through recycling bioenergy products from the timber industry. This is a major success story.

Joachim Spangenberg:

I have read 2-3 years ago that two countries have been setting the trends for the development in industrialised world: U.S and Sweden. Sweden was more successful in 1990ies; in the last decade it was U.S, but Sweden is now catching up again.

If we are talking about everyday life, we are usually talking about household consumption. Sustainable household consumption is not only about environmental issues or buying less. Because buying less could be the result of poverty, which is not socially sustainable. The question is how do we guarantee decent quality of life without overburdening the environment while guaranteeing social cohesion and equity in the society? The safe of minimum income is also a matter of sustainable household consumption. The fair sharing of tasks on household level between men and women is also an important element of household sustainability. We have to broaden the question beyond environmental aspects. Some people may say this is not an urgent priority. According to my experience if we do neglect the social and institutional aspects of sustainability, we get stuck with making progress on the environmental side.

If you look at the theme that dominates in public debate, it is usually waste. But household waste is below 10% in industrialised countries. The most important elements of household consumption, which have an impact on environment and where households can make a difference, are:

- 1. Construction and housing*
- 2. Nutrition*
- 3. Mobility and transport*

In all three we have ideas what can be done. Let me take the example of transport. I don't have a car, I don't need it, because I am living in Cologne where we have excellent public transport system, bicycle paths, good train connection all over the country and even to Paris, and airport close by to come to Estonia. Without having such infrastructure, how should people behave sustainably? It's a political question, whether people can do that.

In Germany people understand the climate issue, the need to act. What the media do, is to confuse the need for political action and just focus on the households. Then on the level household old fashioned advises are given what has to be done, because the knowledge is not there. So the changes of behaviour are very difficult to achieve.

On the other hand, I had a good experience in the Netherlands where they had the peer review of the national sustainability strategy for the first time integrating all the aspects. 18 people from high-level decision makers together with stakeholders discussed what should be the perspective. The same prime minister who 2 years ago said that visions for the Netherlands and sustainability plans are absolutely unnecessary because they contradict economic thinking is now championing. The movement towards that has been the driving

force behind the national council and national plan. They have assessment programmes where they test new legislation for sustainability impacts.

I also moderated Luxembourg sustainability process. For the first time all the ministries are getting together and putting their ideas about future trends on one table. Everybody has the right to commend on the suggestions of the other departments. Usually they talk on their own. Now the ministry of education says what they think ministry of economy should do differently. Then in a big circle they agree on consensus, which is a vision and which then is the bases for developing the national strategy. Institutional innovations are symptomatic for small countries. We have to think outside the box, how to get things done in a different way.

In Germany we have the privileged situation of having the Chancellor who was formerly the Minister of Environment – this shows to people that going into environmental policy is not the dead end road for your career. We have the foreign minister who until two years ago was the sustainability coordinator of the previous government. He gives presentations about world climate policies. For the first time I see the foreign minister who knows what he is talking about. What was most surprising, he said that we have waited for too long to wait U.S to follow, negotiating with the Bush government does not make sense; we have to take action on our own. This is a big step forward. We need to document the best progress we have as stimulation for others to follow.

On the European level, we have the best sustainability strategy. The only problem is that it is combined with the Lisbon process. According to the Commission the Lisbon process is about the short-term policy and the sustainability process about long-term policy. If you look at them, Europe in short term has no environmental problems, because Lisbon process has nothing environmental in it. The other problem is that the sustainability strategy has no economic objectives, what is the sustainable economy in the long run. This is a big deficit – to fill the gap with ideas about how the future economy, production and consumption patterns, should be implemented.

Küsimused saalist.

Anto Raukas:

Olen nähtavasti siin saalis ainuke järgi, kes oli Eesti säästva arengu sünni juures. Olime väga eesrindlikud, sest juba nõukogude ajal tahtsime vastu võtta säästva arengu seadust. Kuid ülemnõukogu polnud küps. Kui tulime 1992 tagasi Rio de Janeirost, moodustati ülemnõukogu esimehe Arnold Rüütli juures säästva arengu nõukogu. Kuid Arnold Rüütel vahetus kohe Lennart Meriga, kellele see polnud prioriteet. Ainuke peaminister, kes midagi ära tegi, oli Andres Tarand. Ta ütles, et kuigi minult muud eriti peale jõulurahuvalitsuse ei oodata, ma vähemalt saavutan selle, et säästva arengu seadus vastu võetakse.

Nüüd on asi järjest halvemaks läinud. Tiit Vähi ajal moodustati säästva arengu komisjon. Kuna komisjoni kuulus seitse ministrit, mis oli rohkem kui pool valitsuskabinetist, siis ei saadud seda nimetada säästva arengu komisjoniks, sest muidu oleks seal saanud vastu võtta otsuseid, mis on tähtsamad kui valitsuse otsused. Nimetati säästva arengu komisjoniks peaministri nõustamiseks säästva arengu üksikküsimustes. Komisjoni pole ka tööl olnud. Valitsus ignoreerib säästvat arengut, üsna nõrguke on ka riigikogu. Siin on kaks põhjust. Esiteks, valitsus vastutab ka millegi eest. Võime palju rääkida alternatiivsetest

energiaallikatest, aga peame kindlustama, et riigis oleks 1. jaanuaril 2016 elektrit. Seda ilmselt ei ole. Kirume põlevkivienergeetikat ja võime palju rääkida tuulest. Ma ei eita, et 2050. aastal on asjad palju teistmoodi. Aga me peame tegema reaalsed kavad.

Tiina Elvisto, Tallinna Ülikool:

Eelmise aastani koordineeris säästvuse temaatikat Eestis keskkonnaministerium. On arusaadav, et keskkonnaministril on väga raske ütelda pea- või majandusministrile, mida nad tegema peavad. Eelmisel aastal viidi valdkond riigikantselei pädevusse, peaministri alluvusse. Kahjuks pole kuulda olnud, kas on sellega kvalitatiivseid või kvantitatiivseid muutusi toimunud?

Minu valdkonnas, kõrghariduses, pole näiteks kõrgharidusspetsialistide ettevalmistamist reguleerivas seaduses sätestatud, et säästvat arengut tuleb käsitleda spetsialistide ettevalmistamisel. See tähendab, et kõik on autodidaktid. Rääkimata sellest, et haridus oleks üles ehitatud nii, et kogu ühiskond liiguks jätkusuutlikkuse suunas, millega tegeleb näiteks Soome. Ka õpetajate ettevalmistamisel pole võimalust, et kõik saaksid tuttavaks selle temaatikaga. Tase on selline, et kui küsida, mida tuleks Eestis jätkusuutlikkuse saavutamiseks teha, siis vastused on sageli sellised, et tuleb prügi sorteerida ja metsa raiumine tuleb keelustada. Koolis aga õpetajad peavad jätkusuutlikkuse temaatikat õpetama 1.-12. klassini.

Valdur Lahtvee:

Ega eriti ei ole vist säästva arengu komisjonis midagi tehtud viimase aasta jooksul. On arutatud Eesti 21 ja Euroopa säästva arengu strateegia täitmist Eestis. See on vist peaaegu kõik?

Riigikantselei esindaja:

Üht-teist on siiski tehtud. Säästva arengu komisjon kutsuti kokku. Ministeriumide säästva arengu töörühm kutsuti kokku, kus on kõikidest ministeriumidest esindajad. Euroopa Komisjoniga oleme suhelnud, aruandeid oleme koostanud, lepime kokku indikaatoreid säästva arengu mõõtmiseks Eestis. Kui midagi on läbi arutatud ja valitsusse viia, siis see ka jõuab sinna.

Valdur Lahtvee:

Hea on see, et meil on arusaamine, mis säästev areng on ja kuidas selle põhimõtteid rakendada. Halb on see, et põhimõtteid ei rakendata piisavalt, tõhusalt. Viimased valitsuse ja riigikogu otsused töötavad nende põhimõtete vastu. Põhjus on lihtne. Poliitikategemine Eestis on suuresti majandushuvirühmade mõju all. Kui neid põhimõtteid –“saastaja maksab”, väliskulude sisestamine jne – tugevamalt rakendada, oleks raskem kasumit teenida. Loodan, et arusaamine põhimõtete rakendamise vajalikkusest kasvab. Esimesed signaalid on olemas, kus omavalitsused ja inimesed on üles tõusnud oma huvide kaitsmiseks, näiteks põlevkivi temaatikas. Vaja on veelgi survet otsusetegijatele tugevdada.

Läheme teise küsimuse juurde.

2. Keskkonnakaitse integreerimine valdkondlikesse poliitikasse – head näited, probleemid?

Joachim Spangenberg:

I can't give you an overall view. But one of the most successful export goods of Germany in the last 5 years is the renewable energies law, which is now implemented in 54 countries in the world and people in China are discussing whether they should have it or not. There is heavy lobbying from the American and European chambers of commerce not to implement it, because it might make the production in China more expensive. Chambers of commerce in U.S and Europe have been lobbying against labour standards, shorter working hours and higher salaries in China as they are in Europe and U.S.

This law foresees that you have guaranteed fixed price if you produce yourself renewable energies and put them into the national grid. That gives everybody an opportunity to invest and earn back his money. This has led to doubling every year since that renewable energy production in Germany. The once backwards country is now the world market leader in wind energy, it has lot of biomass, and it's also competing for the top of the league in that case.

Denmark abolished the similar approach under the conservative government. From being the world market leader and also creating thousands of jobs, the export business of wind energy fell back and lost the industry and tens thousands of jobs. So this is also a responsibility of politics.

Spain is making the same kind of move to adopt the law – they have enough solar energy. In Germany the situation is difficult. Germany has the highest wind speed and solar radiation on the coasts of the North and Baltic seas, very little wind and solar energy in Bavarian mountains.

This kind of integration – setting political framework with which the market could function gives strong incentives to dynamic development, to technology and infrastructure development. It came from the bottom, investments by small scales. The big energy business was out of it, because they had hated the decentralised approach. Only now they are beginning to take the challenge seriously and try to buy up whatever they can.

Extra cost is about 15-18 euros per household in year – one glass of beer per week – price worth to pay for significantly reduced risk. It's a good example of setting framework conditions on the political level. This may also be the idea of thinking about other problems like waste – set clear target and make people move.

In Austria they had a similar approach – but there the big energy companies tried to move into the energy sector like international water companies try to move into local water supply sector. Austrian regional government said that we must have local control on that. So the state has sold their grids in energy and electricity, but not to international companies, but to local cooperatives. Now they are taking care of energy and water supply in their regions. They do it very well, because everybody knows everybody and there would be a lot of trouble if they wouldn't take care of reliability of supply for their region. That makes also absolutely sure that none of the international corporations trying to monopolise the supply, has any chance. That was a deliberate policy of the regional government to stabilize the country against the effect of globalisation. It's an example of how you can guarantee socially, economically and environmentally benign supply for energy, water etc.

Bad example.

The worst example I see is that we have in society one discourse about sustainability and climate, and the other discourse about the need for economic growth, completely not linked to each other, without asking what does one mean for the other? We have to get rid of the growth discourse and instead to have clear economic dimension in the sustainability discourse. Because we want a sustainable, well functioning economy as part of the sustainability concept. Not sustainability as a medical treatment, which comes after economic growth has caused damages.

If you try to monetise that all, then automatically you come in the situation when you substitute things against each other. Then you come to the question like: “How many hectares of virgin forest in Estonia compensate for the million of unemployed?” or “How much more income compensates for the loss of democracy and participation?” If these are nonsense questions, it’s nonsense to monetise. If you go to a shop to buy anything, you look whether it looks good, the quality is good, durability is good, running costs are OK, price is OK, whether you family would like it etc. Costs and prices are one important criterion, but not the only one. We all do that in our everyday life, why don’t politicians do that in their decision-making?

Johan Rockström:

On the negative side:

1. Failure of the European trading scheme on emission rights – good intentions and important step, but the cap was too high and the rights were given out for free. If these had been auctioned out, it wouldn’t have become a subsidy to industry just to earn money on its old historic emissions. Quotas were too high, it didn’t restrain any emission reduction and EU increased its emission last year by 2%. It is a massive scale failure, which can be corrected in the future.

2. Completely bizarre failure of fisheries policy in the Baltic. One of the major mistakes of fisheries policy is that it’s isolating itself within the ministry of fisheries or agencies, as it was only the economic or social issue. But fish is part of the food chain, and plays a very critical ecological function in speeding up the positive feedback on eutrophication of the sea, Eutrophication is changing the food chain and contributing to the growth of different types algae species, which just speed up the eutrophication. It would be very easy to correct. It’s also because we cannot collaborate between countries around the Baltic.

Two positive examples:

1. One of the most exiting developments – leadership of the European Environment Agency. It’s head, Jacqueline McGlade, is a person who is truly trying to take on all the environmental protection agencies in EU to internalise ecosystem services valuation into national accounts. The first exercise has been done, and it shows that only one country has a positive GDP in the world – Botswana, because it invests its diamonds, revenues into social welfare. All others have negative GDP.

2. For the first time there is a bill to the House of Commons, UK, to introduce emission-trading rights for consumers. One of the dramas is that the emission trading system is only for production sources. If I do my own household calculations, I am totally sustainable, zero emitter, apart from my flying: I buy electricity which comes from wind, I have my own energy source – heat pump, I drive the car which uses bioenergy. This gives zero emission in total,

because you are not including emission. But consumption is about 80% of my footprint. I am actually a major emitter, but the emissions are in China or SE Asia from where I buy my consumer goods.

The UK is moving forward by giving emission rights to all of us. For instance, each one is given 2 tonnes of rights to emit for your consumption. If you want to consume more, you have to buy the rights on the market. It's an incentive system to use market mechanism to be able to change consumption patterns. How far that will go, is still unclear, but it's an exciting development. And as you know, some of the big U.S supermarkets are starting to put on the consumer goods the carbon equivalence together with fat, minerals etc.

Martin O'Connor:

Two domains where I feel that there is quite often some success – these are framing conditions.

1. The field of Corporate Social Responsibility – means that no significant company is able to function and report publicly without making a claim of how they are responding to environmental and social quality goals. It doesn't mean that what they say is actually very brilliant. It means that they have to frame their actions in those terms. As a result it creates a dilemma for the companies. Because they say we have to show that we are performing and then we have to be credible because we will be accused of just producing window dressing. In this type of field of legitimacy, businesses move faster than governments. If the framing conditions are clear, businesses do actually innovate. There are good ones and bad ones, real serious innovations and frauds.

These are areas, where once the framework is set, companies start to develop strategies. They start to realise that they can't only declare things they have to do things, because there is a verification process in place to some extent.

2. The other field where real practice can take place is local and territorial investment strategies where local authorities are starting to take seriously that they should assess investment against multiple criteria quite explicitly including environment and social dimensions. This means they now go further than just doing social or environmental impact assessment. They treat the evaluation process as negotiation of quality of territorial or local investments. If this is done in certain ways, this is an empowering of local people and integration of economic and business interests to make sure that the proposals are reasonable and they do respond to some extent of different quality criteria.

Examples from France:

Investments in urban transport systems at local scale and management of quarrying activities. Quarrying is seen as a dirty activity, destroying nature, but functioning in a proactive way, making design and strategy to prove that they are actually improving the environment at the same time as they are taking pieces of rocks and sand, gravel out of ground, is sometimes a convincing process. These processes cost money and they produce results. They also change the framework of meaning of local economic activity.

If people are talking about economic thinking, they are often meaning somebody is making a profit, as it is the only thing economics is addressing. Making profits is a form of viability, prestige, power. Economics is not the only discipline that deals with power, prestige, viability. When we negotiate about which goals and which collective purposes we should have and if those goals include social justice, maintaining ecosystem services on a large scale of awareness, then economics is about looking at the processes and justifications for choices relative to those goals. That's what the discipline by definition is concerned with, that's economic thinking. And anybody who says that economic thinking is about protecting short-term economic interest is misusing the term at the most basic level.

Kaja Peterson:

Halb näide:

Miskipärast levinud arusaam, et keskkonnakaitse on riigi ülesanne, mitte niivõrd kohaliku omavalitsuse ülesanne. Meie uuringud selle kohta, kuidas on säästev areng lõimitud omavalitsuste arengukavadesse ja rakenduskavadesse, on ka seda näidanud, et arengukavades räägitakse küll keskkonnakaitsest teatud peatükis, kuid see sulandub dokumendi lõpus tegevuskavas ja eelarves. Siin on üle-eestiliselt mõtlemiskoht, kuidas omavalitsusi järgi aidata ja et keskkonnakaitse ei ole ainult riigi ülesanne.

Hea näide:

Eesti meedias toimunu paari viimase aasta jooksul, et keskkonnateema on muutunud oluliseks. Ei lähe vist ühtegi päeva, kui mõni keskkonnaga seotud sündmus, artikkel ei pälviks meedia tähelepanu. Iseasi on info ja teema käsitlemise piisavus, sügavus, asjatundlikkus. Teemale aga pööratakse palju tähelepanu.

Võimalus: Eestil tuleks kasutada võimalust, et riigihangetes, nii teenustes kui investeeringutes arvestataks keskkonnakriteeriume – ehk rohelised riigihanked. Oleks oluline panus, kus keskkonnaaspekte saaks arvestada eri sektorites.

Tõnis Meriste:

Hea märk, kuidas keskkonnakaitse on tunginud teistesse valdkondadesse on see, et ettevõtjad tunnevad rohkem huvi keskkonnakaitse vastu. Kui kunagi objektide ostu-müügi puhul võeti arvesse ainult maksumust, siis nüüd uuritakse ka, kuidas on keskkonnanõuetega. Ei ole haruldane, kui uus omanik viib enne ostu läbi keskkonna *due diligence* auditi. Muidugi ettevõtja teeb seda peamiselt selleks, et teada riske, kuid keskkond on läinud ka olulisemaks.

Teiseks, ettevõtjad on hakanud teadlikumalt oma keskkonnaasju tegema – keskkonnajuhtimissüsteeme rakendatakse üha rohkem. Hakkas peale teatud sektorites sellest, et keskkonnajuhtimissüsteem andis ettevõtetele turueelise, kuna hangetes kehtestati teatud valdkondades üheks tingimuseks keskkonnajuhtimissüsteemi olemasolu. Seega keskkonnajuhtimissüsteemide populaarsemaks muutmine ja rohkem rakendamine on hea näide.

Keskkonnakaitse jõuab tarbijani ka läbi nn roheliste toodete. Minnes poodi, viime läbi oma igapäevaseid rohelisi hankeid. Kui on selliste toodete tarbijaid, siis on mõtet ka neid toota ja oma tootmist sellega muuta rohelisemaks.

Keskkonnakaitse jõuab majandusse ka läbi maksureformide, eriti ökomaksureformi. Idee on väga tore – panna ettevõtjat mõtlema loodusvarade tarbimise peale ja maksustada loodusvarade tarbimist. Tahaks loota, et ökomaksureform ei jää ainult üheks maksuseaduseks, vaid et tuleks ka muid huvitavamaid asju välja. Lisaks piitsale, võiks ka mõni präänik ettevõtjale tulla.

Tiit Kallaste:

Paar head näidet, kuidas keskkonnakaitse, sh kliimapoliitika on lõimitud teistesse valdkondadesse. Ja ka üks probleem teile välja pakkuda, nimelt väliskulude arvestamine energiatootmisel.

Riik peaks tegema võrdlusi võrdsetel alustel, võrdlema võrreldavaid näitajaid. Rääkides energiast, siis kuidas me seda teeme? Kutsun üles aru saama, et lihtsalt jutud põlevkivielektrist kui kõige odavamast elektritootmise liigist pole põhjendatud, sest me võrdleme siin võrreldamatuid suurusid. Ei arvestata kliimat enim mõjutava komponendiga – süsinikuhulgaga, mis toote või teenuse ühiku kohta lastakse keskkonda, samuti et põlevkivienergeetika on Eesti suurim veetarbija.

Oleme sellest rääkinud 10 aastat, aga peaksime midagi ära tegema. Kui soovime ühikulist süsinikutarvet vähendada, peame kaks valdkonda ühendama, st väiksema süsinikuhulgaga tootma sama palju energiat kui siiani. Kui paneme põlevkivienergeetika täiskulude (investeeringis-, opereerimis-, kütusekulud, CO₂ kõrvaldamise kulud) juurde väliskulud, võib pilt olla märkimisväärselt teistsugune. Nägin hiljuti diagrammi, mille järgi kõige kallim on ehitada avamere tuulepark, siis maismaa tuulepark, siis gaasi kombijaam, seejärel süsi ja põlevkivi põletamise tehnoloogiad, biomass, lõpuks tuumaenergia. Kuid pannes juurde väliskulud, võib pilt olla hoopis teistsugune.

Iga taastuvenienergeetika projektiga, mis ellu viime, nt tuuleenergeetika, on investeeringud esialgu kallid, kuid edaspidi ressurssi ei kulu. Jäävad ära põletamisel kaasnev keskkonnakahju, tervisekahju, loodusmaastiku ja veerežiimi rikkumine, seega oleme saavutanud efekti teises valdkonnas.

Halb uudis on aga see, et PointCarbon.com (heitmekaubanduse infokiri internetis), andmetel on Eesti katkestanud ühisrakendusprojektidele tõenduskirjade väljaandmise. Põhjuseks on teadmatus heitmekaubanduses.

Valdur Lahtvee:

Kuna aega on vähe, siis kolmandat küsimust me praegu ei käsitle, vaid läheme neljanda küsimuse juurde. Enne palun küsimused saalist.

Annika Uudelepp, keskkonnaministerium:

Keskkonnakaitse lõimimine on meie igapäevane töö. Toon mõned näited. Keskkonnanstrateegia koostamine aastani 2030, mille kiitis riigikogu heaks selle aasta algul. Selle rakenduskava on keskkonnategevuskava 2007-2013. Juhtkomitees olid kõigi partnerministeeriumide juhid ja meie sotsiaalpartnerid: ettevõtted, keskkonnaorganisatsioonid, omavalitsused. See oli protsess, mis andis kindlust, et on võimalik rääkida ühistest eesmärkidest ja seada tegevusi nii, et täitjate lahtreis ei figureeri ainult sõna

keskkonnaministeerium. Täitjate nimekirjast ei puudu vist ükski ministeerium. See toimus ümarlauana, paljude avalike foorumitena. Töögruppides oli enam kui 100 eksperti.

Teine näide: keskkonnatasude süsteem Eestis, mis on võimaluse loonud keskkonnaministeeriumil ja keskkonnaorganisatsioonidel pidada hoopis teistsugust dialoogi ettevõtetega. Keskkonnatasud on teistsugune majandushoob kui piits, see on motiveeriv süsteem. 2005. a. muudetud keskkonnatasude seadus tõstis oluliselt keskkonnatasusid. See on andnud efekti, nt saasteainete vettelaskmises ja mujal. See on juba efekt, et ettevõtja mõtleb selle peale.

Ütlen ka kolmanda küsimuse kohta, mida vajab otsusetegija, et arvestada säästva arengu põhimõtteid otsustamisel, kuna see küsimus jääb vahele. Keskkonnaministeerium on otsusetegija. Meil on vaja informatsiooni, mis on adekvaatne. Teame, et saame seda partneritega koostöös. SEIT, ülikoolid ja paljud teised organisatsioonid/isikud on meie partnerid.

Veel üks positiivne näide, kui eeltöö on hästi tehtud: EL on kinnitanud valdkondlikud rakenduskavad, mis toovad Eestile 53,3 miljonit krooni. Keskkonnakomponent on Eestis võrreldes teiste riikidega kõige suurem. Maailma Looduse Fondi raport seadis Eesti parimale kohale. Tegime selleks poolteist aastat varem tööd kui võib-olla mõned teised ja põhjalikud majandusanalüüsid, milliseid kulutusi on keskkonnasektoris vaja teha. Selle põhjal sündis elukeskkonna rakenduskava, kus keskkonna eesmärgid on tähtsal kohal.

Lõpetuseks tahaksin öelda pealkirja kohta – keskkonnakaitse lõimimine teiste valdkondade poliitikatesse. Kas me ei vaata keskkonnakaitse lõimist kui silotorne – igauks elab oma maailmas ja kokku need ei peagi jooksmata ehk keskkonnakaitse on nagu nõobi külge pintsaku õmblemine? Teen ettepaneku mitte lahterdada keskkonnakaitset valdkonniti, vaid öelda, et me tahame paremat elukeskkonda ja kvaliteetsemat ühiskonda, kus elada. Siis ei pea eraldi rääkima nõobist ja pintsakust.

Kristina Mänd, EMSL/AEF:

The discourse around economic growth is quite alarming. Because the group of people who in general tend not to talk about economic growth have started to do so to follow the examples of businesses, are NGOs that is extremely alarming.

Corporate Social Responsibility – the definition of CSR should be changed into Organisations` Social Responsibility, because NGOs and governments tend to think that this does not concern them.

I very much like the approach of Triple Bottom Line rather where the reporting of what you are doing and using goes against your impact on society and environment as well as your financial resources.

My last comment is about what international NGOs have done regarding environmental sustainability. The huge international organisations that have turnover of billions of dollars, especially advocacy organisations, like Transparency, Amnesty International, WWF etc. have joined into an Accountability Charter. One part of it deals with environmental responsibility and governance, and one promise is simple: fly less. So a lot of things are happening in the

NGO world. Let's not forget that they give out grants in billions of dollars every year and thus have an enormous impact on economy.

Jüri-Ott Salm, Eestimaa Looduse Fond:

Palju on juttu olnud taastuvenergeetikast. Taastuvenergeetika võib areneda, aga me ei tea, mida see toob kaasa looduskaitsele. Oleme olukorras, kus arendaja saab algatada keskkonnamõju hindamise teatud objekti ehituseks, aga kui see ala on looduskaitsele väärtuslikus piirkonnas, siis ta ei hinda alternatiive. Riik võiks teha ära taastuvenergeetika üleriigilise teemaplaneeringu ja keskkonnamõju hindamise, siis saab arendaja teada, kuhu ta võib arendada.

4. Eesti ja globaalsed probleemid – kuidas peaks Eesti nende lahendamisele kaasa aitama?

Tiit Kallaste:

Eesti on küll väike, kuid Eestiski koguneb paljudest väikestest ettevõtmistest kopsakas panus globaalprobleemide lahendamisse. Meil on hea võimalus kliimamuutuste leevendamisele kaasa aidata taastuvenergia laiema kasutuselevõtmisega. Suurim potentsiaal on Eestis biomassi ja tuuleenergia alal. Hüdroenergia potentsiaal on meil piiratud, kuid edaspidi oleks vaja võtta kasutusele päikeseenergia soojuse tootmiseks. Aprillist oktoobrini saaks toota sooja vett ja samuti soojendada ruume. Elektritootmiseks päikest meie laiuskraadil ei jätku. Hädasti oleks vaja näha riigi suunavat mõju just tuuleenergia laiemale kasutuselevõtuks. Loodame, et tuleviku arengukavadesse kirjutatakse sisse vastavad dotatsioonid ja suunavad mehhanismid. Vaja on ühtset, kompleksset kliima- ja energistrateegiat.

Tõnis Meriste:

Kui võrrelda Eesti ja globaalseid probleeme, siis kindlasti on paljud neist olemas ka siin. Parim näide on eeskujul. Ootaks riigi üha paremat koostööd ja et üha rohkem haarataks ettevõtteid, mitte üksikult, vaid assotsiatsioone. Nii jõuame ka omavahel paremale selgusele. Läbi üha parema ja intensiivsema koostöö näidata eeskujul ja see on nakkav.

Kaja Peterson:

Kui globaalselt on olulised teemad energia, tarbimine, loodusvarade, sh eriti vee tarbimise küsimus, siis Eesti peaks oma asjad kodus korras hoidma, et mitte tekitada probleeme juurde. Nagu nägime ka Tiit Kallaste slaididelt, on energeetikas oluline energiaallikate mitmekesistamine Eestis, et mitte aidata globaalsele energiakriisile kaasa.

Eesti võiks ka osaleda erinevates arenguabi programmides kolmandates riikides keskkonna valdkonnas. Rahvusvaheline koostöö Euroopa riikidega kolmandates maades aitaks ka meil paremini mõista omi probleeme ja nende lahendusi. Mitte ainult sõjalise ja toiduabi andmine, vaid ka keskkonna valdkonnas võiks koostöö edasi areneda.

Martin O`Connor:

I come from a small country, New Zealand that has nearly 4 million people. New Zealand tends to be quite proud of its rugby, yachting, etc. So being powerful and visible is not only a question of size.

There are also questions about substantial performance in energy efficiency, pollution, water quality and there are also about important questions about procedures and institutions. Quite often small countries can innovate much faster in procedures and institutions than big countries can do. I would like to suggest that Estonia should look carefully at some of the opportunities that you have for putting into place clear, meaningful and strong procedures of reinforcing and innovating things that are already happening. E.g. the oil shale situation seems to be a source of some stress, because it is environmentally dirty and high-pressure energy source. Why should that be embarrassing? There are questions about how much they contribute to some types of emissions. There are also questions of how well the challenges of transition are faced by the country?

I have not seen in France, where I work, an honest and transparent attempt to discuss the strong and weak performance characteristics associated with nuclear energy. It has never been done in France because the political culture and social conditions have not yet required that to happen. It means that France is not very well placed to work internationally to discuss what are the strong and weak points of different nuclear options. France has got the bad case of failure at present in Central Africa, where there is a uranium mining process, which is socially, economically and diplomatically a big miss. One of the reasons is that the French have never thought through the processes of using evaluation with multiple criteria to negotiate what counts as quality for different people.

Small countries tend to be more aware that you have to negotiate with your neighbours, taking into account their concepts of what is great, what is powerful, what is important, what is of value. This is something where you can turn the problem of oil shale into a strategic opportunity to demonstrate quality of process. Why not to do it that way, instead of being embarrassed of some indicators?

Johan Rockström:

There is enormous risk that small countries like Estonia, Sweden, Norway, Finland place themselves at back seats, because we are so small in the grand scheme of things. Nothing would be more wrong. There is a tremendous urge for good examples and leadership on the planet. Estonia is uniquely placed in that sense. I find this day something we could barely have in Sweden. Here we sit with the former prime minister and SEI-Tallinn board member for many years Andres Tarand, with secretary general of the Ministry of Environment, with Marko Pomerants and other members of the Parliament, with representatives of State Statistics, National Audit Office, with the chairman of the Green Party and other decision-makers in direct dialogue with us. You have enormous privilege to move fast towards exiting developments.

Where does Estonia want to be in 30-50 years in terms of energy? To provoke a bit, there might be two choices. Either you continue, saying that oil shale is a cheap, efficient source of energy, it maximises our economic benefits and welfare on the short term, we will go down that route and in 30-50 years we try to phase it out. With this you play insignificant part in big scheme of things on the planet.

Or you decide: we are going to transform our way out of oil shale and show true leadership in the world that we can make a transformation, even sitting in this difficult situation.

Or we might want to play other couple of other scenarios of how that will impact on the way Estonia is perceived worldwide, in the way it might affect welfare and development for the citizens of Estonia and the way it might look in the future in terms of sustainability indicators. That would be very interesting exercise. Some of these choices are there now, to look far in the future where you want to be. Because no doubt, in 40 years time there will be no more oil shale, no more oil in the world, there will be other oil shakes in the world and they might be of different character totally from what we think today. Many speak today of Brazil being the Saudi Arabia of tomorrow if you could really go into the second generation of biofuels.

These are exiting questions and that is something where Estonia is better placed than many other countries because you have gone through transformation recently and you have close dialogue between science and policy, which is a tremendous achievement.

Joachim Spangenberg:

In my presentation I forgot to mention that there are two different kinds of scenarios: forecasting – if you have a trend and you assume how it continues; and backcasting – if you have a vision and you ask yourself which kind of measures you need to accomplish this vision. You start from the positive vision for your country and you develop steps how to get there.

What could be the positive vision? For every agent to become really active and for changing behaviour three components are needed:

- *Knowledge*
- *Motivation*
- *Opportunity*

What would that mean for Estonia and SEI-Tallinn?

1. Knowledge. Make sure that not only in education but also amongst decision-making knowledge is there about sustainability. I think the knowledge production is under way, but make sure that the knowledge production happens in international and European context, so we can share the knowledge together and proceed further in informing society and decision-makers.

2. Motivation. Motivation is much more than individual thing; it is something about value – whether the value system of society pushes you to take action. Values in society can be changed by official communication, especially by role models. Make sure that every ministry has only a certain amount of litres of gasoline for cars. Those who have the most efficient cars can afford most cars. Those who drive the biggest cars, have only one per ministry. Have new ideas how you make competition, not for more and bigger, but for more efficient and cleaner.

Change development trajectory. Make sure that the Prime minister is permanently biking into office, even in bad weather.

3. Opportunity. Be a role model in the European Union demonstrating that the sustainability transition is possible. The knowledge is easily available in the country, which is of the size of Estonia. You can spread the news. Make sure that institutional structures inside the country encourage sustainable behaviour of business, administration and individuals. Take the opportunity of being the full member of the EU to stimulate the EU to become more sustainable because then it makes a big difference in the world.

Valdur Lahtvee:

Aeg on kahjuks otsas, aga siin kuulud häid mõtteid, kogemust on võimalik viia oma sõprade, töökaaslaste, rahva juurde ja nii kasvatada seda kriitilist massi, et säästev areng on ainuvõimalik tee, et põhimõtted on olemas, neid tuleb hakata ellu viima. Palju jõudu teile selleks! Päeva kokkuvõtteks on sõna SEI Tallinna keskuse juhatajal Tea Nõmmannil.

Tea Nõmmann:

Tahaks täna kuuldust veelkord rõhutada huvitavamaid aspekte. SEI sai alguse keskkonna ja arengu küsimustele keskendumisest. Kuulates täna seda arutelu, näeme, et oleme läinud keskkonnapoliitikast palju kaugemale, mõjutame ka energia-, fiskaal-, põllumajandus-, hariduspoliitikat.

Teine oluline teema, mis on riigi roll? Riik on sageli kõige aeglasem uuendaja – innovatsioonipoliitika on oluline. Mida me mõõdame, mis moodi saame ühest kapitalist tulu genereerida, et seda investeerida haridusse, tagasi looduskapitali tõhususse? Kõik see on innovatsioon. Kuidas riik tuleb järgi? Siin oli küsimus, et ettevõtjates nähakse ainult kasumi teenijad. Majandus ei ole iseenesest halb, ta tegutseb raamides, mis ühiskond talle ette annab. Kuidas me ühiskonnana need raamid loome? Väikse riigina on meil suured võimalused osaleda innovatsioonis ja olla eeskujuks teadmiste rakendamisel: keskkonnaarvestuses, ökosüsteemide hindamisel ning teha seda innovaatsiliselt. Miks me ei kasuta e-riigi võimalusi, et riik saaks olulisi otsuseid teha? Mõtleme hetkel ainult riigi suhtlemisele kodanikega, kuid me ei mõtle sellele, kuidas suurte andmebaaside põhjal saaks riik teha stsenaariume ja tulla välja innovaatsiliste valikutega. Võimalusi on meil palju.

Täna kõik esinejad, osalejaid, kolleege, partnereid, keskkonnainvesteeringute keskust. Peatse kohtumiseni!