

Potential of ecological diplomacy within the context of reaching sustainable development

Annotation. The essence of ecology diplomacy, its specific characteristics, preconditions, features, potential and directions of ecologization of international relations and trade were theoretically studied. In this study the attention is drawn to significance of ecological diplomacy within the context of reaching sustainable development. The influence of international ecological diplomacy on the policy of development and partnership among countries was grounded. It was theoretically proved that overwhelming majority of types of economic activities directly or indirectly affects the environment state, and ecological diplomacy and numerous multi-sided international environmental protection agreements influence the process of trade relations realization to some extent (they may contain regulations on restrictions or prohibition of particular types of goods and services trade, etc.); there is a need for implementation of their interaction regulation mechanisms. Significant role in regulating the mentioned processes belongs to international organizations.

Key words: ecological policy, globalization, WTO, sustainable development, potential, Kyoto Protocol, Paris Agreement.

Аннотация. Теоретически исследована суть экологической дипломатии, определены ее специфические характеристики, предпосылки, признаки, потенциал и направления экологизации международных отношений и торговли. В исследовании акцентировано внимание на значение экологической дипломатии в контексте достижения устойчивого развития. Обосновано влияние международной экологической дипломатии на политику развития и партнерства между странами. Теоретически доказано, что подавляющее

¹ Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Professor, Department of International Trade and Marketing, Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman

² Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Associate Professor, Department of Economics and Entrepreneurship, Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman

большинство видов экономической деятельности осуществляет прямое или косвенное влияние на состояние окружающей среды, а экологическая дипломатия и численные многосторонние международные природоохранные соглашения в некоторой степени осуществляют влияние на процесс реализации торговых отношений (могут содержать положения относительно ограничений или запрета торговли определенными видами товаров или услуг и т.д.), существует необходимость во внедрении механизмов регулирования их взаимодействия. Важная роль в регулировании описанных процессов принадлежит международным организациям.

Ключевые слова: экологическая дипломатия, глобализация, ВТО, устойчивое развитие, потенциал, Киотский протокол, Парижское соглашение.

Анотація. Теоретично досліджено суть екологічної дипломатії, відзначено її специфічні характеристики, передумови, ознаки, потенціал та напрями екологізації міжнародних відносин і торгівлі. В дослідженні акцентовано увагу на значенні екологічної дипломатії в контексті досягнення сталого розвитку. Обґрунтовано вплив міжнародної екологічної дипломатії на політику розвитку і партнерства між країнами. Теоретично доведено, що переважна більшість видів економічної діяльності здійснює прямий чи опосередкований вплив на стан навколишнього середовища, а екологічна дипломатія та чисельні багатосторонні природоохоронні міжнародні угоди у певній мірі здійснюють вплив на процес реалізації торговельних відносин (можуть містити положення щодо обмежень або заборони торгівлі певними видами товарів та послуг тощо), існує необхідність у впровадженні механізмів регулювання їх взаємодії. Важлива роль урегулювання окреслених процесів належить міжнародним організаціям.

Ключові слова: екологічна дипломатія, глобалізація, СОТ, сталий розвиток, потенціал, Кіотський протокол, Паризька угода.

Stating the problem. Geo-economic transformation of the world order is determined by the dynamics of the global competitive environment; it defines the need for maintenance of positions on markets and in spheres which are of interest for

a country. World economy globalization caused concentration of attention to issues of foreign economic activities by legislative and executive powers of the majority of countries. The leading position within this context belongs to state policy. An important tool for foreign economy policy realization is ecological diplomacy. The results of the latter considerably influence ecologization of foreign trade, increasing and promoting export of organic agro-industrial goods as a result of appearing of new generation of consumers who popularize healthy lifestyle, attracting foreign investments into eco-oriented projects, participation in the work of international ecology institutions, and protection and lobbying national ecological interests of the country on the international level.

Under conditions of complementarity of national economic systems and simultaneous strengthening of such processes as globalization and regionalization, development of multi-sided trade-economic interrelations, appearance of supranational economic institutions, multi-sided and double-sided ecological diplomacy that plays an increasing role in international relations is growing its significance. Ecological diplomacy is, first and foremost, linked to the work of international, interstate and intergovernmental organizations, to holding international conferences on ecology issues and relations, to participation in international negotiations, and to development of double- and multi-sided international agreements.

Growing of economic complementarity of countries in the 21st century and mutual aspiration of leading countries for overcoming ecology problems put multi-sided ecological diplomacy in the forefront among the methods of foreign economy policy realization of any country. Currently, the role of ecological diplomacy in double-sided and multi-sided negotiations, diplomacy methods, its actions, functions and principles are being transformed. The effectiveness of economic diplomacy within the structure of state administration of a country determines stability and duration of foreign economy connections; efficiency of trade ecologization, financial and informational technologies and tools; economy innovations; adaptability of a country and its economic agents to global economy conditions; and realization of national ecological-economic interests. The above mentioned determines the need of

complex study of ecological diplomacy, its aims and tools, methods and actions since it influences country development on a particular historical stage and determines the future transformation vector.

Analysis of the recent studies and publications. The problem of perspectives of ecological diplomacy development and international trade activity when considering ecological factor is unveiled in scientific works of such foreign scientists as Daly H. and Farley J. [23], Markusen J. [25], Copeland B.R. and Taylor M. S. [17], Rauscher M. [27], etc. The works of Anderson K. [13], Grossman G.M. and Krueger A.B. [22], Panayotov T. [26] and others are dedicated to studying various aspects of economic and ecological policies realization, their interconnection and interplay, and consequences of implementing ecological regulations. The issue of ecologizations of trade relations is reflected in the studies of domestic scientists, particularly Andreieva N. [1], A. Bokhan [3, 15], Hrabynskiy I. [4], Tunytsia Y. [9], etc. The significance of ecological vector of international trade activation is described in the works of Potapenko V. [7], Ukrainets L. [10], Fedun O. [11], in particular they studied ecologization of international economic activity; Bliznetska K. [2], Kopylov M. [5], Mokhammad S., Rohozhyna N. [8] – international regulations of ecological management and safety; Bottger K. [16] and Winter H. [31] – international trade law and environment protection. In spite of absolute significance of the conducted studies particular issues of ecological diplomacy development perspectives haven't been fully unveiled and need further research. Modern transformation processes within international trade-economic relations are occurring considering postulates of sustainable development ideology. Realization of the mentioned concept in trade activity may be reached using rationalization of resource division and usage, implementing innovative achievements of science and technology, work of international institutions, organizing and holding international ecological conferences, efficiency of international negotiations, and effectiveness of double- and multi-sided international agreements.

The aim of the study is theoretical argumentation and defining potential of ecological diplomacy within the context of reaching sustainable development. *The object* of the scientific work is the process of formation and development of

ecological diplomacy considering ecological factor. *The subject* of the study is preconditions, features, display and directions of international relations and trade ecologization.

Account of main material. Global humanity development is characterized with growth of ecological and economic interdependence of national economic systems, liberalization of international trade and multi-vector diplomacy on the one hand, and intensification of nature resources exploitation on the other hand. Accumulation of social prosperity considering mutual conditionality of ecological and economic components must occur with these two aspects. Herewith, nature protection activity must be built harmoniously along with using mechanisms and tools of ecological diplomacy and considering national trade-economic interests. But currently within the mentioned relations contradicting processes are occurring. On the one hand, reaching economic aims of the country is accompanied with growing pressure on the environment, and on the other hand, economic growth boosts implementation of innovative technologies which enable to decrease the intensity of using nature resources. In this case, ecological diplomacy possesses considerable explicit and latent potential and is able to bring significant results within multi- and double-sided trade relation of countries.

Ecological diplomacy is a relatively new and specific branch of international activity, it may narrowly be defined as a system of methods, ways, and practical actions used for solving ecologically directed problems of foreign economic policy. *Ecological diplomacy* widely means multi- and double-sided diplomacy concentrating on particular ecological problems. It's developing on several interconnected levels: *global* (the UN, WTO Trade and Environment Committee, Environmental Protection World Wide Fund, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, International Atomic Energy Agency, Food and Agriculture Organization, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, etc.); *regional* – within regional organizations and specialized functional programmes as well as within the system of multi-sided interstate relations; *national (double-sided)* – when states (mostly geographic neighbors that have decided to unite their efforts for studying and solving particular

problems) are interacting; *corporative* – mostly transnational corporations manifested in often blamed measures of restricting business ecological practice. Irrelevant of the scale of interaction, all the cooperation forms aim at solving international ecological problems. The basis of modern ecological diplomacy is not defined by narrowly interpreted national interests that feature foreign policy of ideology and military confrontation, but common mankind interest aimed at saving nature.

Thus, it may be summarized that, on the one hand, ecology issues become tools of assertion of national interests [6, 18], but on the other hand, it's necessary to note that according to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set by the UN in 2015 for the year 2030, 17 global goals, which contain 169 particular goal indices and where it's stated that international trade is “a locomotive of universal economic growth and reduction of poverty and boosts implementation of sustainable development concept into action”, were defined. Integration of countries that are developing into regional and global markets is one of the leading SDG goals within which trade activity must provide assistance to sustainable development at the expense of realization of such aims as increasing the volume of help for supporting trade of developing countries; realization of the principle of special and differentiated trade regime for developing countries; boosting export growth of developing countries, etc. Moreover, in order to strengthen global trade-economic cooperation in the interest of sustainable development, the priority of providing spreading implementation of stable production and consuming models is defined. Particularly, the need of realization of 10-year framework programmes in sustainable consuming and production area is emphasized [28].

It's also important to emphasize that priority of the problem of trade activity ecologization has been defined by the countries-members of WTO which is manifested in stimulating sustainable development and green economy at the expense of ratification of a number of regulations concerning forming the mechanism of protection and control in the environmental protection area. The mentioned norms are aimed at providing balance, on the one hand, concerning promoting ecological aims, and on the other hand, avoiding trade activity protectionism actions, and as a result, negative influence on the rights of other countries-members of WTO. As an

exception, in order to gain ecological benefits, violation of such international trade rules as non-discrimination of responsibilities and quantitative limitations prohibition are acceptable (Eliminating trade barriers..., 2016). At the same time, the importance of boosting potential strengthening in trade and environmental protection spheres of developing countries is distinguished. The following factors actualize the need for developing and implementation of international regulatory trade policy considering ecology standards within the GATT/WTO system [32]: firstly, the absence of corresponding ecological standards contributes to investment resources movement from developed countries, where there are higher ecological standards, to developing countries, which leads to uncontrolled reduction of investment and losing jobs in industrially developed countries; secondly, the absence of ecological standards in some regions/countries creates preconditions for unfair competition and market deformation since there's an opportunity to lower goods prices as compared to analogs which are produced in countries with properly functioning ecological regulations and standardization system; thirdly, the absence of ecological standards coordination may cause aggravation of competition with possible further loss of competitive positions within the global market by a number of countries, consequently they will have to lower their ecological standards and keeping high standards will be seen as unsatisfactory, etc. [20].

Liberalization of international trade is accompanied by positive and negative consequences of endogenous and exogenous origin within coordination of trade and economic regimes which may be leveled by diplomacy tools. The main problem of ecological and trade regimes harmonization is a fear of ecological protectionism and creating non-tariff barriers. The given approaches and the concept of inclusive sustainable growth testify the appearance of new complicated and contradicting goals of the 21st century for economic diplomacy which must take into consideration multi-aspectness and complementing of all trade-economic factors of countries' relations: institutional, economic, social, and ecological ones. Under these conditions the significance of multi-sided ecological diplomacy is actualized. A good example of identification of world industry ecology degree and usage of ecological diplomacy is The Global Green Economy Index. Over the last seven years it has contained the data

analysis concerning ecology development of national economies, presence or absence of progress in its achievement. Thus, GGEI 2018 expert opinion covers a considerable number of world regions (North America, Europe, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean countries, Africa, Near East and Northern Africa, Oceania), 130 countries, the EU, OECD, G20 [19, 21]. In order to provide complex estimation of eco-effectiveness and usage of countries' resources, GGEI analysis uses four measurement indices: firstly, management and climate change (a country leader, coverage in media, international forums, climate change results); secondly, branches efficiency (construction, transportation, power engineering, tourism, resource efficiency); thirdly, markets and investments (renewable energy resources, eco-technological innovations, ecological investment boosting, corporative stability); fourthly, environment (agriculture, air quality, water, biological and natural environment, fishing, forests).

Thereby, international ecological diplomacy must gain a consolidating format in the development of effective partnership as a precondition of commitment for progress since international decisions and resolutions in ecological law area are not persuasive enough for some world countries [3]. There are discrepancies between rationalization principles proclamation and industry practice which firstly cause appearing of ecological problems and cataclysms, and then late realization of their ruining consequences. There are famous platforms for ecological risks transformation into constructive cooperation of countries, they are Global Green Growth Institute, Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGGI, OECD, UNEP, World Bank); Global Green Growth Forum (initiated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark which united Ethiopia, Mexico, Qatar, China, Kenya, Korea); Environment and Security Initiative (OSCE, UNDP, UNEP, UNECE, REC); Institute for Environmental Diplomacy&Security, etc.

Green growth governance as an empirical phenomenon lives up to the above definitions, because when there is contact between policies, there is diplomacy at work. In Table 1 below, most of these new specific green growth networks established in the period 2005–2013 are listed. All networks have international participants. These networks are the new spaces and places where global

environmental governance – governing and governmentality – is forged through diplomacy.

Table 1: Examples of International Green Growth Networks

Network name	Established by (year)
Seoul Initiative Network on Green Growth (SINGG)	Korea (2005)
ASEM Green Growth Network	Korea (2008)
Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	Korea (2010)
Global Green Growth Forum (3GF)	Denmark, Korea and Mexico (2010)
Nordic Council of Minister's green growth working group	Denmark (2010)
Green Growth Cities	OECD (2010)
Astana Green Bridge Initiative (AGBI)	Kazakhstan and UNESCAP (2010)
Green Growth Initiative	African Development Bank and OECD (2011)
STRING green growth network	STRING members (2011)
Myanmar Green Economy Green Growth (GEGG)	GEGG (private and academic partners) (2011)
Mekong region's green growth network	Vietnam, ADB, UK, UNEP, WWF, Denmark (2011)
Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP)	Korea, OECD, UNEP and World Bank (2012)
C40 green growth network	New York and Copenhagen (2012)
G2A2 – Green Growth Action Alliance	B20 Task Force on Green Growth (2012)
Green Growth Best Practice (GGBP)	GGGI, Climate Development and Knowledge Network (CDKN), the European Climate Foundation, and the International Climate Initiative (German Government). GGGI serves as the executive agency (2012).
Green Growth Group	United Kingdom (2013)

Source: Adapted from [14].

Mutual decisions of countries in international trade ecologization sphere are formed, first and foremost, considering national expenses for environmental protection. The proof is practical experience of ecological diplomacy policy in fighting for climate conservation where sides seek to reach a consensus concerning responsibilities division among the world countries [15, 30]. For instance, Kyoto Protocol, which for a while had been the only international agreement that obliged world developed countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, currently states the task of parallel coordination of a plan on reducing greenhouse gas emissions for all key economies of the world based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibility. The system of countries-members covers only 13% of greenhouse gas emissions; major polluters China and the USA (they possess nearly 41% of world

CO₂ emissions) are “ecologically polyphonic”; and Canada officially left it in 2012. Ecological policy of numerous countries will change drastically since the fight against climate change to 2050 will expect expenses of nearly 5.5% of the world GDP. Despite the knowledge of governments and society about the gravity of climate change problems, the world volume of CO₂ emissions still increased by 45% during 1990-2010 [3, 24, 30]. However, despite the fact that Kyoto Protocol has legal validity of an international agreement, there haven't been found any mechanisms that would secure its fulfillment.

United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21) and Kyoto Protocol Sides Conference (CRP-11) in 2015 in Paris may be considered as historically significant events [29]. Paris Agreement must substitute Kyoto Protocol in 2020. Within Paris Agreement each country will independently define volumes of emissions for it and will execute the commitments according to its strength. Due to such a step over 160 countries joined the new agreement, most of them used to be afraid to submit their plans on emissions reductions because of sanctions. Paris Climate Alliance was created in order to keep average temperature of global warming under +2°C. Paris Agreement will foresee new commitments for countries whose economic status has changed since signing Kyoto Protocol. Because the world economic system has drastically changed and such relatively wealthy countries as South Korea and Saudi Arabia cannot position themselves as “developing countries” and avoid climate commitments. But China which is judged as the biggest ozone layer destructor by experts, is trying to keep aside from climate initiatives. A considerable difference between these agreements is that Kyoto Protocol allows countries to internationally trade greenhouse gas emissions quotas which has discredited itself over the time of the agreement functioning. To the contrary, Paris Agreement suggests a number of criteria using which it's possible to reevaluate real possibilities of any country concerning its contribution to emissions reduction.

But yet there's an unsolved issue of motivating countries and attracting market agents to constructive cooperation within the context of reaching compromises in international trade using the mechanisms of ecological diplomacy. Because according to experts [12] such a system is more flexible and will allow to promptly and

adequately react to various changes. Particular countries opposed such a principle not wishing to become financial donors of emissions reduction in the future. Among them there's India which currently has GDP per capita twice lower than Ukraine, but is very rapidly developing and has a possibility to become one of the biggest greenhouse gas producers in the future. Ukraine has committed not to exceed the level of greenhouse gas emissions over 60% of 1990 for the following 15 years. Such a decision is ambiguous according to experts, since now Ukraine is emitting about 40% of gases of 1990.

Therefore, the development of current international trade relations is characterized by strengthening of global demand growth processes which causes overuse of non-renewable sources and ruining the ecosystem. The above mentioned circumstances actualize the need for directing the vector of further formation of ecological diplomacy of international trade activity within the concept of sustainable development. Reaching balanced formation of international trade considering an ecology factor demands adjusting national environmental protection norms and standards to international ones; development and implementation of interstate ecological programmes and projects; usage of general principles of ecological direction activity stimulation, as well as ratification of international sanctions for violating environmental protection law. According to modern demands, formation of competitive domestic economic system and keeping competitive positions within the global market must occur taking into consideration the existing demands of the international economic environment. Considering existing international obligations and principles on international trade ecologization issue, domestic economic policy needs to develop and implement new effective levers of its regulation on general state, regional and local levels.

Conclusions. Thus, ecological diplomacy within the context of reaching sustainable development possesses considerable explicit and latent potential. First and foremost, it's connected to the work of international organizations; holding global and regional conferences on ecological problems; setting international economic relations concerning regulation of export-import trade torrents taking into consideration ecology safety for society and environment; protection and lobbying

national ecology interests on world markets; activation of mechanisms and tools for promoting ecological goods to foreign markets; limitation of access of hazardous imported goods; boosting trade and production ecologization among countries; organization and holding international trade negotiations; and developing double- and multi-sided international agreements.

Literature.

1. Андреева Н. Н. Экологически ориентированные инвестиции : [монография] / Н.Н. Андреева - Одесса.: Ин-т проблем рынка и экономико-экологических исследований, 2006.- 536с.

2. Блинецкая Е. А. Международное экологическое управление: ключевые вопросы осуществления и перспективы / Е. А. Блинецкая // Вестн. МГИМО ун-та. – 2012. – № 2–23. – С. 147–154.

3. Бохан А. Екологічна дипломатія: компроміси міжнародної торгівлі / Аліна БОХАН. // Зовнішня торгівля: економіка, фінанси, право. – 2016. – С. 33–43.

4. Грабинський І.М. Еколого-економічна система України: порівняльний аналіз. – Львів: МТШ, 1997. – 240 с.

5. Копылов М. Н. Формирование глобальной экологической политики и международных режимов международного экологического управления: *Per aspera ad astrum* / М. Н. Копылов, С. М. Копылов, С. М. А. Мохаммад // Вестн. Волгоград. гос. ун-та. – (Серия 5). – 2015. – № 2 (27). – С. 138–150.

6. Логінов Я. Екологія як нова сфера дипломатії [Електронний ресурс] / Якуб Логінов // ZN.UA. – 2009. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://dt.ua/ECONOMICS/ekologiya_yak_nova_sfera_diplomatiyi.html.

7. Потапенко В. Стратегічні пріоритети безпечного розвитку України на засадах «зеленої економіки» : монографія / В. Г. Потапенко; за наук. ред. Є. В. Хлобистова. – К. : НІСД, 2012. – 360 с.

8. Рогожина Н. Глобальная экологическая безопасность: позиция развивающихся стран / Н. Рогожина // Мировая экономика и междунар. отношения. – 2013. – № 2. – С. 3–11.

9. Туниця Ю. Діалектика глобалізації в контексті екологічного імперативу / Ю. Туниця, Е. Семенюк, Т. Туниця // Вісн. НАН України. – 2008. – № 2. – С. 8–24.
10. Українець Л. А. Зовнішньоторговельна політика країн – членів ЄС в умовах екологізації економічного розвитку : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. екон. наук : 08.00.02 / Л. А. Українець ; НАН України. Ін-т світ. економіки і міжнар. відносин. – К., 2007. – 19 с.
11. Федунь О. Екологізація міжнародних відносин у контексті сталого розвитку / О. Федунь // Вісн. Львів. ун-ту. – 2012. – Вип. 30. – С. 78–86.
12. Янченко К. Що підписали в Парижі: must know про нову Кліматичну угоду [Електронний ресурс] / Костянтин Янченко // Українська правда. – 2015. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <https://life.pravda.com.ua/society/2015/12/16/204942/>.
13. Anderson K. The standard welfare economics of policies affecting trade and the environment // The greening of world trade issues/ Ed. By K. Anderson, R. Blackhurst. – N. Y etc.: Harvester-Wheatsheaf, 1992. – P. 25–48.
14. Blaxekjær, L. Ø. (2015). Transscalar Governance of Climate Change: An Engaged Scholarship Approach. Copenhagen: Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen. PhD series 2015/8.
15. Bokhan A. International environmental diplomacy: development and partnership policy / A. Bokhan. // Інвестиції: практика та досвід. – 2017. – С. 12–17.
16. Bottger K. Umweltrechtliche Studien. 29. Die Umweltpflichtigkeit von Auslandsdirektinvestitionn im Volkerrechterauegegeben von Gilhuis P. / K. Bottger; et.al. – Baden Baden : Nomos Verl., 2002. – 315 p.
17. Copeland B. R., Taylor M. S. Trade, Growth and the Environment. // NBER Working Paper Series. – 2003. – № 9823.
18. Environmental Diplomacy and Mediation, 2014 [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Introduction/ECP/EnvironmentalDiplomacy/tabid/105991/Default.aspx>

19. GGEI, "The Global Green Economy Index", Measuring National Performance in the Green Economy. – 2016. – 5th Edition, pp. 5–9.
20. Global Environmental Policy and Global Trade Policy [Electronic resource]. – Available from : <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Frankel2Web.pdf>
21. Global Green Economy Index (GGEI) 2018 [Электронный ресурс] // Green Growth. – 2018. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <http://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/resource/2018-global-green-economy-index-ggei>.
22. Grossman, G.M. and Krueger, A.B., 1991. Environmental Impact of a North American Free Trade Agreement. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper 3914, NBER, Cambridge MA.
23. Herman E. Daly and Joshua Farley. Ecological economics: principles and applications: 2nd ed. Washington, DC : Island Press, c2010. 509 p.
24. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2011) [Электронный ресурс] / IPCC. – Режим доступа: <http://www.ipcc.ch>.
25. Markusen J. R. Cooperative Control of International Pollution and Common Property Resources // Quarterly Journal of Economics. - 1975. - № 89. - P. 618 – 632
26. Panayotov, T. Economic Growth and the Environment. Center for International Development at Harvard University, Working Paper No.56, 2000.
27. Rauscher M. International Trade, Foreign Investment, and the Environment // Thuenen Series of Applied Economic Theory 29 – University of Rostock, Institute of Economics, Germany, 2001.
28. Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development[Electronic resource]. – Available from : http://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/08/120815_outcome-document-of-Summit-for-adoption-of-the-post-2015-development-agenda.pdf
29. UNFCCC COP 21 Paris France–2015 Paris Climate Conference [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: www.cop21paris.org.

30. Van Asselt H. The fragmentation of global climate governance : consequences and management of regime interactions / H. Van Asselt. – Northampton : Edward Elgar Publ., 2014. – 352 p.
31. Winter G. Welthandelsrecht und Umweltschutz / G. Winter // Umweltrecht im Wandel. – B. : Schmidt, 2001. – S. 71–98.
32. Yatsenko O. Environmental Perspective of Ukrainian Trade Policy / Olha Yatsenko, Yuliya Zavadzka // Industrial Policy and Sustainable Growth. Series Title: Sustainable Development. – Publisher: Springer Singapore. –Copyright Holder: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. – Singapore, 2018. pp 1-12.
33. Reznikova N. Transnationalization as an aggravator of the nature use problem: challenges on the way to sustainable development / N.Reznikova // Міжнародні відносини. Серія «Економічні науки»: збірник наукових праць (електронне видання). – №7. – 2016. – Режим доступу: http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/ec_n/issue/view/163
34. Reznikova N. Ecological imperatives for extension of globalization processes: problem of economic security /N.Reznikova // Інвестиції: практика та досвід. - 2016. - № 21. - С. 23-26.