

United Nations Security Council (UNSC) - Study Guide

Chairs: Isabella Della Coletta, Guilherme Ferraz Bottrel, Bruna Biazoto Gabriolli e Luca Frizzo Gonçalves

1. Introduction to the committee:

How does society address the challenges arising from the geopolitical tensions in the Arctic? This committee has been convened to look into the issues surrounding territorial disputes, resource exploration, environmental concerns, and military presence in the region. As the Arctic becomes more accessible due to climate change, countries are competing for control over resources and trade routes. At the same time, the effects of climate change are reshaping the landscape, presenting both opportunities and risks. This committee will explore how countries are navigating the delicate balance between cooperation and competition, and how their actions in the Arctic could influence global stability, environmental sustainability, and the future of international diplomacy.

1.1. Topic 1: Territorial Disputes and Sovereignty Claims

This topic explores the competing claims of countries over Arctic territories, particularly in relation to sea boundaries, exclusive economic zones (EEZs), and resource-rich areas. Territorial disputes and sovereignty claims in the Arctic have intensified as countries seek control over the region's vast natural resources and strategic waterways. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) grants coastal nations exclusive economic zones (EEZs) extending 200 nautical miles from their coastlines, but



the ambiguous boundaries of the Arctic's underwater ridges, such as the Lomonosov Ridge, the main underwater ridge of the Arctic Ocean, have led to competing claims from Russia, Canada, and Denmark. This race for resources, including oil, gas, and minerals, has fueled tensions, with Russia expanding its military and exploration presence, while other Arctic nations, like Canada and Norway, work to secure their sovereignty. The Arctic Council has played a role in diplomatic efforts to resolve disputes, emphasizing cooperation through international law. However, the shrinking ice cover and increasing accessibility of the region make it an ongoing geopolitical battleground, where both state interests and the rights of indigenous peoples are at stake.

1.2. Topic 2: Environmental Impact and Sustainability

This topic focuses on the environmental consequences of increased geopolitical competition and resource extraction in the Arctic, as well as international efforts to protect the region's fragile ecosystem. The environmental impact and sustainability of increased geopolitical competition and resource extraction in the Arctic have become pressing concerns as the region's ice continues to melt due to climate change. The rush for oil, gas, and mineral resources, alongside the opening of new shipping routes, has intensified industrial activities in an already fragile environment. These activities, such as offshore drilling, mining, and increased shipping, are significant risks to the Arctic's ecosystems, potentially leading to oil spills, habitat destruction, and the disruption of marine life. Furthermore, the Arctic's biodiversity, including species like polar bears, seals, and various marine organisms, faces threats from rising temperatures, acidification of the ocean, and pollution. In response, international efforts to protect the region have been led by organizations such as the Arctic Council, which promotes sustainable development and



environmental conservation, that aims to reduce carbon emissions globally. However, the competing interests of nations and corporations, often driven by the lure of the Arctic's resources, continue to complicate these efforts, posing challenges for maintaining the balance between development and conservation in the face of urgent environmental threats.

2. Participating Countries:

- 1. Russian Federation
- 2. United States of America
- 3. People's Republic of China
- 4. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- 5. French Republic
- 6. Canadá
- 7. Republic of Finland
- 8. Kingdom of Sweden
- 9. Republic of Iceland
- 10. Kingdom of Norway
- 11. Kingdom of Denmark
- 12. Federal Republic of Germany
- 13. Japan
- 14. Republic of Chile

2.1. Countries description:

2.1.1. Permanent five - Have veto power in the final resolution



- Russian Federation: Largest Arctic landmass and coastline. Militarizing the region and asserting extended continental shelf claims. Strategic control over the Northern Sea Route.
- **2. United States of America:** Arctic state via Alaska.Concerned with maritime freedom, Arctic security, and countering Russian and Chinese influence.Invests in Arctic research and indigenous affairs.
- **3. People's Republic of China:** Declares itself a "near-Arctic state". Developing the "Polar Silk Road" and investing in Arctic infrastructure and research. Seeking influence in Arctic governance despite not having territorial claims.
- **4. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:** Global naval power and Arctic observer. Concerned with Arctic security and freedom of navigation. Strong scientific and environmental involvement.
- **5. French Republic:** Arctic Council observer. Engaged in polar research and maritime policy. Supports international law and climate resilience.

2.1.2. Other countries

- **6. Canada:** Arctic identity with a focus on sovereignty and indigenous communities. Competes with Russia and Denmark over extended continental shelf claims. Supports demilitarization and environmental protections.
- **7. Republic of Finland:** NATO member as of 2023. It shares a long border with Russia; strong Arctic environmental and security interests. Advocate for indigenous rights and scientific cooperation.
- **8. Kingdom of Sweden:** Arctic Council member with environmental and scientific priorities. NATO member since 2024. Opposes militarization of the region.
- 9. Republic of Iceland: Strategically located in the North Atlantic, near key Arctic



shipping routes. Focused on environmental protection and maritime security. Hosts Arctic Circle Assembly, a major Arctic policy forum.

- **10. Kingdom of Norway:** NATO frontline state in the Arctic with significant energy and defense interests. Hosts Cold Response military exercises. Advocates for cooperation through the Arctic Council.
- **11. Kingdom of Denmark:** Arctic state via Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Strong interest in Arctic sovereignty and climate change. Navigates internal debates over Greenlandic autonomy.
- **12. Federal Republic of Germany:** Arctic Council observer; major voice on climate and sustainability. Interested in science diplomacy and governance norms. Concerned with global shipping and economic impact.
- **13. Japan:** Arctic Council observer; technological and research power. Interested in Arctic shipping and resource access. Promotes peaceful cooperation and science-based policy.
- **14. Republic of Chile:** Arctic Council observer with an emerging interest in polar affairs. Focuses on scientific cooperation and climate research. Aligns environmental protection with sustainable development priorities.

2.1.3 Summary:

- Arctic states (8): Russia, USA, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Iceland
- Major powers (P5): Russia, USA, China, UK, France
- Influential observers: Germany, Japan, Chile



3. Opening

3.1. To the committee

Welcome to the United Nations Security Council. Established in 1945 after the devastation of World War II, the Security Council is one of the UN's principal organs, tasked with maintaining international peace and security. Composed of fourteen member states, including five permanent members with veto power, it holds the authority to impose sanctions, authorize peacekeeping missions, and approve military action when necessary. Our goal is to continue the vital mission of preventing conflict, protecting civilians, and fostering global stability.

3.2: To the main topic

The Arctic is changing quickly as the ice melts. This brings new opportunities like shipping routes and resources, but also creates conflicts between countries over borders and military activities. These issues could lead to serious conflicts. As the United Nations Security Council, our job is to protect peace, encourage cooperation, and help countries solve these problems peacefully for the future of the Arctic.

4. Subtopics - chair suggestion

4.1. Topic 1

1.1. Overlapping EEZ (exclusive economic zones) Claims

Address maritime boundary disputes where nations' exclusive economic zones



intersect in resource-rich waters.

1.2. Northwest Passage Dispute

Decide whether the passage is Canadian internal waters or an international strait open to global shipping.

1.3. Non-Arctic State Participation

Establish the role and rights of observers and non-Arctic states like China and India in Arctic decision-making.

1.4. Maritime Arbitration Mechanism

Create a legal framework or tribunal to resolve Arctic sea disputes peacefully and efficiently.

1.5. Indigenous Territorial Rights

Recognize and incorporate indigenous land and governance rights into Arctic sovereignty discussions.

1.6. Prevention of Unilateral Military Action

Develop a legal mechanism to limit solo military deployments in disputed Arctic zones.

1.7. Arctic Sovereignty Convention

Propose a new treaty specifically to govern territorial, legal, and political matters unique to the Arctic.

1.8. Historical and Traditional Claims Recognition

Consider historical presence and use by indigenous and colonial powers in evaluating current claims.

1.9. Demilitarization of the Arctic

Propose a regional arms control agreement or military-free zone in key Arctic



areas, such as Arctic research stations as peaceful, non-militarized zones.

1.10. Arctic Monitoring Task Force

Create a permanent international body to monitor environmental, military, and shipping activity in the region.

4.2. Topic 2

1.1. Regulation of Offshore Drilling

Propose strict safety and environmental rules for oil and gas exploration in Arctic waters.

1.2. Carbon Emission Limits for Projects

Set regional CO₂ emission caps for extractive and industrial activities in the Arctic.

1.3. Protected Marine Biodiversity Zones

Designate sensitive habitats as protected areas to safeguard Arctic marine life.

1.4. Plastic and Microplastic Reduction Strategy

Tackle the rise of marine plastic pollution affecting Arctic waters and wildlife.

1.5. Indigenous Knowledge in Climate Policy

Integrate traditional ecological knowledge into state-level and international climate responses.

1.6. Regulation of Arctic Eco-Tourism

Address the growing footprint of tourism in fragile Arctic ecosystems and propose sustainability standards.

1.7. Limitations on High-Risk Mining Projects

Enforce stricter environmental evaluations and bans on harmful Arctic mining



operations.

1.8. Global Arctic Conservation Fund

Create an international funding pool to support conservation and climate resilience programs.

1.9. Long-Range Pollution Controls for the Arctic Region

Propose stricter international controls on pollutants transported via air and sea to the Arctic.

1.10. Harmonizing Environmental Standards Among Arctic States

Encourage unified regulations on industry, transport, and emissions to protect shared ecosystems.

5. Participating Countries and Their Likely Positions

5.1. Russian Federation

- Overlapping EEZ Claims: Assertive, pushing strong claims over Arctic ridges (esp. Lomonosov).
- Northwest Passage: Supports international shipping rights.
- Non-Arctic State Participation: Opposed if it weakens Russian influence.
- Maritime Arbitration Mechanism: Skeptical; prefers bilateral deals.
- Indigenous Territorial Rights: Limited recognition; domestic control prioritized.
- **Prevention of Unilateral Military Action**: Opposed; maintains active military presence.
- Arctic Sovereignty Convention: Opposed unless it favors existing claims.



- **Historical Claims Recognition**: Supports where it strengthens own claims.
- **Demilitarization**: Strongly opposed.
- Monitoring Task Force: Opposes international oversight.
- Offshore Drilling Regulation: Opposed; favors resource exploitation.
- Carbon Limits: Opposed.
- Marine Protection: Limited support.
- Plastic Reduction: Mild support.
- Indigenous Climate Knowledge: Low priority.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Not a major concern.
- High-Risk Mining Limits: Opposed.
- Conservation Fund: Low interest.
- **Pollution Controls**: Opposed if restrictive.
- Standard Harmonization: Skeptical; prefers sovereignty.

5.2. United States of America

- Overlapping EEZ Claims: Supports clarification, not UNCLOS signatory.
- Northwest Passage: Sees it as international waters.
- Non-Arctic State Participation: Supports allied involvement.
- Maritime Arbitration Mechanism: Supports in principle.
- Indigenous Rights: Increasingly supportive domestically.
- Unilateral Military Action: Prefers freedom of operation.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Cautious support with limits.
- **Historical Claims**: Moderate support.
- **Demilitarization**: Opposed to full disarmament.



- Monitoring Task Force: Supports with U.S. leadership.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Mixed, depends on administration.
- Carbon Limits: Divided by political stance.
- Marine Protection: Supports in key zones.
- Plastic Reduction: General support.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Growing support.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Moderate regulation.
- Mining Restrictions: Cautious support.
- **Conservation Fund**: Supports with conditions.
- **Pollution Controls**: Supports if fair burden-sharing.
- Standards Harmonization: Supports leadership role.

5.3. People's Republic of China

- **EEZ Claims**: Supports freedom of navigation; not a claimant.
- Northwest Passage: Views as international waters.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Strongly supports, wants greater role.
- **Arbitration Mechanism**: Supports but prefers influence.
- Indigenous Rights: No active position.
- Unilateral Action: Resists restrictions that limit access.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Cautious support if included.
- Historical Claims: Neutral.
- **Demilitarization**: Supports to reduce NATO/US advantage.
- Monitoring Force: Supports if multilateral.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Opposed if limits investment.



- Carbon Limits: Opposed without equity clauses.
- Marine Protection: Selective support.
- Plastic Control: Supports under global initiatives.
- Indigenous Knowledge: No priority.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Low priority.
- Mining Restrictions: Opposed.
- Conservation Fund: Supports if non-political.
- Pollution Controls: Prefers voluntary commitments.
- **Standard Harmonization**: Opposed to enforcement mechanisms.

5.4. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

- **EEZ Claims**: Supports legal resolution through UNCLOS.
- Northwest Passage: Recognizes Canadian claim but values navigation freedom.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Supports EU and UK observer roles.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supports.
- Indigenous Rights: Supportive rhetorically.
- Unilateral Action: Supports restrictions.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Likely supports with allies.
- Historical Claims: Supports for indigenous and colonial ties.
- **Demilitarization**: Cautious support.
- **Monitoring Force**: Supports with NATO link.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Supports strong standards.
- Carbon Limits: Supports.
- Marine Protection: Strong support.



- Plastic Control: Strong advocate.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Supports.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports regulation.
- Mining Restrictions: Favors limits.
- Conservation Fund: Supportive.
- Pollution Controls: Supports binding commitments.
- Standard Harmonization: Strongly supports.

5.5. French Republic

- **EEZ Claims**: Supports legal resolution.
- Northwest Passage: Favors international status.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Supports observer rights.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supports multilateral solutions.
- Indigenous Rights: Supportive.
- Unilateral Action: Opposes militarization.
- Sovereignty Convention: Likely supports.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports colonial and indigenous history.
- **Demilitarization**: Strongly supports.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supports under UN/EU.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Supports strong restrictions.
- Carbon Limits: Strongly supports.
- Marine Protection: Advocates for strong zones.
- Plastic Reduction: Leading voice.
- Indigenous Knowledge: Supports integration.



- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports sustainable model.
- Mining Restrictions: Strong supporter.
- Conservation Fund: Supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strongly supports.
- Standards Harmonization: Advocates EU-wide alignment.

5.6. Canada

- **EEZ Claims**: Assertive, especially over Arctic Archipelago.
- Northwest Passage: Views it as internal waters.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Cautious, prefers Arctic-state dominance.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supportive but values sovereignty.
- Indigenous Rights: Strong proponent.
- Unilateral Action: Supports collective oversight.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supports Arctic-led process.
- Historical Claims: Supports indigenous and colonial heritage.
- **Demilitarization**: Supports reduced tensions.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supports for transparency.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Supports strict standards.
- Carbon Limits: Supports strong caps.
- Marine Protection: Strong support.
- Plastic Reduction: Active proponent.
- Indigenous Knowledge: Strongly supportive.
- Eco-Tourism: Supports regulated development.
- **Mining Restrictions**: Supports limitations.



- Conservation Fund: Supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strongly supports.
- Standards Harmonization: Supports within Arctic Council.

5.7. Republic of Finland

- **EEZ Claims**: Supports international law, not a primary claimant.
- Northwest Passage: Respects Canadian stance, leans toward cooperation.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Supports cautious observer involvement.
- **Arbitration Mechanism**: Strong support for legal frameworks.
- Indigenous Rights: Supports Sámi rights and broader recognition.
- Unilateral Military Action: Supports restrictions and cooperation.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supportive of new multilateral treaties.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports indigenous recognition.
- **Demilitarization**: Strong supporter of peaceful Arctic.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supports international oversight.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Strongly supports strict environmental standards.
- Carbon Limits: Advocates for strong emissions control.
- Marine Protection: Strong support for protected areas.
- Plastic Reduction: Proactive policy supporter.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Actively supports integration of knowledge.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports regulation and sustainability.
- Mining Restrictions: Supports precautionary restrictions.
- Conservation Fund: Supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strong supporter.



• **Standard Harmonization**: Favors harmonized Arctic standards.

5.8. Kingdom of Sweden

- **EEZ Claims**: Neutral, supports peaceful arbitration.
- Northwest Passage: Supports Canada but values open sea lanes.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Supports regulated observer roles.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Strongly supportive.
- Indigenous Rights: Strongly supports Sámi and others.
- Unilateral Military Action: Opposes; supports multilateral defense.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supports international agreement.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports indigenous heritage inclusion.
- **Demilitarization**: Strong advocate.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supportive of environmental oversight.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Strong proponent of environmental restrictions.
- Carbon Limits: Advocates ambitious carbon goals.
- Marine Protection: Strongly supports.
- Plastic Reduction: Active proponent.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Advocates for integration.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports strong regulations.
- Mining Restrictions: Strong supporter.
- Conservation Fund: Actively supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strongly supports international standards.
- Standard Harmonization: Promotes EU-like alignment.



5.9. Republic of Iceland

- **EEZ Claims**: Defends its maritime claims but favors cooperation.
- Northwest Passage: Respects Canadian claim but open to neutrality.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Supports limits on external influence.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supports legal arbitration.
- Indigenous Rights: Supports regional rights but lacks internal groups.
- Unilateral Military Action: Opposes militarization.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supportive.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports fair recognition.
- **Demilitarization**: Strong advocate.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supports transparency and neutrality.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Cautiously supports restrictions.
- Carbon Limits: Supports under cooperative frameworks.
- Marine Protection: Strong supporter.
- Plastic Reduction: Actively engaged.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Supports inclusivity in governance.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports sustainable regulation.
- Mining Restrictions: Supports environmental safeguards.
- Conservation Fund: Actively supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strongly supportive.
- **Standard Harmonization**: Supportive.

5.10. Kingdom of Norway

• **EEZ Claims**: Active claimant; emphasizes legal clarity.



- Northwest Passage: Recognizes Canada's claim but favors shipping rights.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Cautious; favors Arctic leadership.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supportive under UNCLOS.
- Indigenous Rights: Strong Sámi protections; advocates rights recognition.
- Unilateral Military Action: Supports collective security.
- Sovereignty Convention: Supportive.
- **Historical Claims**: Advocates indigenous rights.
- **Demilitarization**: Cautiously supportive (NATO member).
- Monitoring Task Force: Supportive.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Balances industry and environment.
- Carbon Limits: Supports, but allows strategic leeway.
- Marine Protection: Proponent of marine reserves.
- Plastic Reduction: Strong advocate.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Supports inclusion.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports regulation.
- Mining Restrictions: Mixed; favors sustainability.
- **Conservation Fund**: Supports.
- **Pollution Controls**: Pro-regulation.
- Standard Harmonization: Supports.

5.11. Kingdom of Denmark

- **EEZ Claims**: Strong Arctic claims (Greenland); active claimant.
- Northwest Passage: Respects Canadian claim.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Cautious supporter.



- **Arbitration Mechanism**: Supports dispute resolution through law.
- **Indigenous Rights**: Strongly supportive (Greenlandic autonomy).
- Unilateral Military Action: Supports restrictions.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supports Arctic-focused framework.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports indigenous and colonial claims.
- **Demilitarization**: Generally supportive.
- Monitoring Task Force: Supports balanced oversight.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Supports strict standards.
- Carbon Limits: Strongly supportive.
- Marine Protection: Active proponent.
- Plastic Reduction: Advocates for solutions.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Strongly supports.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports sustainable development.
- Mining Restrictions: Strong environmental focus.
- Conservation Fund: Supportive.
- **Pollution Controls**: Strong support.
- **Standard Harmonization**: Supports.

5.12. Federal Republic of Germany

- **EEZ Claims**: No direct claim; supports UNCLOS.
- Northwest Passage: Views as international waters.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Strongly advocates observer engagement.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supports legal multilateralism.
- Indigenous Rights: Strongly supports.



- Unilateral Military Action: Supports restrictions.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Strong advocate for new treaty.
- **Historical Claims**: Supports indigenous rights.
- **Demilitarization**: Strong supporter.
- Monitoring Task Force: Actively supports.
- **Drilling Regulation**: Strongly supports bans or strict limits.
- Carbon Limits: Strong advocate.
- Marine Protection: Proponent of large protected areas.
- Plastic Reduction: Strong engagement.
- Indigenous Climate Input: Supports strongly.
- **Eco-Tourism**: Supports regulated access.
- Mining Restrictions: Strongly supports environmental safety.
- Conservation Fund: Strong supporter.
- **Pollution Controls**: Leading voice in EU.
- Standard Harmonization: Strong supporter.

5.13. Japan

- **EEZ Claims**: No claims; supports freedom of navigation.
- Northwest Passage: Favors international route.
- Non-Arctic Participation: Seeks stronger observer role.
- Arbitration Mechanism: Supports legal resolution.
- Indigenous Rights: Neutral externally; supportive in principle.
- Unilateral Military Action: Supports peaceful solutions.
- **Sovereignty Convention**: Supports.



• Historical Claims: Neutral.

• **Demilitarization**: Generally supportive.

• Monitoring Task Force: Supports science-led monitoring.

• **Drilling Regulation**: Cautious support.

• Carbon Limits: Supportive with flexibility.

• Marine Protection: Cautiously supportive.

• Plastic Reduction: Advocates for regional action.

• Indigenous Climate Input: Neutral.

• **Eco-Tourism**: Supports sustainable approach.

• Mining Restrictions: Cautious support.

• Conservation Fund: Supportive.

• Pollution Controls: Strong supporter.

• **Standard Harmonization**: Supportive.

• 5.14. Republic of Chile

EEZ Claims: No claims; supports international maritime norms.

Northwest Passage: Favors international transit access.

Non-Arctic Participation: Advocates scientific cooperation and inclusion.

Arbitration Mechanism: Supportive of multilateral dispute resolution.

Indigenous Rights: Strong domestic emphasis; supportive internationally.

Unilateral Military Action: Opposes; favors collective oversight.

Sovereignty Convention: Supports equitable and rules-based access.

Historical Claims: Neutral.



Demilitarization: Strongly supportive.

Monitoring Task Force: Backs impartial international monitoring.

Drilling Regulation: Favors environmental safeguards with development flexibility.

Carbon Limits: Supports common but differentiated responsibilities.

Marine Protection: Advocates balance between conservation and economic use.

Plastic Reduction: Strong domestic initiatives and international cooperation.

Indigenous Climate Input: Actively promotes in national policy.

Eco-Tourism: Supports sustainable development models.

Mining Restrictions: Cautious; supports regulated extraction.

Conservation Fund: Advocates fair access for Global South.

Pollution Controls: Supports under equitable multilateral frameworks.

Standard Harmonization: Favors adaptable, inclusive frameworks.

6. Websites for Research

6.1. The Arctic Institute

- <u>thearcticinstitute.org</u>
 - A leading think tank providing comprehensive analysis on Arctic policy, security, and environmental challenges.

6.2. Arctic Council

arctic-council.org



 An intergovernmental forum promoting cooperation among Arctic states and Indigenous communities on sustainable development and environmental protection.

6.3. WWF Arctic Programme

- arcticwwf.org
 - Focuses on conserving Arctic ecosystems and addressing climate change impacts in the region.

6.4. Arctic Yearbook

- <u>arcticyearbook.com</u>
 - An annual publication featuring scholarly articles on Arctic politics, governance, and security.

6.5. The Arctic Review on Law and Politics

- arcticreview.no
 - A peer-reviewed journal covering legal and political issues pertinent to the Arctic region.

6.6. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) Debate

- unclosdebate.org
 - Provides discussions and analyses on maritime law as it pertains to the Arctic.



7. YouTube Channels

7.1. Arctic Institute

- YouTube Channel
 - Offers webinars and discussions on Arctic policy and security.

7.2. WWF International

- YouTube Channel
 - Features documentaries and short videos on Arctic wildlife and conservation efforts.

7.3. National Geographic

- YouTube Channel
 - Provides high-quality documentaries on Arctic exploration, climate change, and Indigenous cultures.

7.4. PBS Terra

- YouTube Channel
 - Explores environmental science topics, including climate change effects in the Arctic.

7.5. United Nations

- YouTube Channel
 - o Shares content on global issues, including Arctic governance and



environmental challenges.