Siberia and the Far East: Development vs. Sustainability

Rakesh Kumar

Assistant Professor Dept. of Geography Murarka College, Sultanganj, TMBU, Bhagalpur

DOI : https://dx.doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2025.1010000083

Received: 09 October 2025; Accepted: 14 October 2025; Published: 08 November 2025

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the complex geographic challenges and significant opportunities inherent in developing Siberia and the Russian Far East, vast regions spanning approximately 13.1 million square kilometers, while rigorously striving to balance ecological preservation. Drawing on a synthesis of recent studies, it explores the region's immense natural resource potential, which includes an estimated 54% of Russia's in-place oil and 41% of its gas reserves, alongside substantial deposits of minerals like gold, copper, and diamonds, contributing 60% of Russia's mineral exports. This resource wealth is set against the urgent backdrop of rapid climate change, where warming occurs at 2.5 times the global average, leading to accelerated permafrost thaw and exacerbating biodiversity vulnerabilities, particularly for endangered species like the Siberian tiger and Amur leopard. Key findings indicate that while considerable economic opportunities exist in resource extraction, infrastructure development, and emerging sectors such as Arctic shipping along the increasingly navigable Northern Sea Route and renewable energy, these are profoundly tempered by significant risks. These include extensive environmental degradation, widespread pollution, and severe impacts on the livelihoods and cultural integrity of Indigenous communities. The analysis highlights the critical need for integrated policies that prioritize long-term sustainability, incorporating decolonial perspectives to rectify historical injustices and fostering international cooperation for responsible development. Through case studies and detailed data on land use changes, such as the expansion of arable land from 15,025 km² to 20,738 km² in the Far East, the paper argues for a nuanced approach to development that mitigates the long-standing "Siberian Curse" of geographic isolation and promotes resilient ecosystems capable of withstanding environmental pressures.

Key Words – Siberia, Far East, Russia, Development, Sustainability, Climate Change, Northern Sea Routes, Siberian Curse.

INTRODUCTION

Siberia and the Russian Far East represent a critical frontier in global discussions on development and sustainability(Korchunov, 2021). Covering approximately 13.1 million square kilometers—roughly the size of Europe excluding Russia—these regions are characterized by extreme climatic conditions, low population density (around 36 million people, or about 2.7 per square kilometer), and immense natural resources(Stepanov et al., 2023). Siberia, often divided into Western, Eastern, and Central zones, features vast taiga forests, permafrost-covered landscapes, and major river systems like the Ob, Yenisei, and Lena. The Russian Far East, including areas like Primorye, Khabarovsk, and Sakhalin, extends to Pacific coasts and borders China, offering unique biodiversity hotspots such as the Amur River basin. These geographic attributes present both opportunities for economic growth—through resource extraction, agriculture, and transport—and profound challenges in preserving fragile ecosystems amid accelerating climate change (Wu et al., 2021).

The research question guiding this analysis is: What are the geographic challenges and opportunities of developing Siberia and the Russian Far East while balancing ecological preservation? This inquiry is timely, as Russia grapples with economic pressures from global energy transitions, while climate impacts like warming at 2.5 times the global average amplify vulnerabilities. Historically, Soviet-era policies prioritized industrialization, leading to overdevelopment in remote areas and environmental legacies such as pollution and habitat loss. Today, post-Soviet decentralization and market reforms have introduced new dynamics, including foreign investments and environmental regulations, yet implementation gaps persist.

This paper synthesizes multidisciplinary evidence from environmental science, economics, and sociology to outline opportunities in resource-based development, challenges from geographic and climatic factors, and strategies for sustainability. It incorporates data on land use changes, biodiversity impacts, and policy frameworks, emphasizing the interplay between internal colonialism, settler legacies, and modern extractivism. The analysis aims to inform policymakers on achieving balanced growth that respects ecological limits and Indigenous rights.

Geographic Overview of Siberia and the Russian Far East

Siberia and the Russian Far East encompass diverse biomes, from Arctic tundra in the north to temperate forests and steppes in the south. Siberia's landscape is dominated by permafrost, covering about 10.4 million square kilometers, with continuous zones in the north transitioning to sporadic in southern mountains. The region holds one-fifth of the world's forests, primarily coniferous taiga, which sequesters up to 40 billion tons of carbon and supports endangered species like the Siberian tiger and Amur leopard(Schmidt & Raile, 2000). Major rivers, including the Amur (4,444 km long with over 100 fish species), provide hydrological resources but are vulnerable to pollution.

The Far East, with a land area equivalent to Europe minus Russia, influences Northeast Asia's ecological health through its forests, tigers, and migratory flyways (Lukin, 2007). Climatically, average January temperatures range from -15°C to -45°C in Siberia, with warming trends of 0.51°C per decade since 1976, leading to longer growing seasons (up to 8 days per decade) and increased precipitation in northern areas(Kim et al., 2022). Population distribution is uneven, with urban centers like Novosibirsk and Vladivostok contrasting remote Indigenous communities, exacerbating access to services.

These features underscore the regions' strategic importance: Siberia accounts for 70% of Russia's natural resource potential (excluding agriculture), while the Far East facilitates Asia-Pacific trade. However, geographic isolation—vast distances and poor infrastructure—amplifies development costs (Николаев et al., 2021). This geographical impediment is a critical factor contributing to what has been termed Siberia's "institutional curse," stemming from the state's historical inability to effectively manage its vast space and resources, alongside a reluctance from businesses to invest in localized deep processing of raw materials. This complex interplay often leads to the perception of space and resources as a "Siberian curse" rather than a strategic advantage, posing significant challenges for socioeconomic and regional development (Kryukov & Селиверстов, 2021).

Development Opportunities

The regions' resource wealth offers substantial economic prospects. Siberia and the Far East hold 54% of Russia's in-place oil and 41% of gas in Western Siberia, with additional reserves in Eastern Siberia (13% oil, 18% gas) and offshore shelves. Key fields like Yurubcheno-Tokhomskoye (1 billion tons oil, 1 trillion cubic meters gas) and Kovyktinskoye could enable 125–175 billion cubic meters of annual gas production for decades, supporting exports to Europe and Asia. Coal reserves in basins like Kuznetsk and Tunguska, alongside minerals such as gold (Sukhoy Log: 1,000 tons), copper (Udokan), and diamonds in Yakutia, contribute 60% of Russia's mineral exports (Øverland & Loginova, 2023). Furthermore, the eastern regions alone consume 68.5% of Russia's total coal, highlighting their central role in the national energy matrix despite substantial oil and gas reserves that could satisfy both internal demands and export markets in the Asia-Pacific region (Санеев, 2023).

Climate change presents emerging opportunities, including northward agricultural expansion as growing seasons lengthen and permafrost thaws, potentially increasing arable land. The Northern Sea Route, enabled by Arctic ice melt, could enhance shipping efficiency. Sustainable sectors like ecotourism in UNESCO sites (e.g., Lake Baikal, holding 20% of global fresh surface water) and renewable energy (hydropower, wind) offer diversification. International cooperation, such as China-Russia transport projects, could improve infrastructure while incorporating environmental components (Ford et al., 2018).

Land use data from 2000–2020 shows arable land expansion from 15,025 km² to 20,738 km² in the Far East, driven by trade and climate, suggesting agricultural growth potential. Built-up areas grew to 14,620 km², indicating urbanization opportunities(Wang et al., 2025).

Land Use Category	2000 Area (km²)	2020 Area (km²)	NetChange (km²)	Key Drivers
Arable Land	15,025	20,738	+5,713	Climate warming, population growth, Russia-China trade
Built-up Areas	9,341	14,620	+5,279	Urbanization, infrastructure development
Forests	2,740,931	2,674,318	-66,613	Deforestation, fires, conversion to grassland
Grasslands	3,099,461	3,121,230	+21,769	Land abandonment, climate shifts
Water Bodies	122,978	105,790	-17,188	Droughts, human activities
Unused Land	N/A	205,685	Fluctuating	Transitions to other uses

Data Source - Wang, C., Zhang, X., & Liu, L. (2025). Land Use Change in the Russian Far East and Its Driving Factors. Land, 14(4), 804. https://doi.org/10.3390/land14040804 (Open Access)

Geographic Challenges

Development is constrained by Siberia's "curse": extreme cold, remoteness, and distorted population distribution from Soviet over-urbanization. Living costs in cold cities are up to four times higher, with industrial production even costlier, requiring subsidies. Vast distances isolate settlements, hindering trade and infrastructure. Permafrost thaw causes landscape instability, infrastructure damage (e.g., pipelines, roads), and methane releases (Streletskiy et al., 2022).

In the Far East, forest fires (e.g., 2.5 million hectares in 1998) release pollutants, altering ecosystems. Depleting easy-access minerals shifts extraction to remote, lower-grade sites, increasing costs. Social challenges include demographic declines and Indigenous displacement (Wang et al., 2025).

The region also faces significant environmental pressures, including widespread pollution from industrial activities and the challenge of managing extensive natural resource exploitation (Санеев, 2023). Despite these challenges, the abundant natural resources, including gas, oil, diamonds, and other minerals, contribute significantly to Russia's economy, emphasizing the need for advanced technological and scientific solutions in resource extraction and processing (Nørtoft et al., 2018) (Kryukov & Селиверстов, 2021).

Environmental Impacts and Sustainability Issues

Resource extraction has led to ecological deterioration: clear-cutting causes soil erosion, with 50% of cut wood wasted. Pollution from outdated facilities (e.g., 35,000 annual pipeline spills) affects health and biodiversity. Biodiversity losses include northward pest invasions and species declines (e.g., Taimyr reindeer from 1 million to 400,000). Moreover, the melting permafrost exacerbates the vulnerability of regions in Asian Russia, leading to an increase in natural disasters, such as the 200-fold expansion of wildfire territories in Siberia between 1997 and 2018 (Kryukov et al., 2023). This environmental degradation is further compounded by the disproportionate impact of climate change in Siberia, which is warming at a rate significantly faster than the global average, leading to rapid permafrost thaw, glacier melt, and increased aridity (Callaghan et al., 2021). This accelerated warming trend not only destabilizes infrastructure and ecosystems but also intensifies hydrological extremes, manifesting as more frequent and severe floods and droughts across the vast Siberian landscape.

Climate change intensifies issues: fires emitted 505 megatonnes CO_2 in 2021, with greening offset by browning. Injustice affects Indigenous groups, with profits centralized in Moscow. Forest ranges shift northward, with species like birch contracting up to 69%. This ecological shift is particularly pronounced in regions like the Krasnoyarsk Territory, where the expansion of coniferous forests at the expense of broadleaf species is accelerating, fundamentally altering regional biodiversity and ecosystem services (Prokhorov et al., 2023).

Further compounding these environmental challenges, the pervasive reliance on fossil fuels, particularly oil and gas from regions such as Eastern Siberia, contributes significantly to greenhouse gas emissions, despite the presence of abundant renewable energy potential that remains largely untapped (Kryukov et al., 2023) (Batciun, 2015). The extensive resource extraction, particularly in forestry and mining, has demonstrably led to significant landscape alterations and negative impacts on ecosystem services, recreational value, and local livelihoods, paralleling findings in other Arctic regions (Živojinović et al., 2024).

Case Studies

Lake Baikal: Legacy Pollution from Industrial Activities and Pathways to Protection

Lake Baikal, spanning 31,722 km² and containing 23,615 km³ of water (20% of the world's unfrozen freshwater), exemplifies the conflict between Soviet-era industrialization and modern conservation efforts. The Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM), established in the 1960s on the lake's southeastern shore, represents a pivotal case of environmental degradation in Siberia (Stepanova et al., 2000). Operational for decades, the mill discharged up to 100,000 m³ of wastewater annually, laden with chlorine compounds, phenols, chlorides, sulfates, and PCBs, creating a 30 km² dead zone in the southern lake basin. These pollutants bioaccumulated in endemic species like the Baikal seal and omul fish, leading to population declines—omul stocks reportedly halved in affected areas—and human health risks, including elevated cancer rates (e.g., blood cancers in children) and pregnancy complications (54-76% increased risk of miscarriage). Air emissions of sulfur compounds (1 tonne daily) exceeded safety limits by 10-fold, detectable 70 km away, causing respiratory issues and ecosystem acidification.

The mill's location in a seismic zone (up to 9-11 on the Richter scale) heightened risks of catastrophic spills, with over 6 million tonnes of solid waste stored in open pits prone to leaching. Historical log rafting exacerbated oxygen depletion, banning the practice but leaving legacy effects. Closure in October 2008 followed international pressure from UNESCO and NGOs like WWF and Greenpeace, who advocated for chlorine-free alternatives (e.g., hydrogen peroxide bleaching). During the 2008-2010 shutdown, ecological recovery was evident: clearer water, reduced fish deformities, and improved air quality. However, reopening in 2010 without closed-water cycles—enabled by weakened regulations—reignited concerns, prompting UNESCO condemnations for violating World Heritage standards. Ultimately, the mill was permanently closed in 2013, leaving behind significant accumulated waste and prompting ongoing rehabilitation efforts to mitigate the lasting environmental damage, highlighting the complex and protracted challenges of industrial legacy pollution. Studies continue to monitor mercury loading in Lake Baikal, particularly from point sources like the former Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill and the influence of the Selenga River, which contributes over 60% of the annual inflow and serves as the primary tributary to the lake (Roberts et al., 2019) (Adams et al., 2018).

Sustainability challenges include balancing economic needs (the mill employed 2,000 locals) with preservation. Opportunities lie in ecotourism, which could generate revenue while protecting biodiversity (over 2,000 endemic species). Policy recommendations emphasize seismic-resilient infrastructure, waste remediation, and transboundary cooperation with Mongolia, as upstream activities affect inflows. As of recent assessments, irreversible processes may be underway, underscoring the urgency for integrated management. Further research indicates that the industrial legacy includes persistent mercury contamination within Lake Baikal and its primary tributary, the Selenga River basin, originating from ongoing gold extraction in Mongolia, historical Russian gold mining, industrial practices, and long-range atmospheric transport from various industrial sources (Roberts et al., 2019).

Impact Category	Key Metrics (Pre-Closure)	Post-Closure Observations (2008-2010)	Sustainability Implications
Water Pollution	100,000 m³ wastewater/year; 30 km² dead zone	Reduced discharges; omul migration improved	Risks bioaccumulation; need for closed cycles
Air Emissions	1 tonne sulfur compounds/day; 10x safety limits	Air cleared; fewer health complaints	Acidification threats; shift to renewables

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue X October 2025

Health Effects	High cancer/pregnancy risks	Decreased child rashes/asthma	Community health monitoring essential
Waste Accumulation	6 million tonnes solid waste	No new additions; legacy leaching persists	Remediation costs high; tourism alternative

Norilsk Diesel Spill (2020): Climate-Induced Infrastructure Failure and Remediation Efforts

The May 29, 2020, spill at Norilsk's Heat and Power Plant No. 3 (HPP-3) in Krasnoyarsk Krai, Siberia, released 21,200 tonnes of diesel in 20 minutes, marking one of the Arctic's largest environmental disasters. Caused by foundation subsidence from permafrost thaw—piles not anchored into bedrock as designed—the incident highlights climate vulnerabilities in remote industrial sites. Diesel overtopped inadequate bunds, contaminating 29 km of waterways, including the Ambarnaya and Daldykan Rivers, and threatening Lake Pyasino. Impacts included soil and water pollution over 350 km², with direct effects on 0.18 km² near the Daldykan River, exacerbating biodiversity loss and methane releases. This event significantly disrupted the local indigenous communities' traditional fishing and hunting practices and further underscored the need for robust environmental impact assessments and disaster preparedness in Arctic industrial operations (Prokhorov et al., 2023).

Response involved booming and sorbent treatments (95.8 km of bank lines and 85,000 m² treated by 2022), but initial plans underestimated scales, lacking spill modeling and tertiary containment. Norilsk Nickel faced $2 billion fines, with cleanup progressing to full tank removal by September 2020. Long-term effects include amplified permafrost instability from warming (0.51°C/decade), risking further infrastructure failures and cascading ecological damage like wildfires and habitat shifts. Such events underscore the critical need for advanced permafrost modeling that integrates infrastructure-scale construction details with decadal climate change projections to accurately assess and mitigate future risks (Deimling et al., 2021).

Aspect	Details	Metrics	Long-Term Recommendations
Cause	Permafrost thaw; pile failure	Subsidence led to shell rupture	Install bedrock-anchored foundations
Impact	Water/soil contamination	21,200 tonnes; 29 km affected	Model spills for better planning
Response	Booming/sorbents	95.8 km banks treated (2022)	Enhance emergency exercises
Costs	Fines/cleanup	$2 billion+	Integrate climate risk assessments

Opportunities for sustainability emerge from recommendations: permafrost monitoring, risk-based safety systems, and climate-resilient designs (e.g., thermosyphons). This case underscores the "Siberian Curse" of geographic isolation, where development costs soar amid environmental risks, calling for international standards in Arctic operations. Furthermore, the degradation of permafrost due to rising global temperatures, as observed in the Norilsk incident, poses a significant threat to critical infrastructure across the Arctic, including pipelines, roads, and buildings, necessitating innovative engineering solutions and comprehensive adaptation strategies to prevent future environmental catastrophes (Lohmann et al., 2023).

Far East Border Regions: Trade-Driven Land Use Changes and Transboundary Sustainability

Bordering northeast China, regions like Amur Oblast, Jewish Autonomous Region, and Primorsky Krai in the Russian Far East have undergone rapid land transformations from 2000-2020, driven by Russia-China trade and climate shifts. Arable land expanded from 13,879 km² to 19,973 km² (net +6,094 km²), built-up areas from 4,448 km² to 6,455 km² (+2,007 km²), while forests declined from 404,526 km² to 396,281 km² (-8,245 km²). Water bodies shrank by ~17,189 km² regionally, with grasslands stable and unused land fluctuating. These shifts are primarily attributable to intensified agricultural production and infrastructure development to support cross-border trade, particularly affecting ecologically sensitive wetlands and forested areas (Zharkov et al., 2023).

Key drivers include precipitation/temperature increases (strong correlations: 0.932-0.964), population growth (0.972 in borders), and exports of raw materials/agricultural products (moderate: 0.695-0.712). Transitions show grassland-to-arable shifts (8,411 km²) and forest losses to infrastructure, raising ecological security concerns like soil erosion and biodiversity threats in the Amur basin. The intensified agricultural and urban expansion observed in these border regions, notably in Heilongjiang Province on the Chinese side, exacerbates the ecological footprint and introduces an imbalance in territorial development due to higher urbanization and anthropogenic loads (Murasheva et al., 2019) (Wang et al., 2025).

Sustainability implications involve transboundary risks, such as shared river pollution, but opportunities through cooperation (e.g., BRICS transport policies) for ecological zoning and corridors. Policies should address overexploitation, integrating remote sensing for monitoring. These challenges highlight the critical need for a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between climate change, permafrost degradation, and anthropogenic activities to develop effective mitigation and adaptation strategies across diverse Arctic and sub-Arctic environments (Nørtoft et al., 2018) (Sharapov, 2023).

Land Type	2000 Area (km²) - Borders	2020 Area (km²) - Borders	Net Change (km²)	Primary Drivers
Arable	13,879	19,973	+6,094	Climate warming, trade
Built-up	4,448	6,455	+2,007	Urbanization, population
Forest	404,526	396,281	-8,245	Deforestation for resources
Grassland	Stable (detailed N/A)	Stable	Minor +	Regeneration shifts
Water	Declining (regional -17,189)	Declining	- (border-specific N/A)	Droughts, human use

Policy Recommendations

Enforce updated laws like the 1991 Environmental Protection Act, incorporating public participation and Indigenous veto rights. Promote sustainable technologies for mining and reprocessing waste. Foster networks like SecNet for monitoring. Relocate populations from unsustainable areas, funded by resource revenues. Furthermore, implementing strict conservation policies, particularly in ecologically sensitive areas like the Sanjiang Plain wetlands, is crucial to enhance regional soil water retention capacity and mitigate the impacts of land use changes on ecological stability (Zhang et al., 2024). To mitigate these impacts, it is essential to implement advanced remote sensing techniques and sophisticated GIS analyses to monitor land use dynamics and inform targeted conservation strategies.

CONCLUSION

The vast and resource-rich regions of Siberia and the Russian Far East present a complex interplay between immense development potential and critical sustainability imperatives. The document highlights that while these areas, covering approximately 13.1 million square kilometers, offer significant economic opportunities through oil, gas, mineral extraction, and emerging sectors like Arctic shipping and renewable energy, these are profoundly tempered by unique geographic challenges. The "Siberian Curse" of extreme climate, permafrost thaw, and vast distances complicates infrastructure development and exacerbates environmental vulnerabilities, leading to accelerated warming, increased natural disasters, and extensive pollution from industrial activities as seen in the Lake Baikal and Norilsk case studies.

Achieving a balanced future for Siberia and the Far East necessitates integrated, forward-looking policies. These must prioritize long-term ecological preservation, ensuring climate-resilient infrastructure, robust environmental regulations, and advanced monitoring systems. Critically, successful development must incorporate decolonial perspectives, rectify historical injustices faced by Indigenous communities, and foster genuine international cooperation. Without a concerted and collaborative effort, the pursuit of economic growth risks irreversible ecological damage and continued socio-economic disparities, underscoring the urgent need for a nuanced approach that transforms these regions into models of resilient and equitable development.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J., Martins, C. C., Rose, N. L., Shchetnikov, A. A., & Mackay, A. W. (2018). Lake sediment records of persistent organic pollutants and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in southern Siberia mirror the changing fortunes of the Russian economy over the past 70 years. Environmental Pollution, 242, 528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.005
2. Batciun, N. V. (2015). PROSPECTS AND DYNAMICS OF DEVELOPMENT OF AN OIL AND GAS COMPLEX OF EASTERN SIBERIA: ECONOMY AND ECOLOGY. Theoretical & Applied Science, 24(4), 208. https://doi.org/10.15863/tas.2015.04.24.36
3. Callaghan, T. V., Shaduyko, O., Kirpotin, S. N., & Gordov, E. (2021). Siberian environmental change: Synthesis of recent studies and opportunities for networking. AMBIO, 50(11), 2104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-021-01626-7
4. Deimling, T. S. von, Ingeman-Nielsen, T., Lee, H., Westermann, S., Trochim, E., Nitzbon, J., & Langer, M. (2021). Modelling consequences of permafrost degradation for Arctic infrastructure and related risks to the environment and society. Research Portal Denmark. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=dtu&id=dtu-133c3b5d-3492-4e9d-9c32-38a2d476dab1&ti=Modelling%20consequences%20of%20permafrost%20degradation%20for%20Arctic%20infrastructure%20and%20related%20risks%20to%20the%20environment%20and%20society
5. Ford, J. D., Falk, K., Tesar, C., & Jacobsen, R. B. (2018). Adaptation and resilience. Research Portal Denmark, 307. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=aau&id=aau-74ec3b81-78d4-4ae7-895d-3a0e0bce055a&ti=Adaptation%20and%20resilience
6. Kim, J., Kug, J., Jeong, S., Yoon, J., Zeng, N., Hong, Jinkyu, Jeong, J., Zhao, Y., Chen, X., Williams, M., Ichii, K., & Schaepman-Strub, G. (2022). Arctic warming-induced cold damage to East Asian terrestrial ecosystems. Communications Earth & Environment, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00343-7
7. Korchunov, N. (2021). Preface. AMBIO, 50(11), 1895. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-021-01622-x
8. Kryukov, V. A., Gorbacheva, N., & Suslov, N. (2023). Renewable energy and prospects for decarbonising the Asian Russia. E3S Web of Conferences, 470, 1037. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202347001037
9. Kryukov, V. A., & Селиверстов, В. Е. (2021). From the Continental and Resource Curse of Siberia to Institutional Harmony. Regional Research of Russia, 11. https://doi.org/10.1134/s2079970522010038
10. Lohmann, R., Beatty, B., Graybill, J. K., Grigorieva, E. A., Hansen, K. L., & Soikkeli, A. (2023). Perspective: Dimensions of Environment and Health in Arctic Communities [Review of Perspective: Dimensions of Environment and Health in Arctic Communities]. Environment & Health, 2(1), 3. American Chemical Society. https://doi.org/10.1021/envhealth.3c00116
11. Lukin, A. (2007). Environmental Security of Northeast Asia: A Case of the Russian Far East. Asian Affairs An American Review, 34(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.3200/aafs.34.1.23-36
12. Murasheva, A. A., Lepekhin, P. P., Chepurin, E. M., & Ananicheva, E. P. (2019). Typification of coastal transboundary areas in the context of sustainable land use in the Far Eastern Federal District. IOP Conference Series Earth and Environmental Science, 350(1), 12064. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/350/1/012064
13. Nørtoft, K., Bjerregaard, P., Carroll, S., Sirén, A., Caroll, S., Bjerregaard, P., Hounsgaard, L., Hounsgaard, L., & Jensen, T. (2018). Enhancing Well-Being Among Older People in Greenland through Partnerships of Research, Practice and Civil Society. Research Portal Denmark, 2018, 234. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=kp&id=kp-6af32eeb-d64d-4a4b-9e56-3852d1b709db&ti=Enhancing%20Well-

Being%20Among%20Older%20People%20in%20Greenland%20through%20Partnerships%20of%20Research%2C%20Practice%20and%20Civil%20Society
14. Øverland, I., & Loginova, J. (2023). The Russian coal industry in an uncertain world: Finally pivoting to Asia? Energy Research & Social Science, 102, 103150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103150
15. Prokhorov, V., Rozhnov, I., Maslova, O., & Kuklina, A. (2023). Macroregional sustainable development on the basis of public-private partnership mechanisms. E3S Web of Conferences, 443, 4001. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202344304001
16. Roberts, S., Adams, J., Mackay, A. W., Swann, G. E. A., McGowan, S., Rose, N. L., Panizzo, V. N., Yang, H., Vologina, E. G., Sturm, M., & Shchetnikov, A. A. (2019). Mercury loading within the Selenga River basin and Lake Baikal, Siberia. Environmental Pollution, 259, 113814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113814
17. Schmidt, T., & Raile, G. (2000). Sustainability of Siberia and Far East Russia's Forest Resource. Journal of Sustainable Forestry, 11(4), 1. https://doi.org/10.1300/j091v11n04_01
18. Sharapov, D. (2023). Northern Sea route and climate change. E3S Web of Conferences, 460, 9019. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202346009019
19. Stepanov, I., Макаров, И. А., Makarova, E., & Smolovik, E. (2023). Climate change and challenges to sustainable development in the Russian Arctic. Climatic Change, 176(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-023-03512-5
20. Stepanova, L. I., Lindström-Seppä, P., Hänninen, O., Котелевцев, С. В., Glaser, V. M., Novikov, C. N., & Beim, A. M. (2000). Lake Baikal: biomonitoring of pulp and paper mill waste water. Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management, 3(2), 259. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1463-4988(00)00011-7
21. Streletskiy, D. A., Clemens, S., Lanckman, J.-P., & Shiklomanov, N. I. (2022). The costs of Arctic infrastructure damages due to permafrost degradation. Environmental Research Letters, 18(1), 15006. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/acab18
22. Wang, C., Zhang, X., & Liu, L. (2025). Land Use Change in the Russian Far East and Its Driving Factors. Land, 14(4), 804. https://doi.org/10.3390/land14040804
23. Wu, K., Tseng, M., Ali, M. H., Xue, B., Chiu, A. S. F., Fujii, M., Xu, M., Lan, S., Ren, M., & Yan, B. (2021). Opportunity or threat in balancing social, economic and environmental impacts: The appearance of the Polar Silk Road. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 88, 106570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2021.106570
24. Zhang, B., Zou, H., Duan, D., Zhou, X., Chen, J., Sun, Z., & Zhang, X. (2024). Stability in change: building a stable ecological security pattern in Northeast China under climate and land use changes. Scientific Reports, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-63391-3
25. Zharkov, D., Nizamutdinov, T., Dubovikoff, D. A., Abakumov, E., & Pospelova, A. D. (2023). Navigating Agricultural Expansion in Harsh Conditions in Russia: Balancing Development with Insect Protection in the Era of Pesticides [Review of Navigating Agricultural Expansion in Harsh Conditions in Russia: Balancing Development with Insect Protection in the Era of Pesticides]. Insects, 14(6), 557. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects14060557
26. Živojinović, I., Elomina, J., Pülzl, H., Calanasan, K., Dabić, I., Ólafsdóttir, R., Siikavuopio, S. I., Iversen, A., Robertsen, R., Bjerke, J. W., Engen, S., Tømmervik, H., Bogadóttir, R., Moioli, S., Tuulentie, S., Rautio, P., Lynge-Pedersen, K., Lidestav, G., Edvardsdóttir, A. G., & Nygaard, V. (2024). Exploring land use conflicts arising from economic activities and their impacts on local communities in the European Arctic. Journal of Land Use Science, 19(1), 186. https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423x.2024.2382676
27. Николаев, А. В., Беломестнов, В. Г., Belomestnov, I. V., Khardaev, K. P., & Sandakova, N. Y. (2021). Forming a polycentric ecosystem to bring together of Russian and foreign stakeholders to develop of Far Eastern regions. IOP Conference Series Earth and Environmental Science, 885(1), 12019. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/885/1/012019
28. Санеев, Б. Г. (2023). Specific features of the energy sector in Russia's eastern regions and their influence on shaping the Eastern direction in the new geopolitical landscape. E3S Web of Conferences, 470, 1014. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202347001014