

30 JULY 2026

From sea to space: How the EU can turn the tide on the Arctic

Maria Martisiute
Dr Linda Solstrand Dahlberg
Dr Tobias Etzold

INTRODUCTION

The EU will issue a new Arctic strategy in autumn 2026, a few months after Germany warned, again, that Russia could attack NATO territory before 2029 – an assessment broadly shared across NATO¹ and the EU.² That attack could come in the Arctic or the Baltic Sea region, or in both simultaneously. Both already face infrastructure sabotage, aerial and maritime incursions, and cyberattacks – exposing vulnerabilities across Europe’s northern flank.

These are not isolated Arctic problems. They are symptoms of wider European politico-military weakness over a prolonged period: Russia’s war against Ukraine is in its 12th year, its hybrid war against the EU and NATO is in its 20th and Europe’s race to rebuild military capabilities has just begun. The pressures are compounded by great power competition in the Arctic, America’s retrenchment, Russia’s threat, China’s polar probing, and a rapidly changing environment caused by climate change.

The EU must accelerate action to prepare for short-term risks in 2026-2028, without losing sight of a longer-term vision.

Against this backdrop, the current EU’s 2021 Arctic policy, focusing on a peaceful, sustainable and prosperous Arctic, has fallen behind new strategic realities. The EU must accelerate action to prepare for short-term risks in 2026-2028, without losing sight of a longer-term vision. Success will depend on whether the EU can proactively shape the region’s security amid growing threats and the increased presence of great powers.

BACKGROUND: CLIMATE CHANGE AND SECURITY

The Arctic is warming nearly four times faster than the global average. This is transforming the Arctic ecosystem and geopolitical dynamics with new risks and opportunities.³ Climate change is making the Arctic – its resources, navigation, and tourism – more accessible. Due to its strategic importance, it is attracting a growing interest from both Arctic and non-Arctic actors.

In the Arctic, climate change has not yet directly caused conflict – over resources, water, land, borders. It is not currently the main driver of emerging geopolitical tensions; nor is it likely to be in the near future.⁴ As new shipping routes open and vast reserves of resources become more accessible, climate change does however introduce new social and security risks. It has “profound implications for the environment, local communities, access to, and the security of the region.”⁵ Climate change is frequently labelled a “threat-multiplier” – although not a sole cause of threats or conflict, it has the potential to extend and intensify existing threats.

Military surveillance, training and exercises, search and rescue operations are becoming more complex due to the evolving security environment. Melting and unpredictable ice conditions and extreme weather can undermine military infrastructure such as radar sites, ports and runways through sinkholes, lakes and swamps.⁶ At the same time, the increasing accessibility of the Arctic brings “new security realities, including the potential for increased drone, submarine, and intelligence-gathering activities, and conning signs of a strategic capabilities arms race starting in the region.”⁷

EU’s Arctic policy does not sufficiently address the nexus between geopolitics, climate change and security in the Arctic. The policy update presents a strategic opportunity for the EU.

Although military presence in the Arctic is rising, it remains limited. Troops and equipment need to be modernised. Arctic military, retention and recruitment need to adapt to extreme climate conditions. The current EU Arctic policy does not sufficiently address the nexus between geopolitics, climate change and security in the Arctic. Nor does it define the geographical scope of the Arctic policy. The planned update presents a strategic opportunity for EU policymakers.

STATE OF PLAY

Altered threat picture

The President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, first mentioned a future Arctic policy update in 2025, in the context of rapidly changing Arctic climate and increased activity from Russia and China. She highlighted the need “to strengthen the protection of critical infrastructure, including subsea cables and power grids,”⁸ emphasising their vulnerabilities.

The security landscape has since deteriorated. Russia’s illegal war of aggression against Ukraine has impacted international cooperation in the Arctic and continues to disrupt most of the Arctic Council’s work. Russia’s hybrid threat escalation, military build-up in the Kola Peninsula and military tests in Novaya Zemlya (“New Land”), heighten the tension.

Russia increasingly views the Arctic as a strategic priority for economic resources, military security and global power projection. Moscow is aided by China. The two are deepening ties in shorter shipping routes and dual-use infrastructure investment along the Russian Arctic coast.

The US is prioritising its own vested interests, with the ambition to control Greenland, justified by the supposed threat from Russia and China. Many experts have already analysed how Russian and Chinese strategic capabilities in the Arctic are leveraged to wage hybrid warfare, create socio-economic dependencies, undermine the rules-based order, trust and resilience.⁹

EU Arctic policy 2021

Five years ago, in 2021, the EU rightly recognised the Arctic as a growing arena for great power competition. Europe however fell short of identifying potential solutions to deal with it. Similarly, it deemed that “EU’s full engagement in the Arctic was a geopolitical necessity” but did not consider strategic competition to be an important factor in shaping the EU’s role in the Arctic. As 2026–2028 unfolds and long-term threats evolve, the EU must act decisively and fast.

In the changed security context, the EU’s 2021 Arctic policy has quickly become outdated. Focused on climate change adaptation, green transition, and cooperation with indigenous communities, it has so far neglected to address serious defence and security issues. This presents a policy gap between the EU’s intended goal of a stable and peaceful region and the outcome of increased risk of conflict in the Arctic. Today’s policy update provides an essential and urgent opportunity for an EU Arctic policy fit for reality and purpose.

POLICY PROSPECTS: FIVE AREAS FOR ACTION

1) Atlantic-Arctic-Baltic as a single security area

Vast and diverse, the Arctic can be viewed from various lenses. From the European security lens, the Arctic is geographically and operationally integrated into the North-Atlantic and the Baltic and can be seen as one theatre. This interconnectedness sets the scene for a strong integrated security policy. A failure to acknowledge this risks undermining the posture of those Arctic states who are also Baltic areas. Since Russia acts as both an Arctic and a Baltic power, the EU too needs to employ an inter-regional lens.

From the European security lens, Arctic is geographically and operationally integrated into the North-Atlantic and the Baltic and can be seen as one theatre.

Shared strategic geography

The European Arctic is part of the North-Atlantic, includes the North Sea and sits in proximity to the Baltic Sea and Russia. The three EU member states

Denmark, Finland and Sweden are both Arctic and Baltic Sea nations. Finland's Arctic-Baltic border with Russia spans 1300km, while Sweden's central position makes it indispensable for the defence of Finland and the Baltic States. Although Norway's coastline does not border the Baltic States, its maritime border extends to the region. This Baltic link is reinforced by Norway's membership in the EU's Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region.

The Atlantic-Arctic-Baltic connections are strengthened through NATO membership, shared threat perceptions, support to Ukraine and cooperation with EU defence industry. EU defence and security partnerships with Norway (2024), the UK (2025), Canada (2025), and Iceland (2026) also position the EU deep into the North-Atlantic, elevating cooperation to include maritime security, infrastructure and hybrid warfare. Iceland's EU referendum (August 2026) might anchor the EU more firmly into the strategically important maritime area of the Greenland-Iceland-United Kingdom (GIUK) gap, and its sea passages.

Contiguous infrastructure networks

Infrastructure security and connectivity deepen the rationale for a contiguous Atlantic-Arctic-Baltic space: undersea infrastructure, sea lines of communication, satellite data, supply chains, rail lines, and civil-military communities constitute one integrated operational system. Damages to contiguous infrastructure would also have a spillover effect. A disruption in Svalbard may affect the security in the GIUK gap and the Baltic Sea. A lack of mobility in Northern Europe may affect how Nordics organise logistics in the Baltic.

Proximity to Russia

Borders with Russia reinforce this logic. Norway and Finland lie close to the Barents Sea and Russian nuclear deterrence force in the Kola Peninsula, which is geographically the extension of the Nordic-Baltic shield. Finland and the Baltic States border Russia and Belarus. Known as the "easternmost arm of the Baltic Sea," the Gulf of Finland extends from Estonia to Saint Petersburg. This Arctic-Baltic nexus, together with Saint Petersburg-Murmansk axis and Northern Sea Route, is also mirrored as one strategic environment in Russia's military thinking,¹⁰ empowering Russia to act as an Arctic-Baltic power.

2) Hybrid and military threat

Undersea infrastructure

Hybrid attacks on undersea infrastructure are a serious security concern. There have been at least 17 incidents damaging the High North network since 2018, of which 14 since 2021.¹¹ Three fibre optic cables in Greenland were damaged in 2019. In Norway a cable in the Lofoten-Vesterålen (LoVe) Ocean disappeared in 2021, possibly providing intelligence of the unique Norwegian technology to foreign governments.¹² A year later, one of two fibre optic cables connecting Svalbard to Norway

proper was the victim of suspected Russian hybrid attack.¹³ Data flowing from SvalSat ground station via cables to the mainland was disrupted. In 2022-2025, over 50% of 110 sabotage operations conducted by Russia in the EU took place in the Baltic Sea region.¹⁴ In 2023, three cables and a pipeline incident between Finland, Estonia and Sweden involved a Chinese-owned ship after its maiden journey through the Northern Sea Route,¹⁵ demonstrating Russian-Chinese cooperation in the Arctic-Baltic area.

Undersea infrastructure is not vulnerable – it is under attack.

EU Action Plan for undersea cables

The EU has taken measures to strengthen the resilience of undersea infrastructure. The recent EU Cable Action Plan and the EU Submarine Cable Security Toolbox¹⁶ propose risk-mitigating measures to address redundancy, repair, and monitoring, among others. The EU is investing €1 billion in Cable Projects of European Interest.¹⁷ It identified priority areas for the deployment of new submarine cables such as the West Arctic and Polar passages and across the Baltic Sea, thus linking all Northern Europe.¹⁸ The EU also launched a Baltic Regional Cable Hub to reinforce regional surveillance.¹⁹

To effectively mitigate the risks, the new EU Arctic policy must extend the above measures to Norway, Iceland and Canada. Only by reinforcing the Baltic hub with an Arctic one, can the EU bolster the needed regional surveillance. When placing new cables, it is essential that the EU also counters hybrid threats rather than merely mitigates the risks.

Is EU solving the right problem?

Undersea cables are a case in point. What is the root cause of their damage? Is it the vulnerability of undersea cables? Is their location too high-risk? Is the behaviour of the adversary to blame? To misdiagnose the problem is to miss the responsibility for its resolution.

A great deal of scholarship and policy focuses on the vulnerability of undersea infrastructure.²⁰ Examining this insecurity is important but fixating on the *symptoms* - rather than *causes* - of the damage will yield limited results. In addition to mitigating and repairing the attacked infrastructure, the offenders also need to be held to account.

Hybrid war as a form of aggression

It starts with the recognition that undersea infrastructure is not vulnerable – it is under attack. Undersea cables are designed to sustain extreme marine

conditions and last for decades. They can withstand hydrostatic pressure, saltwater corrosion, and mechanical stress on the ocean floor.²¹

In the technology age, hardening of undersea cables matters, but this focus alone misses the point for two reasons. First, as technology progresses, Russia and China are improving their hybrid threat capabilities.²² China developed a device capable of cutting through the world's most reinforced undersea cables at 4 kilometres depth.²³ Russian spy vessel "Yantar" uses lasers to target pilots and drones that dive down up to 6 kilometres. Yantar has been spotted near the United Kingdom and Ireland: aiming for military planes in British skies²⁴ and previously near internet cables off the Irish waters.²⁵ Second - and perhaps most threatening - Russia may combine cable cut-offs with more aggressive military behaviour. There is proof in the UK²⁶ and Estonia²⁷ that Russia is aided by warplanes and open fire. Russia is also using heavy weaponry in their „civilian“ ships in the Baltic.²⁸

If the EU systematically responds with defensive countermeasures to Russia's offensive hybrid capabilities, they will end up in a perpetual attack cycle. Breaking this cycle requires more strategic consideration on how to affect a change in adversary behaviour.

The EU must legally challenge Russia by recognising that intentional damage perpetuated to critical infrastructure is sabotage and a form of aggression. The EU should establish guiding criteria or principles to assess when aggression that is short of war, yet distinct from wars of aggression, requires criminal accountability. To support this, a common definition of sabotage, hybrid war as a form of aggression, a mechanism for attribution, identification, penalties and enforcement framework is urgently needed. There however seems to be no process for incorporating these elements into the EU's legislation on critical infrastructure protection – at least for now.²⁹

Erosion of international law

The EU's soft response reflects a wider institutional failure to challenge the perpetrators who weaponise international law. According to Swedish security expert Elisabeth Braw, "vessels wishing to deliberately harm undersea infrastructure do so in exclusive economic zones (EEZs). And no, we can't assume we'll be able to coax the ship into territorial waters."³⁰ EPC's own Juraj Majcin explains how "under customary international law and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), states cannot interdict or board ships on the high seas, including within their EEZs, even if they have compelling evidence that a vessel has deliberately severed an undersea cable linked to their country."³¹ If law is weaponised for criminal activities, it fails to fulfil its function.

The EU, Arctic and Baltic nations should adapt national and European legislation to national and regional security concerns. They could make the passage through EEZs conditional on security assessments of the coastal state. Another option is to designate undersea cables as

"installations" under the law of the sea, and to enforce safety regulations. Some international law specialists offer new legal measures and treaties addressing the protection of undersea cables.³² As a minimum, the EU should play a stronger role when projects that carry high EU added value and receive EU taxpayers' money are under threat: it could introduce EU Critical Infrastructure Protection Zones and establish joint investigation teams.

Militarisation of Russia

Moscow's military reconstitution has begun. In June 2026, Norwegian investigative journalists revealed how Russia is expanding the build-up of bases and infrastructure along the Norwegian, Finnish and Baltic borders. Russia has the capacity to deploy 17,000 soldiers by the Norwegian border alone. According to Professor Katarzyna Zyzk, "the build-up is moving faster than many Western intelligence assessments had anticipated." She explains how there had been false "assumptions that Russia would struggle to rebuild while still fighting a major war in Ukraine."³³

US retrenchment

European security in times of war is not a top priority for the US. This is manifesting through reduced US military presence in Romania, Germany, and a withdrawal³⁴ of long-range military capabilities. NATO's command structure is also adapting. Worse yet, the US National Security Strategy 2026, endorsed by Moscow,³⁵ does not portray Russia as a threat, while "the US threat to Greenland left many in the Arctic vulnerable. A seismic shift has happened in Denmark. Around 60% now see the US as adversary."³⁶

3) The Arctic in EU rearmament

These testing times make the integration of Arctic defence into the European defence industrial and technological base (EDITB) indispensable. The prospect of an EU single market for defence and the European Defence Union makes Arctic defence integration all the more important and timely. But the EU must accelerate: the Arctic and Baltic nations must be positioned as prime movers, able to link their geographies and industries against great power rivalry in their region.

Arctic in EU defence industry

The EU initiatives to defragment the European defence industry and integrate with Ukraine through joint military procurement are pivotal for the Arctic. As members of EU's single market, Norway and Iceland are eligible for defence financing from the Security Action for Europe (SAFE), European Defence Fund (EDF) and the European Innovation Council (EIC). Linking Ukraine – whose industry has undergone wartime transformation – but also Canada to the defence industries of the European Arctic would strengthen EU defence readiness, including through situational awareness and defence-critical raw materials.

Situational awareness

Situational awareness – who is around, what is going on, how things may evolve – is a bedrock of civil and military defence. The EU and Arctic states need to perceive and assess threats before they materialise. Yet Arctic nations are dependent for situational awareness on vulnerable undersea communications infrastructure and scarce US space-based capabilities.³⁷

The EU should leverage *bilateral* defence and security partnerships with Arctic nations for improved multi-domain awareness, prioritising maritime and space domains. This involves complete lifecycles of research, test, prototype, integration and deployment of new products for joint intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR). Sensors, radars, drones, underwater robots, icebreaking technology, dual-use satellite technologies – and their fusion, suitable for extreme weather conditions – need to be produced. Of paramount importance is data, and thus investments in data access and security. A *multilateral* dimension of partnerships could also be considered with all Arctic and non-Arctic nations, including NATO. In May 2026, Canada and the Baltic States called for “improved NATO situational awareness and resilience across the Arctic, Baltic Sea and North-Atlantic regions.”³⁸ The EU could also, in coordination with NATO, put forward an overarching Arctic defence and security partnership.

Greenland

The EU must denounce US threats to buy and invade Greenland as illegal. It must throw socio-economic weight in support of Nuuk. By combining respect for local people with investment in socio-economic security, the EU can offer a credible alternative to US President Trump’s deals and reduce EU’s dependence (98%³⁹) on rare earths from China.

The first EU mining investment in Greenland is already emerging with €50 million⁴⁰ and the involvement of a Canadian company, notably for molybdenum metal, vital for Europe’s defence technologies. This shows how EU can punch above its weight with limited resources and offers a template for more ambitious opportunities. As Greenland is key to Europe’s technological independence and geopolitical stability, the EU must propose a long-term joint investment fund for Greenland. Funding and technical support for small local administrations embedded in a people-first culture will set the foundations for stability in the region.

Regional Arctic-Baltic pilot in defence

The Arctic and Baltic nations could serve as pilot testing grounds for a regional defence market and a regional defence union as precursors for EU’s single market for defence and the European Defence Union. This should build on NATO’s regional defence plans and would be a tangible example of the Europeanisation of NATO.

The Arctic and Baltic states could aggregate regional demand for capabilities, remove internal barriers for

defence industrial integration, harmonise standards, rules and supply chains. Drawing on the Nordic-Baltic Eight framework, they could converge ‘total defence’ cultures and improve interoperability of armed forces, leading to a regional Arctic-Baltic force structure. Arctic and Baltic nations could appoint co-leaders to facilitate the process.

The Arctic and Baltic nations could serve as pilot testing grounds for a regional defence market and a regional defence union as precursors for EU’s single market for defence and the European Defence Union. This should build on NATO’s regional defence plans.

The case for a regional Arctic-Baltic defence union is compelling. Russia’s threat to Europe is regional. The Arctic and Baltic regions carry perhaps the highest risk of confrontation with Russia. The case for regional integration is urgent. If the most exposed frontiers do not integrate first, why would the rest of the EU member states and partners do so? The case has political traction. Regional cooperation networks such as the Nordic-Baltic Eight stands united on security. The case also makes economic sense. Baltic markets are smaller, but cheaper, while industrial production is often in the Nordic countries. Examples of integration exist on the ground. The Nordics have already integrated air power into one force.⁴¹ Upgrading NATO Baltic Air Policing into Baltic air warfighting capability could be the next step, followed by a joint Baltic-Nordic air force division. Regional deep tech platforms also exist: the “Nordic Valley - Startup Estonia” already connects Arctic and Baltic governments and startups.

4) Dual-use infrastructure

Arctic infrastructure is a strategic enabler of societal and economic needs. Undersea cables, railway tracks, space satellites and ground stations are the backbone of European security. Considering the competition between great powers for infrastructure, the EU must leverage its regulatory and economic enablement for a robust approach to connectivity and security.

Take Norway for example. According to Norway’s Foreign Minister, “there is no security without people, and there are no people without security.” This means fostering vibrant communities with shared access and responsibility.

Energy

Although the Nordic region is currently rich in energy, future energy demands - with today’s limited grid capacity – are expected to result in energy shortages

by 2030.⁴² The EU can significantly contribute to energy resilience through dedicated investments in grid expansion and capacity, and by building redundancy in the supply and grid network. Targeted investments in research and innovation for renewables and energy infrastructure, combined with the introduction of company regulations to safeguard operations, would immediately strengthen security. When it comes to extractions of Arctic hydrocarbons, the EU should push for a cautionary science-based approach.

Considering the competition between great powers for infrastructure, EU must leverage its regulatory and economic enablement for a robust approach to connectivity and security.

Satellites

Earth observation is a cornerstone of situational awareness. It also provides essential observations on sea-ice coverage and environmental conditions to inform civil and military operations. Longitudinal observations inform about climate change impacts, allowing to better predict future scenarios.

Space-based services are key contributors to both the Arctic and wider European security and resilience. EU space initiatives such as the EU Space Programme, the EU Space Act and Infrastructure for Resilience, Interconnectivity and Security by Satellite (IRIS2) are important contributors to these services. In times when Russia and China are joining forces to expand global influence, they underpin Europe's innovation and technological sovereignty.⁴³ Of paramount importance is data collected through satellites. Data governance, covering sovereignty, access and management, is critical, especially for cross-border data flows. Governance hinges on data stewardship and protection through common standards.

Mobility

Arctic lines of mobility have traditionally been North-South. To enable effective civil-military mobility, it is thus essential to strengthen West-East connectivity – with road networks, railroads and flight routes. This would provide a sustainable multi-use benefit to the free movement of military equipment, personnel and goods.

The trans-European networks for transport (TEN-T) spanning the Scandinavian - Mediterranean as well as North Sea - Baltic Corridor is a case in point. The EU could explore how to further enhance their security dimension by linking both corridors for the purpose of civil-military mobility in the northmost part of Norway, Finland and Sweden. To support secure European trans-

regional mobility, the EU should also be closely involved in NATO planning processes and exercises on civil-military readiness.

5) Comprehensive security

To safeguard vital societal functions, one must look beyond military and hybrid threats and address comprehensive security. This necessitates coordination between official authorities, the private sector, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and broader civil society. To ensure that critical societal functions remain operational during emergencies, capacity must be built in peacetime. The Nordic countries have a long tradition of civil-military defence integration, shaped by history, demographics, and an evolving threat landscape. The EU Preparedness Strategy and the Nordic concept of comprehensive security and total defence are closely aligned. Some gaps however remain.

Information sharing

Information sharing between the public and the private sector is a key requirement for civil-defence integration. It provides shared situational awareness, a joint-up response to emergencies, strengthens search-and-rescue and resilience capabilities. Structures and coordination fora to facilitate joint responses and resilience are however lacking. The EU could use the momentum of the Arctic review to establish an EU-Arctic Civil-Military Coordination Forum to work on civil-military defence capabilities across the Arctic region. Current gaps exist within individual countries, as well as between them. A regional approach would enhance internal coherence, reducing adversaries' room for manoeuvre.

The EU could use the momentum of the Arctic review to establish an EU-Arctic Civil-Military Coordination Forum to work on civil-military defence capabilities across the Arctic region.

NATO-EU coordination

For greater EU-NATO alignment on comprehensive security, the EU Preparedness Strategy needs to integrate NATO's seven baseline requirements for resilience. The EU's Arctic review should align the two frameworks, alongside the concepts, standards and priorities, to generate one synergetic framework for preparedness, with clear roles for public and private institutions.

Stronger institutions

Both public and private institutions play a key role in times of geopolitical turmoil. As carriers and

disseminators of knowledge and information, academia in the Arctic plays a special role in regional security. For example, the role of universities has cascading benefits for regional security and resilience, involving:

- ▶ Research on situational awareness, analysis, and information sharing.
- ▶ Land, sea, and spacebased research infrastructure for monitoring and data.
- ▶ Education that improves regional resilience, supports collaboration, and enables reskilling and upskilling of the local workforce.
- ▶ Attraction of newcomers to the region, supporting demographic sustainability.

Through civil science initiatives, universities harness civilian observation from local and indigenous populations. Arctic academia is a key pillar of comprehensive security and should be strengthened. This civic and comprehensive approach builds holistic resilience.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

With rising threats amid great power competition, the EU should consider the following actions for its forthcoming Arctic policy review:

Climate security

- ▶ **Articulate the connections** between climate and military security.
- ▶ **Adapt military-civilian operations** to the extreme environment and modernise forces, equipment, recruitment, and training to Arctic-specific conditions.
- ▶ **Establish a comprehensive and robust policy framework** that addresses current and future climate-related security challenges.

Security landscape

- ▶ **Reassess the security landscape**, highlighting the impact of Russia's war against Ukraine, US retrenchment, and great power play, compounded by climate change.
- ▶ **Approach the Atlantic, Arctic and Baltic as a single security area** based on geographical and operational considerations.
- ▶ **Accelerate action against short-term risks in 2026-2028**, while also maintaining a longer-term vision.

Hybrid and military threat

- ▶ **Prioritise** the fight against Russian hybrid warfare.

- ▶ **Share with Norway, Iceland and Canada** the EU Undersea Cable Action Plan and its mitigation measures as best practices.
- ▶ **Establish a new Regional Cable Hub for the Arctic** that complements the existing Regional Cable Hub in the Baltic.
- ▶ **Treat hybrid attacks as sabotage and a form of aggression.** Establish guiding criteria or principles to assess when aggression that is short of war, yet distinct from wars of aggression, requires criminal accountability. Agree common definitions and design a mechanism for attribution, identification, penalties and enforcement.
- ▶ **Tighten national and European law** on the grounds of national and regional security. Make passage through EEZs conditional; designate undersea cables as "installations" to enforce safety regulations; explore new legal measures on undersea cable protection.
- ▶ **Play a stronger role** in projects that carry high EU added value and receive EU taxpayers' money.

Arctic in EU rearmament

- ▶ **Integrate the Arctic in the EU's defence industrial and technological base** and increase investment in regional Arctic military capabilities.
- ▶ **Improve situational awareness** through a full life cycle of research, test, prototype, integration and deployment of new technologies – and their fusion.
- ▶ **Create a joint investment fund for Greenland.** Use the first EU mining project as a model for more ambitious socio-economic investment. Embed it in a people-first culture, with technical support for small local administrations.
- ▶ **Create a pilot for a regional Arctic-Baltic market** and union for defence as precursors for EU's single market for defence and the European Defence Union.

Dual-use infrastructure

- ▶ **Enhance the security dimension** of TEN-T by linking the Scandinavian - Mediterranean and North Sea - Baltic Corridors for improved civil-military mobility.
- ▶ **Coordinate with NATO** the harmonisation of activities related to civil-military readiness.
- ▶ **Invest in energy grid capacity**, increasing redundancy in supply; invest research and innovation funds in renewables and energy infrastructure.
- ▶ **Invest in space infrastructure** to foster space industry and capacity.
- ▶ **Enhance Arctic-based data governance, access and use.**

Comprehensive security

- ▶ **Close the gaps** between EU Preparedness Strategy and Nordic models.
- ▶ **Establish an EU–Arctic Civil–Military Coordination Forum.**
- ▶ **Expand public–private mechanisms for information-sharing.**
- ▶ **Align EU and NATO frameworks for preparedness** by integrating NATO’s seven baseline requirements for resilience into the EU’s Preparedness Strategy.
- ▶ **Increase EU support for Arctic universities** as a pillar of comprehensive security.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS / DISCLAIMER

This Policy Brief draws on desk research and findings from a closed-door expert Arctic roundtable held in May 2026. It is part of the EPC’s project of Northern Europe Platform (NEP).

The authors would like to thank Karen van Loon from Clingendael - the Netherlands Institute of International Relations, and Iro Särkkä from the Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA), for valuable input to earlier activities that contributed to this paper.

The support the European Policy Centre receives for its ongoing operations, or specifically for its publications, does not constitute an endorsement of their contents, which reflect the views of the authors only. Supporters and partners cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

- ¹ Lunday, Chris, [“We must be ready to fight”: Germany army chief warns of rising Russia threat – POLITICO](#) *Politico*, 11 June 2026.
- ² Kubilius, Andrius, [EU WARNING: Intelligence Says Russia Could TEST Article 5 Within 3 Years – Kubilius Sounds the Alarm](#), *EU Debates*, 30 January 2026.
- ³ J. R. Maynard et al (2010). Russia, FSU and the Circum-Arctic: the final frontier. In: Geological Society, London, Volume 7 of Petroleum Geology Conference Series, pp. 589 – 590.
- ⁴ Østhagen, Andreas (2023), [Five misconceptions in Arctic Security and Geopolitics](#), *The Arctic Institute*, accessed 23 July 2026.
- ⁵ NATO (2024). The Secretary General's Report: [NATO Climate Change and Security Impact Assessment](#), pp.1-32.
- ⁶ Marisol Maddox (2023) *Implications of Climate Change for Military Operations in the Arctic*. In: Friis, K., Wilson Rowe, E., Sfraga, M. and Sverdrup, U., (eds.) *Report: Navigating Breakup: Security Realities of Freezing Politics and Thawing Landscapes in the Arctic*. Input Report for the Arctic Security Roundtable at the Munich Security Conference 2023. Available at: [MSC ASR Input Report 2023 Navigating Breakup.pdf](#).
- ⁷ Goodmann, Sherri et al (2021) [Climate Change and Security in the Arctic](#), *The Center for Climate and Security, Institute of the Council on Strategic Risks and Norwegian Institute of International Affairs*, p.1-23.
- ⁸ European Commission (2025), [Statement by President von der Leyen with Icelandic Prime Minister Kristrún Frostadóttir](#), accessed 23 July 2026.
- ⁹ Schalin, Johan; Arts, Sophie (2026), [“Bracing for a Cold Front: Assessing Russian and Chinese strategic objectives and hybrid threat capabilities in the Arctic”](#), *The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats*, Paper 28-8, pp.1-44.; Østhagen, Andreas (2023), [The Arctic after Russia's invasion of Ukraine: The increased risk of conflict and hybrid threats](#), *The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats*, Paper 18-15, pp.1-20.
- ¹⁰ Hansen, Flemming Splidsboel (2025), [“Russian military thinking about the Baltic Sea and the Arctic”](#), *Danish Institute for International Studies*, p.1-4, accessed 16 July 2026.
- ¹¹ Miklesaar, Anniki (2025), [“Incidents with High North Fibre Optic Cables,”](#) JSTOR: Ruptures at the Top of the World: High North Network Infrastructure Protection, pp.6-10.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Gulldahl, Håvard; Eriksen, Inghild [“This is what the damaged Svalbard cable looked like when it came up from the depths,”](#) *Norsk rikskringkasting (NRK)*, 26 November 2024.
- ¹⁴ Bryjka, Filip; Dwyer, Anna Maria; Kozioł, Aleksandra, (2026), [“White Paper on Russian Acts of Sabotage and Subversion against Members of the Council of the Baltic Sea States,”](#) *The Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM)*, 29 May 2026.
- ¹⁵ Schalin, Johan; Arts, Sophie (2026), [“Bracing for a Cold Front: Assessing Russian and Chinese strategic objectives and hybrid threat capabilities in the Arctic”](#), *The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats*, Paper 28-8, pp.1-44.
- ¹⁶ European Commission (2026), [Report on Resilient Submarine Cable Infrastructures: Submarine Cable Security Toolbox and Cable Projects of European Interests](#).
- ¹⁷ Reuters, [EU to spend nearly a billion euros to protect undersea cables | Reuters](#), accessed 14 July 2026.
- ¹⁸ European Commission (2026), [Report on Resilient Submarine Cable Infrastructures: Submarine Cable Security Toolbox and Cable Projects of European Interests](#).
- ¹⁹ European Commission, [Commission funds first Regional Cable Hubs and launches €40 million call for cable repair facility](#), accessed 17 July 2026.
- ²⁰ Pohoryles, Daniel, (2025), [“Risks and protection of subsea cable networks,”](#) Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg; Braw, Elisabeth, [“Let's get creative to protect undersea cables from sabotage,”](#) *Politico*, 23 January 2025; House of Commons; the House of Lords - UK Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy, [“Subsea telecommunications cables: resilience and crisis preparedness,”](#) First Report of Session 2024–26, 15 September 2025.
- ²¹ Fibconet, [“What is a subsea fiber optic cable?”](#) 12 March 2026.
- ²² The Jamestown Foundation (2026), [“Strategic snapshot: Russia - PRC Technology and Hybrid Operations”](#); Schalin, Johan; Arts, Sophie (2026), [“Bracing for a Cold Front: Assessing Russian and Chinese strategic objectives and hybrid threat capabilities in the Arctic”](#), *The European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats*, Paper 28-8, pp.1-44.; Braw, Elisabeth, [“Russia's Baltic Sea Cable Sabotage Could Endanger European Energy,”](#) *Foreign Policy*, 3 January 2025.
- ²³ *The Economic Times*, [“China unveils underwater 'kill switch' for the internet,”](#) 29 March 2025.
- ²⁴ Gardner, Frank, *BBC News*, [Yantar: How serious is the Russian spy ship move?](#) 19 November 2025.
- ²⁵ *Naval News*, [“Russian Spy Ship Yantar Loitering Near Trans-Atlantic Internet Cables,”](#) accessed 16 July 2026.
- ²⁶ *The Guardian*, [“Russian warship carried out firing exercise off Plymouth coast,”](#) accessed 21 July 2026; [“Why did a Russian frigate fire warning shots and what can the UK do about it?”](#) accessed 16 July 2026.
- ²⁷ *Helsinki Times*, [“Estonia warns Russia may defend shadow fleet with force after airspace breach,”](#) 15 May 2025.
- ²⁸ Pinster, Jesse, [“Photos reveal Russian gas tanker with heavy machine guns as Baltic tensions rise,”](#) *Follow the Money*, 29 June 2026.
- ²⁹ European Commission, EUR-Lex: Access to European Union Law, [European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection](#), COM(2006) 786 final, accessed 16 July 2026.
- ³⁰ Braw, Elisabeth, [“Let's get creative to protect undersea cables from sabotage,”](#) *Politico*, 23 January 2025.
- ³¹ Majcin, Juraj, [Battle of the Baltic: Safeguarding critical undersea infrastructure](#), European Policy Centre (EPC), 22 April 2025.
- ³² Lott, Alexander (2025), [“Unconventional legal approaches to protecting underwater infrastructure”](#), The Hague: The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies, pp.1-16; Takei, Yoshonobu (2012), [Law and Policy for International Submarine Cables: An Asia-Pacific Perspective](#), *Asian Journal of International Law*, Volume 2, Issue, 2 pp. 205 – 233; Kamara, Osman Keh; Kazmir, Abraham (2025), [“Enhancing International Legal Protections for Undersea Cables and Transoceanic Pipelines,”](#) *The Federal Communications Law Journal (FCLJ)*, Volume 77, Issue 3, pp. 225 – 254.
- ³³ Zysk, Katarzyna, *LinkedIn*, 10 June 2026.
- ³⁴ Jack, Victor, [US to pull jets, destroyers and submarines from NATO as part of European drawdown](#), 26 May 2026.
- ³⁵ BBC News, [New US security strategy aligns with Russia's vision, Moscow says](#), 7 December 2025.
- ³⁶ Parello-Plesner, Jonas, [The Case of Greenland: Insights, recommendations, and next steps](#), *European Policy Centre (EPC)*, January 2026.
- ³⁷ Vidhammer Berge, Jonas (2024), [Addressing Arctic Vulnerabilities: Lessons from Ukraine](#), Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 17 December 2024.
- ³⁸ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, [Joint Statement of the Fourth Canada–Baltics “3+1” Foreign Ministers’ Meeting](#), 20 May 2026.
- ³⁹ Vigna, Anna Chiara (2023), [“The EU's dependence on Chinese rare earths: Assessing the potential for trade weaponization,”](#) Publications Office of the European Union, accessed 28 July 2026.
- ⁴⁰ *Financial Times*, [Greenland Resources Provides Update on EUR 50 Million Equity Investment Led by Horizon Europe](#), 27 April 2026.
- ⁴¹ Finnish Air Force, [Four Nordic Air Forces Fighting as One](#), 3 March 2025.
- ⁴² Rønning Birkelund, Helge, [“Det er full kraftkrise i nord. LO ber alle kommuner se etter muligheter for ny strømproduksjon,”](#) 7 May 2026.
- ⁴³ Legarda, Helena, [“The Arctic, outer space and influence-building: China and Russia join forces to expand in new strategic frontiers,”](#) *MERICS*, 22 October 2025.

