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ABSTRACT

The master thesis is about the Nord-Stream gas pipeline from Russia to Germany, which will cross the Baltic Sea and go through territorial waters of Denmark, Finland and Sweden. Nord-Stream is a complex project with different stakeholders and different interests. The main focus of the study is the representation of the Nord-Stream project in the media of Russia and Sweden as stakeholders in the deal. The period of media representation is 2009.
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Introduction

1.1. Background

The Master Thesis is about the representation of Nord-Stream project in media of Russia and Sweden. Nord-Stream is a project of a gas pipeline construction from Russia to Germany through the Baltic Sea. The construction of the pipeline started in April, 2010 and temporarily is under construction. Why is Sweden in the study? Sweden is in the study, because the pipeline will cross the exclusive economic zone of this country and the island of Gotland has become a logistical centre for the technical support for the pipeline construction. Sweden also is a stakeholder in the project, as the state has given permission to Nord-Stream consortium in 2009 for the pipeline construction on its naval territory.

As it will be seen further, Nord-Stream is not only a pipeline project. The change of the pipeline route project, political debates in all countries of the Baltic Sea and in European Union have been important aspects of the Nord-Stream project.

Nord-Stream is a complex project with many stakeholders having different interests. The project has many sides, but the thesis will be focused on the media representation of the project, because media is a called a fourth authority and media is quite important in any society. The aim of the thesis is to see how the project is represented in two countries.

Nord-Stream is a project for a gas pipeline which will go from Russia (Vyborg) to Germany (Geifswald) through the Baltic Sea. In 2005 Nord Stream AG was set up in Switzerland to engineer, construct and operate the gas pipeline.

The 1,223-kilometer Nord Stream gas pipeline will cross territorial waters of Finland, Sweden and Denmark. The annual capacity of the gas pipeline will reach 55 billion cubic meters. The Nord Stream gas pipeline is a fundamentally new route of Russian gas export to Europe (Nord-Stream, 2009). The target markets for gas supply via the Nord Stream are Germany, the UK, the Netherlands, France and Denmark.
At present, Nord Stream AG shareholdings are split in the following way: Gazprom (Russia) – 51 per cent, Wintershall Holding AG (Germany) – 20 per cent, E.ON Ruhrgas AG (Germany) – 20 per cent, Gasunie (The Netherlands) – 9 per cent.

Permission for the construction of the pipeline was required from Finland, Sweden and Denmark in accordance with the legislation of the countries. The pipeline route was selected after the evaluation of technical, environmental and economic aspects. The final route was optimized after a consultation process with the Baltic Sea littoral states extending over several years (Nord-Stream, 2009). The pipeline will traverse the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) and territorial waters of Russia (123 km), Denmark (137 km) and Germany (81 km), as well as the EEZs of Finland (375 km) and Sweden (506 km).

Nord Stream is not a usual investment project; it is connected with other important issues, including the environment factor, the balance between long and short term benefits. Researching the Nord-Stream as a project it is necessary to know its pro and cons. The problem is that it is not one-side project and not all involved into decision-making are agreeable. The Nord-Stream is more than a pipeline. There are different stakeholders involved in the project, and their goals are even controversial. Nord Stream is a complex project, that’s why there are different problems. The process of decision-making in this case is limited by the time pressure and not so many existing alternatives. Furthermore, the beginning of 2009 was marked by the disruption of gas supplies to Europe, which made citizens of some countries to stay in cold in winter days. And actually this was not the only case when the European gas consumers became the ‘hostages’ of Russian-Ukrainian transit disagreements.

1.2. Nord-Stream from Swedish (Gotlandic) perspective

The pipeline will be dragged near the island of Gotland, where the local industrial port in Slite is a logistics centre for the delivery of required materials and pipes. Temporarily, Slite port is receiving pipes by the ships.

In 2007 Nord Stream and Gotland’s Community were discussing improvements to the Port of Slite, which Nord Stream proposed to use as a logistics base for its pipeline project. The idea was that Slite could become a ferry port after finishing work on the pipeline. Dirk von Ameln, Deputy Technical Director of Nord Stream said: “For Nord Stream, use of the Port of Slite would mean both economic and environmental advantages. The location of the port ensures minimal transportation distances, reducing environmental impacts and shortening the process of laying the pipeline on the seabed.” (Nord-Stream, 2009)

Nord Stream regarded the use of Slite on the island of Gotland as both economically and environmentally beneficial (Nord-Stream, 2009). Its location would enable short transport distances to the pipeline route (the alternative would have been a port on the Swedish mainland or in another Baltic state (Nord-Stream, 2009). The advantage of the rather short distance from the pipeline route would be the substantial reduction of the volume of shipping and the resulting environmental impact. Moreover, Nord Stream has contributed to upgrading the port at Slite. Gotland could thereby benefit from an alternative port to Visby and would be able in the future to use the new port facilities for ferry connections, in particular to Poland and other Baltic states. The local authorities received enquiries for such routes and recognized them (Nord-Stream, 2009). According to Nord-Stream Company, in addition to the temporary positive effects during the construction of the pipeline, the investments would also bring long-term advantages for Gotland. (Nord-Stream, 2009). Usually in the tourist season all ferries are fully booked. In the course of the project, the investments in and the operation of the port and the stock yard would bring additional employment gains.

“At Nord Stream, we are very pleased to propose investments that would be beneficial for
Gotland. Apart from the jobs created during the construction phase, the improvements to the Port of Slite will establish a new ferry port that will have lasting benefits for business and tourism in Gotland”, said Dirk von Ameln. That’s why Nord-Stream looked forward to hold constructive discussions with the Gotland Community regarding the Slite harbor. The suggested investments would provide convenient storage, harbour and transportation facilities needed.

The reconstructed port has a water depth of eight meters with a new 150 meter long and 30 meter wide quay. In light of the limited area available at the port, Nord Stream has developed a special, customized pipe-handling concept for Slite (Nord-Stream, 2009). Pipe segments were shipped over the longer distance from Mukran (Germany) by larger vessels. From there, they are being transferred on a “just-in-time” basis across the pier to smaller special ships that will deliver them to the pipe lay barge. It is innovative ship-to-ship handling system that makes it possible to use Slite, whose location is ideal from a logistics point of view (Nord-Stream, 2009). The Gotland municipality received payment about SEK 70 Mln from Nord-Stream AG (the exact sum is a secret) which was invested into modernization and deepening of Slite harbor.

Upgrading the Port of Slite has brought some jobs to Gotland. Nord Stream estimated using Slite as a logistics base would mean approximately 80 jobs for at least 20 months during construction, of which 55 could be filled locally in Gotland. Yes, for Gotland with 57 thousand population and the existing rate of unemployment, the work places would be not extra.

Besides improving Slite harbor, Nord-Stream supported other projects on Gotland. One of them was the ‘Underwater Heritage – Maritime Archaeology on Gotland’, focused on detailed survey, documentation and excavation of shipwrecks on the Baltic seabed near the island and initiated by the Swedish archaeological company Aqua Arkeologen Sverige together with the County Museum of Gotland and Gotlands Havsgille (Nord-Stream, 2009). For Nord Stream, this project gave an opportunity to demonstrate its responsible approach to underwater research, especially since Nord Stream was carrying out the most comprehensive seabed survey ever done in preparation for the underwater natural gas pipeline across the Baltic Sea (Nord-Stream, 2009). Historical sources from the last 250 years indicated that more than 2,500 ships wrecked around the island, but only about 100 wrecks have been found. Only some few wrecks and remains have been archaeologically excavated, making the project very unusual and interesting (Nord-Stream, 2009).

One more project supported by Nord-Stream was at Gotland Museum in Visby. Also Nord-Stream supported a project on birds (alfåglar in Swedish) and the Baltic Sea bottom research at Gotland University, though the last project dropped a gentle hint on the freedom and independence of the research.

One important issue around Nord-Stream and Gotland is environment. The impact of eventual accident on the Baltic Sea and even land could be harmful. The County Administrative Board of Gotland noted that in a number of areas, e.g. Hoburgs and Midsjo Banks, in connection to the laying of the pipeline, it would be necessary to stabilize the pipeline using dumped masses of material in order to prevent freely suspended spans of pipe across valleys in the sea floor (Nord-Stream, 2009). The Environmental Impact Assessment contained a description of the monitoring that was required for the pipeline, particularly in connection to these areas, because any settling of the bottom material might affect the stability of the pipeline. A leak from the pipeline could have devastating consequences. The Environmental Impact Assessment must illuminate the risks this may bring in comparison with previous alternatives, both during the construction phase and the operational phase (Nord-Stream, 2009). In other respects, the County Administrative Board referred to its statement “Opinions on documentation for Environmental Impact Assessment for Nord Stream Gas Pipeline”. Decisions on this case had been made by Christian Runeby, strategic manager, in the light of reports by Lars Vallin, Water and Fisheries.
Other important environmental aspects are animal life and ammunition. Fish and birds are the most important species in the Baltic Sea. For these species, information was collated concerning important breeding, nursery and migration areas, followed by an impact description in view of the planned gas pipeline. Consequences for the fishing industry should also be elucidated fully for the areas of the parties of origin. The Baltic Sea is a ‘local arena’ for Scandinavian fishing industry and there is a fear that the industrial equipment could ‘catch the pipe’ and thus create unpredictable consequences. Since many fish species have wide patterns of dispersal from actual breeding grounds, a negative impact in, for instance, the breeding grounds of the southern Baltic could be of consequence for a large part of the Swedish fishing industry.

Ammunition and chemical weapons from the World War II which are still left on the bottom of the Baltic Sea is to be exploded. Some of old mines were exploded in 2009 and some of the mines are to be exploded in the future. The danger is that the mines are movable in water and anytime they can undermine pipeline with gas. So the old mines around the pipeline are supposed to be exploded.

As it is known, the shipping across the Baltic Sea is both passenger and industrial. Vessels are going from Scandinavian counties to the east, to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, to the South to Poland and Germany, and the pipeline is to be constructed taking into consideration all these vessels’ routes.

1.3. Problem Formulation

As it was stated by the Nord-Stream AG, the ‘pipeline route is is a fundamentally new route of Russian gas export to Europe’. The Aim of Nord-Stream pipeline construction is to diversify the existing gas pipelines, to enhance the volumes of gas export to Western Europe, and diminish the influence of political factor on the gas delivery (Nord-Stream, 2009). Such political factor is created by the discrepancies between Ukraine and Russia regarding the transition.

Irrespective of existing and developing sources of renewable energy, European energy consumers are still highly dependent on the imported gas, which creates the necessity for the pipeline construction.

However, Sweden and Gotland are obviously not particularly interested in importing of gas from the Nord-Stream in future because of the other existing sources of energy.

When Poland, Latvia and Lithuania refused to give permission for the pipeline construction in their territorial waters; the route of the pipeline was changed. So the territorial waters of Scandinavian countries have become an alternative route for the pipeline dragging. And according to the International Marine Law, any company is obliged to ask for permission in a country on whose territorial waters the pipeline is to be constructed. Nord-Stream had to receive the ‘green light’ on building from Finland, Sweden and Denmark. But the process of decision-making in these states concerning the permission was not simple. There had been a lot of debates in Scandinavian countries and particularly in Sweden. Even the European Parliament conducted discussing concerning Nord-Stream, characterizing it as of a vital strategic significance, but at the same time as questionable from ecological point of view. European Parliament voted against the Nord-Stream project. 543 European parliamentarians
voted for the resolution and no more than 60 opposed it. At the same time the European Parliament recognized the project as strategically important for Europe.

But despite of all disagreements, the Nord-Stream AG has done significant paces towards the project development: it succeeded to persuade the authorities of Finland, Sweden and Denmark to give permission on the construction in November 2009. The construction of the pipeline has started in April 2010, and the first pipeline is supposed to start transportation of gas already in 2011.

Knowing these facts it is interesting to see how the Nord-Stream was represented in media of Russia and Sweden during 2009, the year of granting-receiving of the permission on the gas pipeline construction. It is interesting to observe how differently the same project can be described in two countries. Perhaps, the description derives from the meaning of the project to a certain country…

1.3. Purpose of the Thesis and Research questions

I wrote this paper because there was a need for a more critical examination of the ways that media were considered within the project description. The thesis was written to provide an overview of Russian and Swedish media within the topic of the Nord-Stream gas pipeline. The purpose is to examine how the Nord-Stream is described in the media of Russia and Sweden. Here are the following research questions:
- What kind of project is Nord-Stream?
- Who are the stakeholders in the project?
- How to map the stakeholders?
- How is the Nord-Stream project described in Russian media?
- How is the Nord-Stream project described in Swedish media?
- What issues concerning the project are highlighted more in the media of each country?

2. Methodology

2.1. The Method of Research

In order to make a research of media representation, two methods will be used for the research of the study. The first method will be content analysis and the other method will be comparison.

‘Content analysis is an approach to the analysis of documents and texts that seeks to quantify content in terms of predetermined categories and in systematic and replicable manner. It is a very flexible method that can be applied to a variety of media. In a sense, it is not a research method, in that it is an approach to the analysis of documents and texts rather than a means of generating data. But it is usually used as a research method because of its distinctive approach to analysis’ (Bryman, Bell, 2007). Content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication (Berelson, 1952:18). Content analysis is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (Holsti, 1969:14).

Bryman and Bell write that ‘many studies of the mass media entail the specification of a research problem in the form of the ‘representation of X in the mass media’. They ask which media is better to focus on, for example, newspapers television, radio etc. Then Bryman categorizes the source, for example, the newspaper can be of different types, like a tabloid, or broadsheet, or Sunday newspaper. In me thesis I will use national newspapers and one journal.

Also the method of comparison will be used in order to compare the representation of the project in Russia and Sweden. I shall compare the media between two countries in order to see what
the media write about and what do the media highlight more about the Nord-Stream. I shall compare how the media describe the project, what are the main issues described in the media. The project is one, but as it will become clear from the empirical findings, the representation will not be the same in two countries. Perhaps there is a link between the representation and the meaning of the project to the countries.

Both methods of the study, the content analysis and the comparative method are necessary tools to answer all research questions.

2.2. Collection of Data

The data was collected from different media sources (newspapers and a journal) in order to see a broader picture of the project representation. The data was collected from 2009, because 2009 was the year when the Nord-Stream consortium received permission for pipeline construction from three countries, Denmark, Finland and Sweden. It is interesting to see the development of events during 2009. At the beginning of the year countries were unsure if to give permission, and in the end of the year all permissions were given to the Nord-Stream. Simultaneously, there had been a lot of debates around such decision. In Sweden, theoretically, it would be necessary to analyze local Gotlandic media, because the Nord-Stream is in fact more important for Gotland than for Sweden in general. However, I will not analyze the Gotlandic newspapers, because their content is not different from the national newspapers. In Russia I will research national media, and a marine journal.

2.3. Validity

In the theoretical part of thesis I will refer to the literature of experts in the area of project management. I will take into consideration their works, describing complex projects in order to prove that Nord-Stream is really a complex project. Also, I will write about stakeholders of the project and their conflicts of interests. Theory of media representation deserves and requires attention as well. In these three parts of theoretical framework I will rely upon existing works of experts. However in the very empirical part the validity of media is quite tricky concept, because the representation in two countries is different in fact. How can one know the truth and trust by 100 percent to the media? To my mind, the representation derives from the interests of the countries, and the interests of the countries are different. Logically, it is not so strange that the representation is different too.

2.4. Limitations

The master thesis covers only media representation of 2009. Also, 6 Russian newspapers and 1 journal, 5 Swedish newspapers were selected for the study. In Sweden the Gotlandic newspapers were not included into the study, because their content is actually not different from national newspapers. But still, Swedish newspapers have the same trend, that is they highlight the same issues. In Russia, all selected newspapers have similar articles too.

3. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I will analyze the theories of complex projects, stakeholders and media representation in order to describe and explain the attributes of the Nord-Stream project.

3.1. Theory of Complex Projects

What kind of project is Nord-Stream? The answer is ‘a complex project’. In order to prove that the Nord-Stream is really a complex project, it is necessary to define the term of ‘complex project’ and to find out its features. For this aim it is necessary to review the works of experts in the area of project management.

The synonyms for the term complex are difficult, complicated, intricate, involved, tangled, and knotty, etc. Commonly the project management literature uses the term loosely, for instance when describing the “web of relationships” among project stakeholders that need to be
managed (Ng A. and Loosemore 2007). Projects themselves have been described as complex systems that require management (Dombkins 2006, Shenhar 2001). Shenhar (2001) and Williams (1999), not only because they deal with technological issues but because they deal with the wider organizational factors largely beyond the project manager’s control (Xia 2004).

According to the definition of Bar-Yam (2003), the complexity is a measure of the inherent difficulty to achieve the desired understanding of a complex system. A complex system is a system formed out of many components whose behavior is emergent and the behavior of a complex system cannot be simply inferred from the behaviour of its components (Bar-Yam, 2003). Complexity theory has been liberally applied in many disciplines as disparate as astronomy, biology, physics and finance in an attempt to solve complex problem (Ziemelis, 2001). Baccarini (1996) proposes a definition of project complexity as “consisting of many varied interrelated parts”, which he operates in terms of differentiation—the number of varied elements—and interdependency—the degree of interrelatedness between these elements (or connectivity).

Jones (Jones and Deckro, 1993) defined a concept of ‘technical complexity’, which is characterized by the variety of tasks, the degree of interdependencies within these tasks. The complexity in the project comes not only from individual structural elements and their interaction, but also from the dynamic effects of each of these changing and then interacting as they change, causing further change in other parts of the system (Maylor, Vidgen, 2007). Diehl and Sterman, (1995) showed how decision-making suffers under conditions of dynamic and the more complex the type of interdependency, the greater the added complexity. Thus complexity is a variable rather than a binary commodity, and without measures for it, is a term that is less than helpful, particularly when being used to prescribe what is and is not a complex project (Whitty, 2005 and Cicmil et al. 2006). While many project managers use the term a complex project, there is no clear definition about what is meant beyond the general acceptance that it is something more than simply a ‘big’ project (Williams, 1999).

In a world where projects represent an increasingly important organizational and economic unit, the capability of generating and executing projects becomes critical for company performance and sustainability of firm-level competitiveness (Söderlund et al. 2008).

Dombkins (2006) defines the characteristics of complex projects. He uses the language of complexity science such as open, dynamic, recursive, non-linear feedback, and emergent, however these are not the characteristics of the projects cited in the definition. A game of chess is used by Dombkins (2006) to exemplify dynamic complexity where parts of the system can react and interact. However, chess is a two player, time and turn based game, with a clear set of deterministic rules. The system is not open. It is played on a square board of eight rows and eight columns, extra squares never emerge.

There also other characteristics of complex projects. Lilliesköld (2006), for example stated that complex projects are likely to change. And Nord-Stream is not exception, because first the dragging was planned to be near Poland and Baltic states, but later near Gotland. Whitty and Maylor (2009) state almost similar hypothesis that unforeseen events are inevitable to some degree in almost all projects.

One more characteristics according to Häggren (2007) is that projects are often run concurrently, with tight deadlines, and no slack available to absorb delays that’s why, projects are vulnerable for disturbances and dealing with project deviations are thus a daily practice within complex projects.
Testing the definition of complex projects, (Dombkins, 2006) cited that ‘If one considers the projects have managed e.g. gas and oil pipelines, railroads, flight control centres, to name a few, one immediately sees that these systems are not necessarily complex’.

Uncertainty is also a characteristic of complex projects. High levels of uncertainty may indicate a dynamically complex project, but this does not provide an exclusive definition – many small and relatively simple projects could be classified as complex projects by this definition (Williams 1999). The idea of uncertainty is discussed by Turner and Cochran (1993). They classify projects by two parameters: how well defined the goals are, and how well-defined are the methods of achieving those goals - a classification arrived at by a number of authors. They then identify four distinct types of project, depending on whether the goals are well- or ill-defined, and whether the methods are well- or ill-defined, and suggest different management and particularly different project start-up methods. It is suggested that these two types of uncertainty bring two dimensions of added complexity to projects.

Uncertainty in methods is related to complexity. For example, Shenhar (Shenhar and Dvir, 1993) distinguished among good management styles and practices for different types of projects. But while uncertainty in the methods brings about one element of added complexity, even when the methods are known, another dimension of added complexity comes about when there is uncertainty in the goals. The essential difficulty with complex projects is that the requirements are not frozen, and uncertainty or changes in some requirements will mean that interfacing elements also need to change, and again there are cross-impacts, re-work, feedback-loops—an increase in the features of structural complexity. Indeed, the ‘freezing’ and ‘un-freezing’ of sub-systems formed a central part of the Channel Tunnel model described in Williams (Williams, Eden, Ackermann and Tait, 1995). Many of these results in practice are called ‘Delay and Disruption’. (Wozniek's (1993) ‘clarity of scope definition’ is presumably similar to Goals Uncertainty. A key element of the added complexity brought about by the changes or modifications that results from uncertainty in goals, is that these changes often cause two separate increases in complexity. In evaluating such a project, then, not only does the product complexity have to be taken into account, but also the increase in product complexity throughout the life of the project (Ackermann et al. 1996), remembering that the effect on the project of many changes is more than the sum of the effects of each change individually (Williams, Eden, Ackermann and Tait, 1995).

Baccarini (1996) stressed the importance of the concept of complexity to the project manager, and its role in the strategic management of projects. He also stated referencing Morris and Hough (1987), that “complex projects demand an exceptional level of management, and that the application of conventional systems developed for ordinary projects have been found to be inappropriate for complex projects”.

According to Velde and Donk (2002), complex projects can have extra costs and communication, time pressure and, of course, additional complications in project control. As a general rule, one might argue that changes in the process-oriented part save money or yield a better solution in a qualitative sense, while adaptations in the construction-related part cost extra money and time (Velde and Donk, 2002). In general, who will pay these extra costs will depend upon a combination of things such as contracts and negotiation. Usually, project management in consists of the following elements, as proposed in the literature. The first is whether the project meets its goals in terms of time, cost and quality will be monitored throughout the project (Van Den Honert, Broersma, 1997 and Wijnen, Renes, Storm, 1988). The second is a combination of written information and verbal commitments used, where agreements are primarily made during institutionalized meetings. In addition, ad
hoc communication is important as well; it is in fact essential to exchange the information needed to perform the interrelated activities. Agreements are written down as much as possible to function as contracts and plans that reduce uncertainty. As visualized written information, technical drawings play an important role in the communication between the client organization and the engineers. The drawings are internally, as well as externally, revised at several stages during the project. They illustrate the reduction of uncertainty, combined with a growing insight into technical details.

Project management in large industrial construction projects deals with a high degree of uncertainty and risk. Risk management has generally been recognized as an important area in construction (Akinsola et al., 1997) and it is especially relevant to investigate the nature of the uncertainties. Basically, there are two kinds of technological uncertainty. The first uncertainty is the possibility that the starting points for the whole project are challenged. Examples are changes in the markets served by the client organization, discovery of fundamental new technologies, changes in legislation, etc. The second uncertainty is the nature of the production process related engineering, as mentioned, because growing insights and continuous optimization of the production process during detailed engineering will reveal better solutions which cause unexpected changes in the construction part.

Both of these uncertainty measures are probably difficult to operate into a quantifiable parameter. The vagueness of the goals might be measurable by how long it would take to establish whether the goals were satisfied; changes in goals could perhaps be measured in terms of contract changes. It is not obvious to Akinsola et al. (1997) how uncertainty in methods could be operated, beyond vague terms such as ‘newness of technology’. It appears to be an accepted fact that the complexity of projects is increasing (even if complexity has not often been defined).

Williams (1995) points to two compounding causes for projects increasing in (structural) complexity. The first derives from the relationship between product complexity and project complexity discussed above. The second cause compounds this increasing structural complexity. Projects have tended to become more time-constrained, (Clarke, 1994) and the ability to deliver a project quickly is becoming increasingly important. Furthermore, there is an increasing emphasis on tight contracts, using prime contractorship to pass time-risk onto the contractor, frequently with heavy liquidated damages for lateness. As projects become shorter in duration, this enforces parallelism and concurrency, which by definition increases project complexity further. The increasing desire to reduce ‘time to market' times, and the subsequent development of the field of Concurrent Engineering (which aims to support the integrated, concurrent design of products and their related processes, including manufacture and support) is well-described in textbooks such as Syan and Menon (1994).

Laufer (Laufer, Denker and Shenhar, 1996) characterized the last 4 decades of project management by an evolution of models appropriate to changing dominant project characteristics: he characterized the 1960s by scheduling (control), for simple, certain projects; the 1970s by teamwork (integration) and the 1980s for reducing uncertainty (flexibility), both for complex, uncertain projects, and the 1990s by simultaneity (dynamism) for complex, uncertain and quick projects—in other words, the very elements defined as ‘Complexity'.
Having defined the term of complexity, it is clear that classical project management techniques are unsuitable for dealing with such projects. For structural uncertainty, decomposition models do not account for the compounding effects when individual perturbations accumulate in a project; Williams, Eden, Ackermann and Tait, (1995) cannot deal with feed-back loops; Ackermann, Eden, Williams, 1996 do not account for the systemic, holistic effects that are present in structurally complex projects; Williams (1995) is not able to deal with goal- or method-uncertainty (Turner and Cochrane, 1993).

What is needed, then, are new ways of looking at modern, complex projects, new models and techniques for analyzing them, new methods for managing them—in fact, new paradigms to underlie our approach to them (Turner and Cochrane, 1993).

Jones (1993) explains how an increase in project complexity leads to an increase in internal conflicts within the project, so management methods and style must adapt to deal with such conflict. Changes need to be made to the internal management structures within projects; in particular, the use of multi-disciplinary teams is becoming more widespread. Laufer's study ( Laufer, Denker and Shenhar, 1996), discussed above, concludes that for the new type of project, that was defined by a wide definition of complexity, one should have a project management style based on elements such as integration, system management, simultaneous management, the use of teams, and managing functional plans simultaneously and interdependently. Looking wider than one project, new views have to be taken of the multi-project environment, programme management. Complexity finally needs to be considered in the establishment of joint ventures and other inter-corporate arrangements.

Dalcher (1993) claims that “Contemporary project management practice is characterized by: late delivery, exceeded budgets, reduced functionality and questioned quality. As the complexity and scale of attempted projects increases, the ability to bring these projects to a successful completion dramatically decreases”. Williams (1999) argues that one needs to take up this challenge, and look to see how, differently, one should tackle complex projects. As the first small step, Dalcher (1993) has tried to ask what constitutes complexity. In particular, it has highlighted structural complexity, the number and interdependence of elements (following Baccarini) and uncertainty in goals and means (following Turner and Cochrane). Complexity is increasing as all of these elements increase, exacerbated by simultaneity resulting from tightening project deadlines (Williams, 1999).

3.2. Stakeholder analysis

In this chapter I will write who are the stakeholders in the project and how to map them. Bengt Jacobsson and Christine Blomquist (2002) in their book ‘Dreams about Future’ wrote about the bridge and tunnel from Sweden to Denmark, where the first project was successful but the other was a failure. In this book the authors defined the actors which took part in the decision – making process in the projects in order to define the main ‘players’. Using the same method, I would define Nord-Stream’s actors or stakeholders too.

First of all there are shareholders of Nord-Stream (Russian Gazprom, German EON and Wintershall, and Dutch Gasunie). Second, there are Baltic Sea littoral states. Third, there are future consumers of gas.

According to Whitty and Maylor (2009), virtually all projects are by definition multi-objective, with conflicting goals and virtually all projects have a multiplicity of stakeholders, not only the obvious — client, project manager(s) and project team, but also owner, the public, sometimes public bodies, and so on. This adds complexity in a similar manner to the multiplicity of goals. Both of them add additional dimensions of complexity to the project. Projects involve a wide
array of stakeholders whose interests and demands need to be considered in the managerial decision-making, to ensure the success of the project (Cleland, 1986, Diallo and Thuillier, 2005 and Olander and Landin, 2005). Stakeholder theory provides a solid basis for identifying, classifying and categorizing stakeholders, and understanding their behavior. The basic idea of stakeholder theory is that the organization has relationships with many constituent groups and that it can engender and maintain the support of these groups by considering and balancing their relevant interests (Freeman, 1984 and Jones and Wicks, 1999). A lack of understanding of the various interest groups, the drivers of their actions and their potential to influence during the project life-cycle, especially on the part of management, has been identified as a major challenge in international projects (Miller and Olleros, 2001 and Winch and Bonke, 2002). As open systems, projects interact with their stakeholder environment on various levels and in various ways (Cleland and King, 1968 and Morris, 1983).

Cleland and King (1968) stated, that a project’s stakeholder environment is understood to consist of all organizations and relationships between them, that can affect, or be affected by, the project. Project stakeholder analysis is a central component of stakeholder management, because it is the process through which project managers attempt to understand and read the project’s stakeholder environment in order to be able to determine the right type of action concerning different stakeholders (Miller and Olleros, 2001). It is a widely acknowledged assumption in both the project management literature and in ethical guidelines of infrastructure projects (IFC, 2007) that the project preparation phase is a stage where different stakeholders with differing opinions and objectives have the best possibility to affect the project’s objectives and outcomes (IFC, 2007 and Project Management Institute, 2008). Landin (2005) selected the context of international projects for the purposes of this study because such projects typically involve a highly complex, demanding and uncertain external stakeholder environment.

3.3. Theory of Media Representation

The analysis of media representation is very important, because media plays a key role in the society. Not occasionally the media is called ‘the fourth power’. It is very interesting that in Swedish media the Nord-Stream gas pipeline is always described as Russian-German, though it is also Dutch in fact.

It is now commonly accepted in studies of the media that news reports do not transparently represent ‘facts’ (Fowler, 1991; White, 1997), but, like language more generally, are seen as ‘ideological’ (Cameron, 1998) and related to the values, beliefs and practices of their social context in various ways. This relationship with social reality is complex and dialectical. At one level, as a cultural artifact, media discourse is part of social reality itself. However, the relationship is not static, but the discourse operates within particular social contexts, and is said to both be affected by and able to affect the power relations embedded therein (Fairclough, 1995), although precisely how this interchange takes place is not an easy matter to describe (Fairclough, 1995).

The starting point for examining this is to consider the headlines in which Nord-Stream is mentioned. Given that the headline occupies a position of textual and evaluative prominence in the news report (Bell, 1991; White, 2000), it might be predicted that the representation of the project in these fragments would be of particular importance and indicative of the emphases assigned to the identities associated with the various representations. Each of the headlines was analyzed according to the name attributed to Nord-Stream, the topic of the news report and the newspaper in which the report was published. In particular the arguments focus on the ways in which media represents the project, and why more attention should be given to the study of media within this project.
The issues of media effects are often viewed as negative, sometimes as pro-social (Silverstone, 1999). This reveals a tension in the discipline around what the media does to individuals, and what people do with media. The emphasis is on considering relationships and social practices surrounding media use in everyday life. This is not to deny that media use may have negative consequences in some instances.

Silverstone (1999) provides an accessible introduction to why it is important to study the media. Emphasis is placed on exploring the pervasive nature of media in everyday life and how media can captivate our attention in a variety of ways, as well as go virtually unnoticed. In emphasizing the importance of media in this regard, Silverstone points to the need to avoid media-centricity – asserting media as an over determining influence on our understandings of social life and practices.

4. Empirical Findings
This chapter is divided into three parts. Each part represents an issue regarding the Nordstream project. Political, environmental and economic issues were most important issues highlighted in media.

4.1. Political issues
Political issues were extremely important in both countries. As it is known, Nord-Stream is an international company, but 51 percent of the consortium shares belong to Gazprom. And Gazprom is Russian national company, so the state has a certain political influence on the project.

In Sweden the permission for construction was given by government, and the decision concerning permission granting was previously discussed in other national authorities. In Sweden political issues were quite conflicting, because national interests and international law did not coincide in this case. I mean that Sweden was not supposed to become a future consumer of the gas and the pipeline could be not safe enough for the environment in some areas of the Baltic Sea. But at the same time, there is an international marine law with its rules and regulations, which are to be followed.

At the very beginning the Nord-Stream gas pipeline was designed to go through the Baltic Sea near Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, but these countries refused to give permission immediately. Later on, the Nord-Stream company sketched a new route for the pipeline nearer to Scandinavian countries. Nord-Stream consortium, in order to build a pipeline in the sea, had to receive permission from the governments of Denmark, Finland and Sweden, as well as from the governments of Russia and Germany (these governments were the last to give permission).

‘During 2010 the first pipelines will be built on the Russian side. In the end of 2011 the pipeline should reach Germany. Then the gas taps will be opened. The affected countries will say ‘yes’ or ‘no’. These ‘yes’ or ‘no’ will depend on the Nord-Stream succeeding in satisfying the environmental requirements. The time of government’s decision was prolonged to the end of August. Lars O Gronstedt does no reckon to get any ‘no’.

It was spoken much in Russia that the EU countries are very exacting and it would be difficult to see a green light. For example, during the Petersburg international forum on fuel and energy complex, the doctor in physics, Victor Binenko (Russian Academy of Science) gave a grade on ecological risks and made a conclusion of scientific research, connected to the transportation of hydrocarbons through the Baltic Sea. The political context of NS construction was included in Binenko’s speech as well. He told that:
‘The countries of the Baltic Sea are extremely politicizing the problem of the Nord-Stream gas pipeline construction, resting against different ways of possible negative influence of the NS on the ecological condition of the Baltic Sea. The results of the research have shown that ecological risks attended by the project of the Nord-Stream construction on the bottom of the Baltic Sea are pretty lower than in case of oil transportation by ships. And through the natural gas is less dangerous than oil and its derivatives, both of them pollute the marine environment. That’s why the ecological monitoring of hydrocarbons transportation ways by the Baltic Sea must be regular and complex’.

(Morskoy Biznes, 2009)

At the beginning of 2009 and until November Russia was highly uncertain about the permission receiving. The aspiration of Russia to accelerate the process of Nord - Stream approval met new problems from the side of countries, in whose territorial waters the pipeline would go. The Finnish authorities did not give their consent until November 2009, and Sweden has prolonged the period of examination of Nord-Stream documentation from the end of August to November 2009. Besides, the doubts of Swedish officials created the questions of safety securing for the navigation. It was connected to the presence of mines, which were left in the region since the World War II. However Nord-Stream expressed its optimism and assured that there would be no disruptions of terms for beginning of construction of the marine part of the project, which was planned on the second half of 2010. But experts supposed that it would be impossible to keep the time frameworks.

‘Besides the fear that the gas pipeline can cause ecological problems because of the presence of mines from the war, Swedes are afraid that Nord – Stream will limit the possibility of using wind electric stations at the shores of Sweden. As it was communicated by a representative of the ministry of environment of this country, the operator of the project has again introduced incomplete documentation. So the deadline for project examination is transferred to August 2009, and it is not a fact yet, that the concluding session of Stockholm will be positive.

(Nezavisimaya gazeta, 2009-06-22)

The experts of the project were interviewed by the Nezavisimaya Gazeta (in Russia). These experts did not see any optimism neither in the project itself nor in the beginning if its practical realization. Mihail Krutihin, the partner of the ‘RusEnergy’ consulting company assured that in Finland the deal would not be limited even by positive decision of the government. To his mind this could be followed by some national public discussions of the project with the analysis of all possible threatens, coming together with the pipeline. And it would not be excluded that the approval could be rejected’. Krutihin wrote:

‘It will be absolutely impossible to begin the building of the pipeline in the given time frameworks, that is in spring - summer of the next year (2010). And in Sweden, where the majority of population already today is against the gas pipeline construction in its waters, the situation is much worse, – the analyst underlines, – ‘Any threat to ecology will cause such resistance of the community, that no politicians will take the responsibility to approve the project’

(Nezavisimaya Gazeta, 2009-06-22)

Except the Nord-Stream, Russia had other gas issues, where it had to defend itself at three fronts at the
same time. In Brussels, the European commission was considering a plan how to escape the next ‘gas war’. Ukraine recognized at once, that it would be not able to pay for the delivery of Russian fuel more. All understood which consequences it could have. The situation has reached such tension, that European countries thought a lot to agree with Moscow’s proposal to participate in transition. But there was not only one problem. The gas tension arouse also with Belarus, where Gazprom offered to return debts. The third case was in the East: the building of two gas pipelines from Siberia to China was disrupted. (Izvestiya, 2009-06-18)

In Sweden there had been long debates before the permission was given. Especially, the debates were around environment. Nord Stream kept its proposition about where the planned gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea would be dragged through the Swedish economic zone. ‘Nord-Stream gas pipeline stretching is the most suitable in the judgment that will be done in accordance with the law on the continental shelf’ – the company was writing and that’s why it required the recognition of the pipeline stretching.

In the meanwhile the countries, on the sea bottom of which the pipeline would go, were still conservative about the approval of proposed route. Furthermore, besides Finland and Sweden, the claims to alternative route of Russian gas delivery to Europe were being expressed in Germany, which is one of the major partners of Russia. In particular, the German Bundestag was striving for the changing of the route or even for the revision of the project, motivating that the gas pipeline would go nearby the naval firing ground at the island of Rugen, where the military naval studies took place.

In Sweden there had been twenty authorities and all affected municipalities which made their own evaluation on the pipeline construction. When the company had come with the answer to the small commitment round, there had to be a bigger commitment round at these all authorities. These authorities held special ‘commitment rounds’ in order to make a decision concerning the permission. Sweden had a deadline for the permission and it was August 2009, however, due to different debates the permission was granted in November 2009.

‘The commitment time was running out for the authorities and other organizations which would express themselves about Nord-Stream’s description of environmental consequences of the gas pipeline building in the Baltic Sea, however only half of the commitment answers have come. It was two most important documents among all the commitments. The first was the answer from Sjöfartsverket (naval authority) and SMHI. Judging from their answer, the government will have a tricky task during the examination of the gas pipeline accordance with the law on continental shelf.’

_Dagens Nyheter, 2009-08-20_

The reasons that the decision was later was that the naval authority established the fact that those judgments that Nord-Stream risk levels ‘did not explicitly pay attention the classification of the Baltic Sea as a specially protection worth marine area’. Further, there was more demand for researches of alternative pipeline stretching routes which would be ‘more advantageous for the navigation safety’.

SMHI (Swedish meteorological and hydrological institute) also suggests that Nord-Stream had misinterpreted the authority’s consult report given to the company. ‘Misleading’, ‘totally wrong’- was written. The industrial department (Näringsdepartementet) was the last to go through the commitment in order to check if there were any question marks that had to be corrected before the Nord-Stream’s request would be laid on the government’s table. SMHI was worrying about how the pipeline can affect the salinity and oxygen conditions in Bornholm basin, the central area for cod fish
growth in the Baltic Sea. That’s why it was suggested that the company should do the research in order to describe the interaction between the pipeline and water streams.

Swedish authorities in the commitment had a similar judgment of how gas pipeline had to be dragged in the sensitive areas around Hoburgs bank, Southern and Northern Midsjo banks, situated on the south east of Gotland.

The naval authority’s judgment (in Sweden) derived from the risk of vessel movement and the necessity for anchoring of these vessels. That’s why the naval authority (Sjofartsverket) wanted to drag the pipeline as far away as possible from the fairway, while the environmental authority (Naturvårdsverket) wanted to drag the pipeline far away from sensitive Southern Midsjo banks and nearer to the fairway.

Nord Stream also had to answer some questions from the Defense authority (Försvarsmakten), which had got a delay from the government with its commitment. Besides, the company was writing that it would come back to the question about request for investigating of possible alternative stretching routs.

The naval authority (Sjofartsverket) had the sharpest writing. The authority questions the Nord-Stream’s analysis of risks for personal injury in case if the gas pipeline would be damaged. According to Nord-Stream, the risk of damage at a passenger vessel is 10 percent and 60 percent for the cargo boat. However, the Swedish authority had another point of view: ‘The probability of gas ignition can be higher at a passenger vessel than at a cargo vessel outside the construction requirements, depending on the type of a vessel. The analysis merely considers the presence of people on the deck. The risk is that the vessel through the air receiving takes in gas high ignites in the machine room, personnel and passenger space is relevant, which means that the number of injured will probably be more than 10 percent at a passenger vessel. Nord-Stream’s answer is that the risk for the third party to be injured of the jet fire is so little that even if it was ten times higher, its level would be under the international practice.

On the 15-16 of June of 2009 the German Stralsund hold a 2-days meeting of international group ‘Espo’, in which representatives of different ministries of nine countries of the Baltic region participated. The countries informed each other about received comments of the community about the international ecological influence of the Nord-Stream construction through the Baltic Sea. Every country in the framework of social consultations expresses its opinions and comments which is a totally normal process. According to Nord-Stream, the governments of Russia, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Germany discussed the questions with Nord-Stream and took into consideration the possible ecological impact of the gas pipeline during the decision making process and distribution of permissions.’

‘The gas pipeline is a political cocktail with an explosive power’. It is about the Baltic Sea’s environment and how the European Union’s future energy providing will look out, because the gas pipeline does not lead off from the fossil dependence. It also touches the safety policy. And Russian-German company Nord-Stream indirectly owned by Russian state has obviously been persuaded for a long time that the Swedish government’s answer would not be negative. The company has already invested many millions into the project. Different economic propositions had been a part of a strategy of influence. Money went to Swedish Fishermen and to different projects on Gotland.’

(Svenska Dagbladet, 2009-11-05)
The government of Sweden gave permission for German Nord_Stream AG to build two controversial gas pipelines for the transportation of natural gas on the international waters through Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea.

(Dagens Industri, 2009-11-05).

Swedish island of Gotland was considered to become and became a logistical centre in the middle of the Baltic Sea. The existing industrial harbor Slite had to be improved and deepened. So the Nord-Stream in 2007 invested into the harbor improvement. But first the Nord-Stream asked for permission for such improvement at Gotland municipality, and the municipality agreed. However, in 2009 the municipality was against the pipeline construction, ‘Government Says ‘Yes’ to Nord-Stream, but Gotland says ‘No’.

The position of Gotland municipality seems to be dual. First, in 2007 the municipality agreed to improve the Slite harbor for the Nord-Stream’s money. But in 2009 the municipality voted against the pipeline construction. The European Union as a mega-organization is a stakeholder as well.

Gotland municipality said ‘no’ to the Nord-Stream gas pipeline. The industrial department wrote in its committee that it ‘wanted to oppose the natural gas pipeline and declare that it would be better to invest into long-term sustainable energy sources.’

Thanking to the gas pipeline, the municipality did not want to have, it still got a good restoration of Slite harbor through business with the North-Stream from 2008. The company rents harbor during the period of time from 2009 to 2011 in order to use it as a logistical centre during the construction of the gas pipeline. The municipality has received around 70 million Swedish crowns for this purpose in advance.

When authorized representatives voted about the harbor and a contract with Nord Stream, the majority for the deal was 52 against 19. So we see the conflict of interests of the island and the government.

Why have the Scandinavian countries agreed? Heaving read different Russian newspapers, the answer would be so. Denmark has agreed because it is supposed to be a future consumer of gas. Finland has agreed, because Russia has left the moratorium on duty fees increasing for imported Finnish timber. Sweden has agreed, because its two economic neighbors had agreed and there was no other choice.

Since Denmark has told ‘yes’ to the Nord-Stream, Finland has informed that it would report its decision during the nearest days. After that, Sweden, Russia and Germany had to give their answers. The administration of Swedish island Gotland refused to support the building of the Nord-Stream. The representatives if Swedish island were anxious by the influence of the project realization on the environment. They declared also that this could detain the development of renewable sources of energy.

In 2009 the government of Sweden and Gotland municipality had a different view on the permission. Gotland municipality voted against the pipeline construction because of environmental reasons, but the government was obliged to give permission according to the international marine law.

Russian authorities in their turn assured that everything would be taken into consideration, in order to minimize the risks of influence of pipeline construction on the ecology of marine environment. For the laying of pipes a ship will be used. The ship will be able to carry out the building without anchor stop. Taking into account the mood of Sweden, it was decided not to construct a service platform nearby the island of Gotland.
It is supposed that the first turn of the pipeline will start to work in the fourth quarter of 2011. The works of second line must be finished before 2012 (Moskovskiy komsomolets, 2009-12-18).

Russian Environmental control has give permission for the construction of the marine piece of Russian section of the marine gas pipeline Nord-Stream. 123 kilometers of the pipeline will go through Russian waters. In the framework of permission receiving, the Nord-Stream documentation was examined by the National Ecological expertise in November 2008, and also by the Main National expertise of Russia in May 2009 and received positive resolutions of the both national expertise.

Besides, as it was reported in the message of Nord-Stream Company, Russia, realizing the project, is following all norms of international convention about the estimation of impact on the environment in international context.

Sweden and Finland have given green light to Russian - German project ‘Nord-Stream’. The notorious Scandinavian unity expressed itself so that two key countries on the route of the gas pipeline did it practically simultaneously. Denmark allowed little earlier. Now the formal agreement of main initiators of the project, Russia and Germany is required.

The most interesting question in connection to such operative decision of Scandinavian countries is the possible benefits which the countries will receive in the result of this project.

What about Finns, they have done their best to press maximum of their geographical situation, resting on the interests of the basic paper industry of the country. In the end of October Vladimir Putin in the framework of Russian-Finnish forest summit promised, that the moratorium on the increase of customs fees for the timber will be prolonged for 2010, and possibly, even for 2011. Finns have left one more benefit behind. Apparently for the case if something promised by Russia would go wrong. Besides the agreement of the government, which has been already declared, the operators of Nord-Stream project have to make an agreement with the authorities of one region in Finland, nearby which the pipeline would go.

Denmark has received a possibility to diversify the deliveries of gas to the kingdom. Nowadays Denmark buys all volumes of gas from the exploitations of shelves of the North Seas. The Russian prime minister promised that Denmark will be able to provide for itself the extra deliveries in the volumes of 1 billion cubic meters annually.

However it is unknown what Sweden has got in the result of this ‘universal bargaining’. Perhaps, it is planning to build a branch from the Nord-Stream for its own needs. The gas will not be extra for this country, and the possibility to become one of the dispatchers of the project among Scandinavian countries, in particular Finland, Norway looks like tempting. The fast agreement of Sweden was furthermore surprising, because namely this country promised to produce the hardest ecological requirements.

Against the background of overcoming hindrances, Nord-Stream had only small things left to do. This was a clean concord of lines, which must not hinder other Baltic underwater communications, the round of territorial zones and dangerous places in form of wastes and drowned vessels.

Perhaps, the main problems for Nord Stream will be concentrated in Brussels in connection to the exploration and acceptation of so called energy bags, which can legislatively limit the striving of Gazprom to come directly to the European consumers. So in the future we will have entertaining lobby fighting (Pravda 2009-11-06).

The green-light to the Nord-Stream was so unexpected in Russia that the journal Morskoy Biznes (Marine Business) wrote that Russian prime-minister had underestimated Nord-Stream. Russian authorities did not even expect so quick solution of contradictions of the project. Though, the hindrances on the way of Nord-Stream are not finished yet. Almost simultaneously the
governments of Sweden and Finland declared that they do not mind the construction of the gas pipeline Nord Stream in their territorial waters in the Baltic Sea, according to 'Reuters’ agency.

By the words of the Minister of Environment of Sweden, 'Swedish authorities have carefully studied all represented documentation before making a decision,' – and could not find anything contradictory to the existing legislation’ – this paragraph was almost in all newspapers both in Russia and Sweden.

The biggest apprehensions from Sweden’s side were caused by ecological consequences of gas pipeline construction. 'The government produced hard requirements in order to provide safety to fragile environment of the Baltic Sea,' – according to Andreas Carlgren. To all appearance, the results of the expertise on the influence of Nord-Stream on the environment did not rouse censure at Swedes.

In the opinion of Dmitriy Abzalov, the leading expert of the Centre for political conjuncture, Sweden had no other choice rather than to approve the NS construction, because its two economic neighbors had already agreed. Besides, during the negotiation process with Swedish authorities, there had been rumors that in particular a branch from NS could be built, and talks about joint economic projects had place.

‘Today is an important day for the Nord-Stream project. We are glad for the decision of governments of Sweden and Finland. The given permissions have become important steps both for our project and for the energy safety of Europe,’- said the managing director of Nord-Stream AG Mattias Warnig. It is said in the company, that there had been huge ecologic researches, tight cooperation with authorities and consultations with interested persons and specialists during several years before the decision. There had been several alternatives of route lying learned. The ecology, safety of navigation, fishing, cultural heritage and drowned chemical weapons became the main factors of routes evaluation. The prime-minister of Russia Vladimir Putin has already thanked Swedish and Finnish authorities for the decision. By the words of prime-minister, Russia at the present time is preparing its program for the sanitation of the Baltic Sea. The prime minister has given a task to the ministry of economic development and the ministry of finance to finish all necessary procedures for the realization of this project. (Trud, 2009-11-05)

‘On Gotland the prosecutor began a preliminary investigation about bribe- and corruption crime since a professor at Gotland University received 5 million Swedish crowns for a project from Nord-Steram Company, which wants to build a gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea’ – was written in Swedish newspaper Dagens Industri (2009-02-18). ‘More concrete data has come, which gives a reason to look at the question if there is a specific person that got favour of these money, - said Malin Palmgren from the State Unity against corruption (Riksenheten mot corruption) to the TV 4 News (Dagens Industri (2009-02-18)).

In January 2007 Gotland University together with the competent professor warned building of the pipeline near sensitive birds’ area in the Baltic Sea. The same year Nord Stream came up with 5 million crowns, which was directed to the project about birds (alfåglar), the professor’s research field. The company knew that the University even later would express itself about the pipeline. However, the university’s administration recognized money, which has never been a secret. Also, the Nord-Stream informs that there is no conflict of interests in the financing of the research project.

A danger for navigation and passenger traffic, the threat for cod (fish), an uncertainty concerning the sea bottom was connected to the project. Swedish authorities indicated many weak points in the gas pipeline project Nord-Stream. When Nord-Stream left its request to the Swedish government in December 2007, the aim was to lie down the first pipeline during summer 2009 and to finish the construction in 2010. This plan was revised. ‘Now we are planning that the first of two pipelines will be transporting gas in 2011’, - says Nicklas Andersson at Nord-Stream.
In November 2008 about ten authorities received so called ‘small commitment’ (liten remiss) to go through the Nord-Stream’s request in order to check if there are any question marks which are to be decided before the beginning of a big commitment round.

The defense authority (Försvarsmaften) established the fact that there were four districts with a concentration of unexploded ammunition and drowned mines along the stretching of the gas pipeline in Swedish economic zone.

Sweden has long ago planned a summit in Stockholm between Russia and the EU on the 18th and 19th of November of 2009. However there was no clear decision from the Russian side neither about date nor for the place for summit. In a while, it was easy to understand that it was better to come to Brussels than to Stockholm. But this could break an old tradition of summits between Russia and the EU.

The summit between the EU and Russia usually takes place twice a year. In spring the summit is in Russia and in autumn the summit is in a country, which has the presidency in the EU. The Russian side is led by President while in the EU it is led by the state- or prime-minister of the country, which has the rotating presidency.

Russian side brings forward Brussels as a suitable meeting place with an argument that this would simultaneously give a chance to visit the EU commission. In such case it would be clever to wait until the admission of a new EU commission. This was told by the Swedish side and meant that the summit would be shifted to the beginning of 2010. In this connection the Swedish government wanted presumably to show that it did not want to allow Russia dictating the conditions of the summit.

‘The government’s space for actions has been more limited than during examination of applications concerning Swedish territorial waters or construction in Sweden’ – the government was writing in a press message.

In November 2009 Sweden gave permission to the Nord-Stream pipeline construction. ‘This is important that the pipeline is being built outside the Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea. Gas pipeline is unambiguously allowed by the international law, - says Carlgren. According to the minister, the Swedish point of view on the gas pipeline environmental impacts have met demand after 23 month handling by authorities and contacts with the Nord-stream.

‘Authorities had a full view and no serious Swedish government could so clearly break against the international law by saying no to the gas pipeline construction’, - explains Carlgren. And points that all states have a right to build the pipelines in international waters and that the coast states have no right to monopolize their districts, but there must be a responsibility for the environment. “

The minister of environment mentioned arguments against the dragging, which were handled by the Swedish authorities and environmental organizations. This concerns the chemical weapons, mines, disturbances for fish, overfeeding and water muddy creation.

If to speak about the chemical weapons, says Andreas Carlgren, the pipeline is not supposed to go through the area, where the chemical weapon is. But if it were possible to find such ones, they could be handled. Nord Stream has during the examination found nine mines, one of which should be exploded, which is no unusual (Andreas Carlgren).

The government considers that there will be no problems of the higher overfeeding or muddy creation of water, and eventual leaking of methane gas from the pipeline does not mean any risk of explosion (Dagens Industri).

The environmental minister referred to the law, making a decision concerning the Russian-German gas pipeline. But purely politically it has been difficult for the Swedish government to say ‘no’. Nothing can stop the Russian-German gas pipeline through the Baltic Sea. The next year first pipes will be laid on the sea bottom. It is doubtful if someone cares about the negative decision from Swedish government.
4.2. Environmental Issues

Nord-Stream project in the media of Sweden was often highlighted mostly by environmental topics. The headlines in certain newspapers were quite extreme, like ‘Swedish environmental interests are being sold out’, ‘We Need a Serious Environment Minister’, ‘A camel in the Baltic Sea’ etc.

In Russian media the environmental issues were discussed too. But environmental issues were considered to be a hinder for permission on construction. The permission would be determined on the environmental basis. However, the permission for the construction of the pipeline was given according to the international law rather than environmental benefits.

‘Naturvårdsverket (The Environmental authority) has researched the alternative routes for the pipeline building around sensitive Hoburgs bank and Midsjo banks. But the background for the government’s decision is that all states have a right to construct pipelines on the international waters,’ according to Andreas Carlgren. However, the decision was hardly criticized by the journalist of Aftonbladet:

‘I cannot interpret this other than unprecedented cowardice, a kind of bending effect, which is now the result of Swedish environment policy through referring to the international law rather than to the national one. The environment minister is hiding behind paragraphs instead of looking after all possibilities to change the project and get a reduced influence on the environment.’

Aftonbladet, 2009-11-20.

According to the journalist, all the managing of Environment ministry is characterized by the lack of political will and passivity. The united environmental movement has been against the project because of effects on the Baltic Sea sensitive environment. The Baltic Sea is the world’s most sensitive sea with a middle depth of only 60 meters, which is still ‘feeling bad’.

Naturvårdsverket required the change of pipeline route, which has not been satisfied. However the government recognizes the project without demand for more information and more measures in order to diminish the environmental consequences of the pipeline.

It is also not justifiable that the government did not require the NS to report an alternative pipeline dragging by the land. The modern law, for example, the Swedish environment code requires different alternatives to be compared in order to evaluate environmental impacts (Aftonbladet, 2009-11-20).

The government’s ‘yes’ to the Nord-Stream is merely based on the environmental examination. It is not valid to close eyes at the safety and political consequences. All who worried about the Nord-Stream pipeline can breathe out now. Blue mussels at Hoburgens bank and Midsjo banks will not be disturbed (Aftonbladet, 2009-11-20).

The environmental minister was crystal clear at recording the motive for government’s ‘yes’ to the gas pipeline from Vyborg to Greifswald – through the Swedish economic zone. The environmental examination had been rigorous. Two mines need to be exploded. The fish will not be affected by any problems.

Of course it is good that Nord-Stream during the trip has been forced to create an environmental profile of the project and has even rejected the plans for service platform construction to the east of Gotland. But still it could be argued that the government has chosen to strain at a milieu gnat instead of to swallow a Russian camel (Svenska Dagbladet).
The government has done a decision to the environmental question. At the last press-conference the environmental minister made an impression that the gas pipeline in general would not influence the Baltic Sea strategic situation.

The government disregarded the safety and political aspects of the Russian-German gas pipeline. This is not valid. And it is not valid either to see only the economic project. The government should have required an alternative dragging route by the land.

‘Swedish government’s ‘yes’ to gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea means that the Swedish environmental interest is being sold out in favor of Russian gas. The gas pipeline lies not in Swedish interest, first of all with an idea about the long term consequences for environment. However the interest lies in Russian interest.’

Svenska Dagbladet, 2009-11-06

Swedish government has told yes to Russian-German gas pipeline Nord-Stream on the bottom of the Baltic Sea. The commitment rounds, environmental examinations, lobby campaigns and diplomatic tours on a high level have preceded the decision. But can the government guarantee that vital Swedish interests are not being sold out in order not to disturb the EU presidency? – U. Ahlin and A. Ygeman wonder (Svenska Dagbladet, 2009-11-06).

The gas pipeline with an imagined ramification to Sweden is risking by making obstacles for investments into bio energy. The recognition of the gas pipeline is binding Europe with the dependency on Russian gas and means serious environmental risks in a very sensitive sea district. Every new stuck in natural gas billion investments slows down the European investing in renewable energy.

‘In 2007, one summer morning in Visby the journalist ate a free hotel breakfast together with Dirk von Ameln, the vice technical director of the Nord-Stream gas consortium. The hotel’s breakfast table was covered with a big table cloth in a shape of a map. Dirk von Ameln set a height at Vyborg, Russian start point of the gas pipe line. Dirk talked about environment, fishery and safety. In the evenings it was possible to communicate with Nord-Stream representatives. And during days it was possible to get information. The same thing was during 2008 political week on Gotland. But it was nothing in 2009. Not any program point connected to the Nord-Stream.’

Aftonbladet, 2009-06-29

The Swedish decision for the Nord Stream is one of five national permissions that are required in order the gas pipeline to be built. It means the end of the year of negotiations with Swedish authorities. It is clear that this is an important milestone. We had been working for a couple of years taking care that we will cope with the conditions and felt during the last week that we will fix it, - says Lars O Gronstedt, the senior advisor of the Nord-Stream. About 50 miles of the total 120 miles of the pipeline’s length will run through so called Swedish economic zone. Nord-Stream describes in the press-release that Swedish permission is a result of huge expert studies of environment and technique during many years, as well as a good dialogue with the responsible authorities.
More pipeline routs had been researched carefully with a consideration of environment, navigation, fishing, chemical weapons drowning and cultural heritage.

‘What could you say to those who trouble about the environment in the Baltic Sea? We do quite extensive engagement concerning the laying of the pipeline in order not to disturb fish or animal life. We do an undertaking about how we will remove the mines and engagement concerning the muddy creation that is how much water slam can be muddled during the work. Later, when it lies there, it is difficult to imagine some more environmentally friendly way to transport the energy, - says Grönstedt. (Dagens Nyheter, 2009-11-05)

There are four mines in the district, which are on less than 100 meters depth and relatively close to each other. It takes about two working days to explode one mine. Nord-Stream in the autumn has received the permission to explode the mines from the Finnish environmental authorities

_Dagens Nyheter, 2009-11-05._

The gas pipeline company Nord-Stream leaves now its environmental report to nine countries around the Baltic Sea. Accordingly, a new stage in the project with commitment in all states was introduced in May. The work with the old mine explosion along the area where the Nord-Stream gas pipeline will be dragged in the Finnish Bay was opened recently, but afterwards became interrupted. The British company that cares about mine exploding in the sea on the south of Helsinki informed that the work was interrupted because of technical problems. A new try will be made next week.

According to the original plans, the mine exploding should have been started for two weeks ago. The first mines which are to be exploded during the planned gas pipeline construction, are on the international waters but in the Finnish economic zone.

The affected states and the company had a meeting in Copenhagen agreeing that the report is ready for further handling. ‘The material is with all completing so good that we decided to have a consultation at the beginning of March’ – says Egon Enocksson from the milieu agency (Naturvårdsverket).

The meeting was one of many in so called Esboprocess. It is being regulated by the UN treaty, called ‘Esbokonvention’, which is a convention on the environmental protection. According to this convention the countries on whose economic zones the pipeline will be constructed must inform other states about the limit exceeding environmental effects.

The Nord-Stream describes such effects in the approved report. The report will be published in all languages. The documents which were left by the company the environmental agency are not public yet.

The commitment round in Sweden grasps also the company’s national request. It is being examined according to the law on the continental shelf because the pipeline will be laid in the Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea.

The government has received the basis for this commitment in January and further completing in the end of February.

So when Nord-Stream at the beginning of March delivered all basic materials, the countries were given three months for domestic consultations and also for the exchange by the ideas between states.

However the commitment period for the publicity will become shorter, because we need some weeks to place together points of view that we have already received’, - says Egon Enocksson.
The Baltic Sea sanitation is also tied to the Nord-Stream project. As it is known, both Germany and Russia (Kaliningrad) have access to the Baltic Sea. Why are the countries investing into the sanitation only now but not before? The Baltic Sea has been polluted quite for a while, but only now measures are to be taken.

4.2. Economic issues

Economic issues are quite important in the Nord-Stream project. Conflict of interests was present between the stakeholders. For Russia the Nord-Stream project is necessary from economic point of view, however the project perhaps is not so necessary for Sweden.

The EU needs to increase its import of the natural gas almost by 90% until 2030. Simultaneously the EU countries are troubling to become dependent on Russia. Norway states that it can increase its gas production by 25 – 40 percent. But Swedish report is warning that this is too optimistically. Now the natural gas is a quarter of energy consumption in the European Union (Aftonbladet).

Sometimes media wrote that there was lobby of the company in Sweden, because of the fact that the pipes for the pipeline were in Sweden before the country gave permission for construction. During summer both Russian and German governments had increased the pressure on Sweden in order to accelerate the decision process. Nord-Stream’s Swedish chief Lars O Gronstedt informed that April 2010 was considered to be the deadline for getting the permission from all required countries.

The company’s self-confidence was great. On the 20th of August the first 168 steel pipes for the gas pipeline were unloaded in Karlskrona. Before the end of 2009, 13000 more pipes were supposed to arrive here. Totally the building needs 200000 pipes which are to be located in Karlskrona, Slite, Kotka, Greifswald and Vyborg before they will be laid on the bottom of the Baltic Sea.

‘The Russian - German gas pipeline Nord-Stream is planning to put down around 20000 of twelve meters long steel pipes on the bottom of the Baltic Sea. The first 168 pipes had been unloaded now at Karlskrona despite the fact that the Swedish government has not given yet its permission for gas pipeline construction.’

_Aftonbladet, 2009-08-20_

However in the interview to Aftonbladet Lars O Gronstedt said that:

‘There is nothing unusual in the fact that we began to deliver the pipes before we received the permission. It’s almost like the situation, when people take home a little timber before the vacation for building of a new veranda.’

_Aftonbladet, 2009-08-20_

‘We reckon to satisfy all probable environmental requirements. Then there will not be any ‘no’,’ – says Lars O Gronstedt, the senior advisor to the Nord-Stream consortium. (Aftonbladet)
Generally speaking, the Russian media describe the Nord-Stream project as necessary and useful. First of all, the rout through the Baltic Sea will be a new route. The transportation of gas through the Baltic Sea has its own ‘pluses and minuses’. The minuses are that the pipeline construction under water is more expensive than by the land. The pipeline with gas in the water will always have a tendency to come to surface (the effect of a saving circle). That’s why there will be bearings which will hold the pipeline. Such bearings might be quite expensive but necessary to construct. One more minus is that the costs of the pipeline construction will be laid partially on German consumers (Riley, 2008).

On the other side, Russia will not need to handle political disputes with Ukraine, which led to the gas deliveries disruption in the past. Furthermore, the GazProm will not need to pay for Ukrainian transition, which will diminish the transportation costs. Transporting gas by the Sea will not require payment to states on whose territorial waters the pipeline will be constructed. Lately, Ukraine offered to sell its gas-transportation system to Russia, but the Gazprom was not interested. The gas experts in Ukraine consider that the GazProm has invested so much money into the Nord-Stream, that Ukrainian gas transportation system is not interesting any more.

In general, the construction of the Nord-Stream gas pipeline should bring benefits for Russia. First of all, the transit fee will be absent, which will decrease the cost of gas for European consumers. Of course, there are many advantages for pipeline construction. In the Leningrad region, Russia, one of the biggest projects of Gazprom is being realized. The over ground gas pipeline ‘Griazovets-Vyborg’, which is a part of Nord-Stream, will go through this region. The economy of this region is already getting the influence of project’s realization:

‘Except the attraction to its projecting, building and exploitation of numerous Petersburg and regional companies, the producers of equipment for compressor stations of the gas pipeline and the suppliers of pipelines are fighting for Gazprom orders. The realization of huge investment project in the region will undoubtedly become one of the stimuli for economic growth by creating new labor places, tax revenues, by development of similar branches of industry, - Gazprom is sure’. (Kommersant, 2009-09-03).

However, the project is nor realized yet, but it already brings a tangible effect in form of working enterprises and creation of working places at companies, which take part in the project realization. The gas pipeline Griazovets-Vyborg will provide the delivery of gas to the Nord-Stream gas pipeline and to the consumers of North-Eastern region of Russia. There will be seven compressor stations built, including ‘Portovaya’. The Portovaya station will be situated on the Russian sea-coast of the Baltic Sea in the Portovaya Bay near Vyborg and it will become a unique object of gas transportation system, having no analogues in capacity and work pressure in Russia (Kommersant, 2009-09-03).
5. Conclusion

The main purpose of the project is a gas pipeline construction, but actually it not only a pipeline. The project is connected with environment, economics, politics, international law, ethical issues, employment, lobby etcetera and etcetera.

The Nord-Stream is a complex project which involves different stakeholders. The project could be considered as a conflict of interests between the stakeholders. The Nord-Stream project in 2009 was represented in media of Russia and Sweden differently. The environmental issues were described as most important in the media of Sweden. But in Russia the project was described as necessary and of a vital interest both to the country and to European consumers. The Nord-Stream pipeline was first designed to go near Poland and Baltic States, but these countries refused and the pipeline route was redesigned to be nearer to Scandinavian countries.

The most important parties in the project are Russia, Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden (especially Gotland) and Denmark. The stakeholders could be mapped by the next way. First, there are shareholders of the Nord-Stream AG (Gazprom, Wintershall, E-On, Gasunie). Secondly, the stakeholders are the Scandinavian countries, on whose territorial waters the pipeline will go. Thirdly, the stakeholders should be the future consumers of the natural gas (The UK, France, Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands).

Nord-Stream has all attributes of a complex project. It has many sides; it has many actors, whose purposes are often totally different. The project was started in 2005, but there have been so many events since that time. In Swedish media the project is occasionally or deliberately called ‘Russian-German’, though it is in fact also Dutch.

Then there are stakeholders which are not shareholders. They are Finland, Sweden and Denmark. Though several years ago there were other stakeholders. They were Poland, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia which did not allow building the pipeline in their territorial waters. One author in a Swedish newspaper wrote that if the Nord-Stream would be built, the gas delivery to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia would be stopped. It is difficult to agree with such suggestion, because these states do not receive the gas free. And if these states did not pay for gas, the GazProm would not get income. Generally speaking all nine states of the Baltic Sea are in fact the stakeholders of the Nord-Stream project. The future consumers are stakeholders too. They should be Germany, Denmark, the UK, France, and Netherlands.

One aspect of this complex project is the ethical issue. The Nord-Stream financed Gotland Museum, the birds- and sea bottom research projects, the lifting of drowned ships. Also the Nord-Stream is going to sanitize the Baltic Sea. In Russian media the Nord-Stream is described in a positive manner. The project was designed to eliminate problems with transportation countries (Ukraine and Poland). In Sweden the Nord-Stream project was more connected with environmental issues. Also the permission given to Nord-Stream was strongly criticized.

According to the media of Sweden and Russia the representation of the Nord-Stream project derives from the interests and the meaning of the project to the countries.

Three main issues around the Nord-Stream project are environmental, political and economic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>- Scandinavian countries might not give permission because of high environmental requirements</td>
<td>- extremely important, the Baltic Sea is sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental issues in Russian</td>
<td>- Ammunition left on sea bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Since World War II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ferries movement across the Baltic Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Birds and fish could be affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political**
- Poland, Latvia and Lithuania refused to give permission for the pipeline construction in their territorial waters;  
- Irrespective of existing and developing sources of renewable energy, European energy consumers are still highly dependent on the imported gas, which creates the necessity for the pipeline construction.  
- Political conflicts with Ukraine disrupted the gas delivery to European consumers, that’s why new route is necessary  
- Sweden had to give permission for the Nord-Stream construction  
- Conflict between national interests and international law  
- Different points of view of government and Gotland municipality

**Economic**
- The existing necessity to deliver gas to Europe  
- Production of pipes, which creates additional employment in the country  
- Nord-Stream financed Slite harbor improvement as well as other projects, which were criticized in Sweden  
- Sweden is not supposed to be a future consumer of Nord-Stream gas that’s why the project was not described as necessary

The aim of Nord-Stream pipeline construction is to diversify the existing gas pipelines, to enhance the volumes of gas export to Western Europe, and diminish the influence of political factor on the gas delivery (Nord-Stream, 2009). Nord-Stream had to receive the ‘green light’ on building from Finland, Sweden and Denmark. Territorial waters of Scandinavian countries have become an alternative route for the pipeline dragging. According to the International Marine Law, any company is obliged to ask for permission in a country on whose territorial waters the pipeline is to be constructed. There had been a lot of debates in Scandinavian countries and particularly in Sweden.

Nord-Stream is a complex project, because it has many stakeholders whose purposes are totally different. The stakeholders in the project are Russia, Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden and Denmark. Some stakeholders e.g. future consumers of the gas and Gazprom are very interested in the pipeline construction, however other stakeholders in the projects were against pipeline construction because of different reasons. The Nord-Stream project could be considered as a conflict of interests between the stakeholders. The Nord-Stream project in 2009 was represented in media of Russia and Sweden differently. Three main topics of Nord-Stream representation were environmental, political and economic.
Environmental issues in Russia were described mainly as a threat to Nord-Stream to get permission for construction. Media wrote that Scandinavian countries are extremely exacting in environmental requirements and they might not give permission. In Sweden a lot had been written about environment. Ammunition left on the bottom of the Baltic Sea since World War II, ferries movement across the Sea, animal life, and sensitivity of the Baltic Sea were main reasons why it would be dangerous to build the pipeline.

Political issues in Russia were highlighted by constant political conflicts with Ukraine which disrupted the gas delivery to European consumers many times before, leaving European consumers in cold in winter. Also, Poland, Latvia and Lithuania refused to give permission for the pipeline construction in their territorial waters and that’s why a new route near Gotland has been designed. Furthermore, irrespective of existing and developing sources of renewable energy, European energy consumers are still highly dependent on the imported gas, which creates the necessity for the pipeline construction.

Political issues in Sweden were quite tricky. Sweden had to give permission for the pipeline construction, and there emerged a conflict between national interests and international law. The problem was that Gotland municipality was against pipeline construction; however government had to follow international marine law.

In Russia economic issues were described by existing necessity to deliver gas to Europe, also national companies could produce pipes for the pipeline and thus create employment. Nord-Stream would not need to pay for the transit of gas to the Scandinavian countries.

In Sweden economic issues were important too. Sweden was not supposed to be a future consumer of Nord-Stream gas that’s why the project was not described as necessary. Nord-Stream financed Slite harbor improvement as well as other projects, which were strongly criticized in Sweden.

According to media of Sweden and Russia the representation of the Nord-Stream project derives from the interests and perhaps the meaning of the project to the countries.
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Appendix

1.1. Media in Russia

1.1.1. Russia has allowed to build Nord-Stream

2009-12-18

Russian Environmental control has given permission for the construction of the marine piece of Russian section of the marine gas pipeline Nord-Stream. 123 kilometers of the pipeline will go through Russian waters. In the framework of permission receiving, the Nord-Stream documentation was examined by the National Ecological expertise in November 2008, and also by the Main National expertise of Russia in May 2009 and received positive resolutions of both national expertise.

Besides, as it was reported in the message of Nord-Stream company, Russia, realizing the project, is following all norms of international convention about the estimation of impact on the environment in international context. (The name of the article’s author is absent).

1.1.2. Moskovskiy komsomolets

Sweden Complicates Plans for the Construction of North Stream

2009-08-21

The administration of Swedish island Gotland refused to support the building of the Nord-Stream. The representatives of Swedish island are anxious by the influence of the project realization on the environment. They declare also that this can detain the development of renewable sources of energy.

Russian authorities in their turn assure, that everything is taken into consideration, in order to minimize the risks of influence of pipeline construction on the ecology of marine environment. For the laying of pipes a ship will be used. The ship will be able to carry out the building without anchor stop. Taking into account the mood of Sweden, it was decided not to construct a service platform nearby the island of Gotland.

It is supposed that the first turn of the pipeline will start to work in the fourth quarter of 2011. The works of second line must be finished before 2012.

1.1.3. Izvestiya

Russia has Come Forward in All Gas Fronts

Pavel Arabov

2009-06-18

On Thursday (17 June) Russia had to defend itself at three fronts at the same time. In Brussels, the European commission was considering a plan how to escape the next ‘gas war’. Ukraine recognized at once, that it would be not able to pay for the delivery of Russian fuel more. All understand which consequences it can have. The situation has reached such tension, that European countries thought a lot to agree with Moscow’s proposal to participate in transition. But there was not only one problem. The gas tension arouse also with Belarus, where Gazprom offered to return debts. The third case was in the East: the building of two gas pipelines from Siberia to China was disrupted.

1.1.4. Kommersant

The Nord-Stream Hauls Region

2009-09-03

In the Leningrad region one of the biggest projects of Gazprom is being realized. The over ground gas pipeline ‘Griazovets-Vyborg’, which is a part of Nord-Stream, will go through this region. The other (marine) part of the pipeline will cross the Baltic Sea. The economy of this region is already getting the influence of project’s realization. Except the attraction to its projecting, building and
exploitation of numerous Petersburg and regional companies, the producers of equipment for compressor stations of the gas pipeline and the suppliers of pipelines are fighting for Gazprom orders.

**The Land Start.** In the framework of Nord-Stream, on the territory of the region the gas pipeline Griazovets-Vyborg is being built. It will provide the delivery of gas to the Nord-Stream gas pipeline and to the consumers of North-Eastern region of Russia. Its length will be 917 kilometers, 588 kilometer of which will cross the Leningrad region. There will be seven compressor stations built, including ‘Portovaya’. The Portovaya station will be situated on the Russian sea-coast of the Baltic Sea in the Portovaya Bay near Vyborg and it will become a unique object of gas transportation system, having no analogues in capacity and work pressure in Russia.

**Stimulus for Growth.** The exploitation of the gas pipeline will make the gas delivery more reliable, and will help to repair and reconstruct the existing pipeline Griazovets-Leningrad. The realization of huge investment project in the region will undoubtedly become one of the stimuli for economic growth by creating new labor places, tax revenues, by development of similar branches of industry, - Gazprom is sure.

However, the project is nor realized yet, but it already brings a tangible effect in form of working enterprises and creation of working places at companies, which take part in the project realization.

1.1.5. **Morskoy Biznes**

*Putin has underestimated Nord-Stream*

Natalia Gorova

Sweden and Finland gave their consent on the construction of Nord-Stream gas pipeline. Russian authorities did not even expect so quick solution of contradictions of the project. Though, the hindrances on the way of Nord-Stream are not finished yet. Almost simultaneously the governments of Sweden and Finland declared that they do not mind the construction of the gas pipeline. NS in their territorial waters in the Baltic Sea, according to 'Reuters' agency.

‘Sweden has given permission to NS to build 2 pipelines on the continental shelf in Swedish economic zone for the natural gas transportation’ – is in the message of the state’s government.

By the words of the Minister of Environment of Sweden, ‘Swedish authorities have carefully studied all represented documentation before making a decision,’ – and ‘could not find anything contradictory to the existing legislation.’ The biggest apprehensions from Sweden’s side were caused by ecological consequences of gas pipeline construction. ‘The government produced hard requirements in order to provide safety to fragile environment of the Baltic Sea,’ – according to Andreas Carlgren, quoted by AFP.

To all appearance, the results of the expertise on the influence of Nord-Stream on the environment did not rouse censure at Swedes.

**Interested Sweden**

In the opinion of Dmitriy Abzalov, the leading expert of the Centre for political conjuncture, Sweden had no other choice rather than to approve the NS construction, because its two economic neighbors had already agreed. Besides, during the negotiation process with Swedish authorities, there had been rumors that in particular a branch from NS could be built, and talks about joint economic projects had place.

**Politicizing of problem**

During the Petersburg international forum on fuel and energy complex, the doctor in physics, Victor Binenko (Russian Academy of Science) gave a grade to ecological risks and made a conclusion of scientific research, connected to the transportation of hydrocarbons through the Baltic Sea.
The political context of NS construction was included as well. It is necessary to mark that the countries of the Baltic Sea are extremely politicizing the problem of the Nord-Stream gas pipeline construction, resting against different ways of possible negative influence of the NS on the ecological condition of the Baltic Sea.

The results of the research have shown that ecological risks attended by the project of the NS construction on the bottom of the Baltic Sea are pretty lower than in case of oil transportation by ships. And through the natural gas is less dangerous than oil and its derivatives, both of them pollute the marine environment. That’s why the ecological monitoring of hydrocarbons transportation ways by the Baltic Sea must be regular and complex.

1.1.6. Pravda

*Finland and Sweden have Opened Way for Nord-Stream*

2009-11-06

Vladimir Shabanov

Sweden and Finland gave given green light to Russian - German project ‘Nord-Stream’. Te notorious Scandinavian unity expressed itself so that two key countries on the route of the gas pipelinedid it practically simultaneously. Denmark allowed little earlier. Now the formal agreement of main initiators of the project, Russia and Germany is required.

The most interesting question in connection to such operative decision of Scandinavian countries are the possible benefits which the countries will receive in the result of this project.

What about Finns, they have done their best to press maximum of their geographical situation, resting on the interests of the basic paper industry of the country. In the end of October Vladimir Putin in the framework of Russian-Finnish forest summit promised, that the moratorium on the increase of customs fees for the timber will be prolonged for 2010, and possibly, even for 2011.

By the way, Finns have left one more benefit behind. Apparently for the case if something promised by Russia will go wrong. Besides the agreement of the government, which is already declared, the operators of Nord-Stream project have to make an agreement with the authorities of one region in Finland, nearby which the pipeline will go.

Denmark has received a possibility to diversify the deliveries of gas to the kingdom. Nowadays Denmark buys all volumes of gas from the exploitations of shelves of the North Seas. The Russian prime minister promised that Denmark will be able to provide for itself the extra deliveries in the volumes of 1 billion cubic meters annually.

However it is unknown what Sweden has got in the result of this ‘universal bargaining’. Perhaps, it is planning to build a branch from the Nord-Stream for its own needs. The gas will not be extra for this country, and the possibility to become one of the dispatchers of the project among Scandinavian countries, in particular Finland, Norway looks like tempting.

The fast agreement of Sweden is furthermore surprising, because namely this country promised to produce the most hard ecological requirements.

Against the background of overcoming hindrances, Nord-Stream has only small things left to do. This is a cleat concord of lines, which must not hinder other Baltic underwater communications, the round of territorial zones and dangerous places in form of wastes and drowned vessels.

Perhaps, the main problems for Nord Stream will be concentrated in Brussels in connection to the exploration and acceptation of so called energy bags, which can legislatively limit the striving of Gazprom to come directly to the European consumers. So in the future we will have entertaining lobby fighting.
1.1.7.  Trud

The Nord-Stream is Coming on the Finish Line
2009-11-05

‘Today is an important day for the Nord-Stream project. We are glad for the decision of governments of Sweden and Finland. The given permissions have become important steps both for our project and for the energy safety of Europe,’ says the managing director of Nord-Stream AG Mattias Warnig. It is said in the company, that there had been huge ecologic researches, tight cooperation with authorities and consultations with interested persons and specialists during several years before the decision. There had been several alternatives of route laying learned. The ecology, safety of navigation, fishing, cultural heritage and drowned chemical weapons became the main factors of routes evaluation. The prime-minister of Russia Vladimir Putin has already thanked Swedish and Finnish authorities for the decision. By the words of prime-minister, Russia at the present time is preparing its program for the sanitation of the Baltic Sea. The prime minister has given a task to the ministry of economic development and the ministry of finance to finish all necessary procedures for the realization of this project.

1.1.8.  Nezavisimaya gazeta

Nord-Stream Stumbles in Sweden
2009-06-22

Sergey Slavin

The aspiration of Russia to accelerate the process of Nord-Stream approval meets new problems from the side of countries, in whose territorial waters the pipeline will go. The Finnish authorities have not given their consent yet, and Sweden has prolonged the period of examination of Nord-Stream documentation to the end of August. As it was communicated by a representative of the ministry of environment of this country, the operator of the project has again introduced incomplete documentation. Besides, the doubts of Swedish officials create the questions of safety securing for the navigation. It is connected to the presence of mines, which were left in the region since the World War II. Nord-Stream expresses its optimism and assure that there will be no disruptions of terms for beginning of construction of the marine part of the project, which is planned on the second half of 2010. But experts suppose that it will be impossible to keep the time frameworks.

Besides the fear that the gas pipeline can cause ecological problems because of the presence of mines from the war, Swedes are afraid that Nord-Stream will limit the possibility of using wind electric stations at the shores of Sweden. So the deadline for project examination is transferred to August, and it is not a fact yet, that the concluding session of Stockholm will be positive. Simultaneously, the official representative of Nord-Stream AG in Russia Irina Vasilyeva reported in the conversation with Nezavisimaya gazeta, that nothing dramatic has place. ‘Every country in the framework of social consultations expresses its opinions and comments, - she marked. – This is a totally normal process, so the transfer of terms is out of speech.’ According to Nord-Stream, on the 15-16 of June the German Stralsund hold a 2-days meeting of international group ‘Espo’, in which representatives of different ministries of nine countries of the Baltic region participated. ‘The countries had informed each other about received comments of the community about the international ecological influence of the Nord-Stream construction through the Baltic Sea, - is in the press release. – The governments of Russia, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Germany will discuss the left questions with Nord-Stream and take into consideration the possible ecological impact of the gas pipeline during the decision making process and distribution of permissions.’
In the meanwhile the countries, on the sea bottom of which the pipeline should go, are still conservative about the approval of proposed route. Furthermore, besides Finland and Sweden, the claims to alternative route of Russian gas delivery to Europe are being expressed in Germany, which is one of the major partners of Russia. In particular, the German Bundestag is striving for the changing of the route or even for the revision of the project, motivating that the gas pipeline will go nearby the naval firing ground at the island of Rugen, where the military naval studies are currently taking place.

The experts of the project were interviewed by the Nezavisimaya Gazeta. These experts did not see any optimism neither in the project itself nor in the beginning if its practical realization. ‘It will be absolutely impossible to begin the building of the pipeline in the given time frameworks, that is in spring - summer of the next year (2010) – assures Mihail Krutihin, the partner of the ‘RusEnergy’ consulting company. – In Finland the deal will not be limited even by positive decision of the government. Perhaps, this will be followed by some national public discussion of the project with the analysis of all possible threatens, coming together with the pipeline. And it is not excluded that the approval will be rejected’. And in Sweden, where the majority of population already today is against the gas pipeline construction in its waters, the situation is much worse, – the analyst underlines. – ‘Any threat to ecology will cause such resistance of the community, that no politicians will take the responsibility to approve the project’ – writes Krutihin.

1.2. Media in Sweden
1.2.1. Aftonbladet

Only to Gas on Naturvårdsverket has researched the alternative routs for the pipeline building around sensitive Hoburgs bank and Midsjo banks. But the background for the government’s decision is that all states have a right to construct pipelines on the international waters, according to Andreas Carlgren. I cannot interpret this other than unprecedented cowardice, a kind of bendings effect, which h is now the result of Swedish environment policy through referring to the international lar rather than to the national one.

The Baltic Sea is the world’s most sensitive sea with a middle depth of only 60 meters, which is still ‘feeling bad’. All the managing of Environment ministry is characterized by the lack of political will and passivity. The environment minister is hiding behind paragraphs instead of looking after all possibilities to change the project and get a reduced influence on the environment. The united environmental movement has been against the project because of effects on the Baltic Sea sensitive environment. Naturvårdsverket required the change of pipeline route, which has not been satisfied. However the government recognizes the project without demand for more information and more measures in order to diminish the environmental consequences of the pipeline.

It is also not justifiable that the government did not require the NS to report an alternative pipeline dragging by the land. The modern law, for example, the Swedish environment code requires different alternatives to be compared in order to evaluate environmental impacts.

Mikael …

Aftonbladet
Soon the gas pipeline will be built 2009-06-29
Nothing can stop the Russian-German gas pipeline through the Baltic Sea. The next year first pipes will be laid on the sea bottom. It is doubtful if someone cares about the negative decision from
Swedish government. We reckon to satisfy all probable environmental requirements. Then there will not be any ‘no’ – says Lars O Gronstedt, the senior advisor to the Nord-Stream consortium.

Two years ago, one summer morning in Visby I ate a free hotel breakfast together with Dirk von Ameln, the vice technical director of the Nord-Stream gas consortium. The hotel’s breakfast table was covered with a big table cloth in a shape of a map. Dirk von Ameln set a height at Vyborg, Russian start point of the gas pipe line. Dirk talked about environment, fishery and safety. In the evenings it was possible to communicate with Nord-Stream representatives. And during days it was possible to get information. The same thing was during last year’s political week on Gotland. But it was nothing in this year. Not any program point connected to the Nord-Stream.

Environment

Aftonbladet

Environmentally messy grounds

During 2010 the first pipelines will be built on the Russian side. In the end of 2011 the pipeline should reach Germany. Then the gas taps will be opened. The affected countries will say ‘yes’ or ‘no’. These ‘yes’ or ‘no’ will depend on the Nord-Stream succeeding in satisfying the environmental requirements. The time of government’s decision was prolonged to the end of August. Lars O Gronstedt does no reckon to get any ‘no’.

The question will be determined on the environmental basis. Only there we can get yes or no answers. During all the process our aim was to satisfy all probable environmental requirements. If we succeed in this, there will be no negative answers, - says Lars O Gronstedt.

We Need a Serious Environment Minister

2009-11-05

Per Bolund, energipolitisk talesperson Environment Party.

All managing of the environment ministry is characterized by a lack of political will and passivity. The environment minister hides behind paragraphs instead of handling all possibilities to change the project and to get a reduced environmental impact.

No Serious Swedish Government Can Say No

2009-11-05

Claes Vasterteg (C) political environmental talesperson

Today the government has says yes

Soon the gas pipeline will be built

2009-06-29

Nothing can stop the Russian-German gas pipeline through the Baltic Sea. The next year first pipes will be laid on the sea bottom.

1.2.2. Dagens Industri

Government Says Yes to Nord-Stream

2009-11-05

Government gives permission for German Nord-Stream AG to build two controversial gas pipelines for the transportation of natural gas on the international waters through Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea.

‘The government’s space for actions has been more limited than during examination of applications concerning Swedish territorial waters or construction in Sweden’ – the government is writing in a press message.
‘This is important that the pipelines is being built outside the Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea. Gas pipeline is unambiguously allowed by theinternational law,’ - says Carlgren.

According to the minister, the Swedish point of view on the gas pipeline environmental impacts have met demand after 23 month handling by authorities and contacts with the Nord-stream.

‘Authorities had a full view and no serious Swedish government could so clearly break against the international law by saying no to the gas pipeline construction’, - explains Carlgren. And points that all states have a right to build the pipelines in international waters and that the coast states have no right to monopolize their districts, but there must be a responsibility for the environment. “

The minister of environment mentioned arguments against the dragging, that were handled by the Swedish authorities and environmental organizations. This concerns the chemical weapons, mines, disturbances for fish, overfeeding and water muddy creation.

If to speak about the chemical weapons, says Andreas Carlgren, the pipeline is not supposed to go through the area, where the chemical weapon is. But if it were possible to find such ones, they could be handled. Nord Stream has during the examination found nine mines, one of which should be exploded, which is no unusual (Andreas Carlgren).

The government considers that there will be no problems of the higher overfeeding or muddy creation of water, and eventual leaking of methane gas from the pipeline does not mean any risk of explosion.

Gotland Says No to Gas Pipeline
2009-08-25

Gotland municipality says no to the Nord-Stream gas pipeline. The industrial department writes in its committee that it ‘wants to oppose the natural gas pipeline and declare that it is better to invest into long-term sustainable energy sources.’

Thanking to the gas pipeline, the municipality does not want to have, it still gets a good restoration of Slite harbor through business with the North-Stream from last year. The company rents harbor during the period of time from 209 to 2011 in order to use it as a logistical centre during the construction of the gas pipeline. The municipality gets around 70 million Swedish crowns for this purpose in advance.

When authorized representatives voted about the harbor and a contract with Nord Stream, the majority for the deal was 52 against 19.

Prosecutor investigates Nord Stream Bribe
2009-02-18

The prosecutor began a preliminary investigation about bribe- and corruption crime since a professor at Gotland University received 5 million Swedish crowns for a project from Nord-Steram company, which wants to build a gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea.

‘More concrete data has come, which gives a reason to look at the question if there is a specific person that got favour of these money,’ - says malin Palmgren from the State Unity against corruption (Riksenheten mot corruption) to the TV 4 News.

In January 2007 Gotland University together with the competent professor warned building of the pipeline near sensitive birds’ area in the Baltic Sea. The same year Nord Stream came up with 5 million crowns, which was directed to the project about birds (alfåglar), the professor’s research field. The company knew that the University even later would express itself about the pipeline. However, the university’s administration recognized money, which has never been a secret. Also, the Nord-Stream informs that there is no conflict of interests in the financing of the research project.

1.2.3. Dagens Nyheter
Nord Stream: ‘An important milestone’
2009-11-05

The Swedish decision for the Nord Stream is one of five national permissions that are required in order the gas pipeline to be built. It means the end of the year of negotiations with Swedish authorities. It is clear that this is an important milestone. We had been working for a couple of years taking care that we will cope with the conditions and felt during the last week that we will fix it, - says Lars O Gronstedt, the senior advisor of the Nord-Stream.

About 50 miles of the total 120 miles of the pipeline’s length will run through so called Swedish economic zone. Nord-Stream describes in the press-release that Swedish permission is a result of huge expert studies of environment and technique during many years, as well as a good dialogue with the responsible authorities.

More pipeline routs had been researched carefully with a consideration of environment, navigation, fishing, chemical weapons drowning and cultural heritage.

‘What could you say to those who trouble about the environment in the Baltic Sea? We do quite extensive engagement concerning the laying of the pipeline in order not to disturb fish or animal life. We do an undertaking about how we will remove the mines and engagement concerning the muddy creation that is how much water slam can be muddled during the work. Later, when it lays there, it is difficult to imagine some more environmentally friendly way to transport the energy, - says Grönstedt.

Nord-Stream does not want to change the dragging
2009-10-28

Nord Stream keeps its proposition about where the planned gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea will be dragged through the Swedish economic zone. The company writes this in a new petition to the industrial department.

Nord Stream mine exploding is escaped
2009/11/22 TT-FNB

The work with the old mine explosion along the area where the Nord-Stream gas pipeline will be dragged in the Finnish Bay was opened recently, but afterwards became interrupted. The British company that cares about mine exploding in the sea on the south of Helsinki informed that the work was interrupted because of technical problems. A new try will be made next week.

According to the original plans, the mine exploding should have been started for two weeks ago. The first mines which are to be exploded during the planned gas pipeline construction, are on the international waters but in the Finnish economic zone. The distance to Drumsö in Helsinki is about thirty kilometers.

There are four mines in the district, which are on less than 100 meters depth and relatively close to each other. It takes about two working days to explode one mine. Nord-Stream in the autumn has received the permission to explode the mines from the Finnish environmental authorities.

Pipes for the gas pipeline are on the place
2009-08-20, Jan Malmborg

The Russian - German gas pipeline Nord-Stream is planning to put down around 20000 of twelve meters long steel pipes on the bottom of the Baltic Sea. The first 168 pipes had been unloaded now at Karlskrona despite the fact that the Swedish government has not given yet its permission for gas pipeline construction.
On Friday the commitment time is running out for the authorities and other organizations which will express themselves about Nord-Stream’s description of environmental consequences of the gas pipeline building in the Baltic Sea.

On Thursday only half of the commitment answers have come. It was two most important documents among all the commitments. The first was the answer from Sjöfartsverket (naval authority) and SMHI. Judging from their answer, the government will have a tricky task during the examination of the gas pipeline accordance with the law on continental shelf.

The naval authority establishes the fact that those judgments that Nord-Stream does of the risk levels ‘not explicitly pay attention the classification of the Baltic Sea as a specially protection worth marine area’. Further, there is more demand for researches of alternative pipeline stretching routes which would be ‘more advantageous for the navigation safety’.

SMHI also suggests that Nord-Stream has misinterpreted the authority’s consult report given to the company. ‘Misleading’, ‘totally wrong’- is written. The industrial department will now go through the commitment in order to check if there are any question marks that must be corrected before the Nord-Stream’s request will be laid on the government’s table.

During summer both Russian and German governments had increased the pressure on Sweden in order to accelerate the decision process. Nord-Stream’s Swedish chief Lars O Gronstedt informed that April 2010 was considered to be the deadline for getting the permission from all required countries.

The company’s self-confidence is great. On Wednesday morning the first 168 steel pipes for the gas pipeline were unloaded in Karlskrona. Before the end of the year 13000 more pipes will arrive here. Totally the building will need 200000 pipes which will be located in Karlskona, Slite, Kotka, Greifswald and Vyborg before they will be laid on the bottom of the Baltic Sea.

There is nothing unusual in the fact that we began to deliver the pipes before we received the permission. It’s almost like the situation, when people take home a little timber before the vacation for building of a new veranda, - says Lars O Gronstedt.

* Nord-Stream is investing in 2011*

2009-01-23, Jan Malmborg

A danger for navigation and passenger traffic, the threat for cod (fish), an uncertainty concerning the sea bottom. Swedish authorities indicate many weak points in the gas pipeline project Nord-Stream. Now it is the company’s turn to answer.

When Nord-Stream left its request to the Swedish government in December 2007, the aim was to lie down the first pipeline during summer 2009 and to finish the construction in 2010. This plan is revised. ‘Now we are planning that the first of two pipelines will be transporting gas in 2011’, - says Nicklas Andersson at Nord-Stream.

In November 2008 about ten authorities received so called ‘small commitment’ (liten remiss) to go through the Nord-Stream’s request in order to check if there are any question marks which are to be decided before the beginning of a big commitment round.

The defence authority (Försvarsmakten) established the fact that there were four districts with a concentration of unexploded ammunition and drowned mines along the stretching of the gas pipeline in Swedish economic zone.

SMHI is worrying about how the pipeline can affect the salinity and oxygen conditions in Bornholm basin, the central area for cod growth in the Baltic Sea. That’s why it is suggested that the company should do the research in order to describe the interaction between the pipeline and water streams. Nord-Stream will update the material in February. The naval authority (Sjofartsverket) has the sharpest writing. The authority questions the Nord-Streams analysis of risks for personal injury in case if the gas pipeline would be damaged.
According to Nord-Stream, the risk of damage at a passenger vessel is 10 percent and 60 percent for the cargo boat. However, the Swedish authority has another point of view: ‘The probability of gas ignition can be higher at a passenger vessel than at a cargo vessel outside the construction requirements, depending on the type of a vessel. The analysis merely considers the presence of people on the deck. The risk is that the vessel through the air receiving takes in gas high ignites in the machine room, personnel and passenger space is relevant, which means that the number of injured will probably be more than 10 percent at a passenger vessel.

Nord-Stream’s answer is that the risk for the third party to be injured of the jet fire is so little that even if it was ten times higher, its level would be under the international practice.

Now, when the company has come with the answer to the small commitment, there is a bigger commitment round that will soon take place. Twenty authorities and all affected municipalities and counties will tell their own point of view. The handling of the commitment is expected to be finished in May.

*Ready for commitment about gas pipeline*

2009-02-13, Leif Svensson

The gas pipeline company Nord-Stream leaves now its environmental report to nine countries around the Baltic Sea. Accordingly, a new stage in the project with commitment in all states was introduced in May.

On Friday the affected states and the company had a meeting in Copenhagen agreeing that the report is ready for further handling. ‘The material is with all completing so good that we decided to have a consultation at the beginning of March’ – says Egon Enocksson from the milieu agency (Naturvårdsverket).

The meeting was one of many in so called Esboprocess. It is being regulated by the UN treaty, called ‘Esbokonvention’, which is a convention on the environmental protection. According to this convention the countries on whose economic zones the pipeline will be constructed must inform other states about the limit exceeding environmental effects.

The Nord-Stream describes such effects in the approved report. The report will be published in all languages. The documents which were left by the company the environmental agency are not public yet.

The commitment round in Sweden grasps also the company’s national request. It is being examined according to the law on the continental shelf because the pipeline will be laid in the Swedish economic zone in the Baltic Sea.

The government has received the basis for this commitment in January and further completing in the end of February.

So when Nord-Stream at the beginning of March delivered all basic materials, the countries were given three months for domestic consultations and also for the exchange by the ideas between states.
However the commitment period for the publicity will become shorter, because we need some weeks to place together points of view that we have already received’ , - says Egon Enocksson.

3.2.4. Svenska Dagbladet

*A camel in the Baltic Sea*

2009-11-06

The government’s ‘yes’ to the Nord-Stream is merely based on the environmental examination. It is not valid to close eyes at the safety and political consequences. All who worried about the Nord-
Stream pipeline can breathe out now. Blue mussels at Hoburgens bank and Midsjo banks will not be disturbed.

The environmental minister was crystal clear at recording the motive for government’s ‘yes’ to the gas pipeline from Vyborg to Greifswald – through the Swedish economic zone. The environmental examination had been rigorous. Two mines need to be exploded. The fish will not be affected by any problems.

Of course it is good that Nord-Stream during the trip has been forced to create an environmental profile of the project and has even rejected the plans for service platform construction to the east of Gotland. But still it could be argued that the government has chosen to strain at a milieu gnat instead of to swallow a Russian camel.

The government has done a decision to the environmental question. At the last press-conference the environmental minister made an impression that the gas pipeline in general would not influence the Baltic Sea strategic situation.

The government disregarded the safety and political aspects of the Russian-German gas pipeline. This is not valid. And it is not valid either to see only the economic project. The government should have required an alternative dragging route by the land.

Sweden environmental interests are being sold out
2009-11-06
Swedish government’s ‘yes’ to gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea means that the Swedish environmental interest is being sold out in favor of Russian gas.

The gas pipeline lies not in Swedish interest, first of all with an idea about the long term consequences for environment. However the interest lies in Russian interest. Swedish government has told yes to Russian-German gas pipeline Nord-Stream on the bottom of the Baltic Sea. The commitment rounds, environmental examinations, lobby campaigns and diplomatic tours on a high level have preceded the decision. But can the government guarantee that vital Swedish interests are not being sold out in order not to disturb the EU presidency? – U. Ahlin and A. Ygeman wonder. The gas pipeline with an imagined ramification to Sweden is risking to make obstacles for investments into bio energy. The recognition of the gas pipeline is binding Europe with the dependency on Russian gas and means serious environmental risks in a very sensitive sea district. Every new stuck in natural gas billion investments slows down the European investing in renewable energy.

A Political Cocktail with an Explosive Power
2009-11-05
The environmental minister referred to the law, making a decision concerning the Russian-German gas pipeline. But purely politically it has been difficult for the Swedish government to say ‘no’.

The gas pipeline is a political cocktail with an explosive power. It is about the Baltic Sea’s environment and how the European Union’s future energy providing will look out, because the gas pipeline does not lead off from the fossil dependence.

It also touches the safety policy. And Russian-German company Nord-Stream indirectly owned by Russian state has obviously been persuaded for a long time that the Swedish government’s answer would not be negative. The company has already invested many millions into the project. Different economic propositions had been a part of a strategy of influence. Money went to Swedish Fishermen and to different projects on Gotland.