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The Project

• A double offshore gas pipeline in the Baltic Sea
• 1200 km long, 1.4 m diameter
• New direct link between Western Europe and Russian gas reserves
• Capacity 55 billion m$^3$/year
• Nord Stream Co = Gazprom 51%, Wintershall and E.ON Ruhrgas 20 each, Gasunie 9%
Five different parts of the route

- Finnish EEZ
- Swedish EEZ
- Danish,
- German
- Russian EEZ and territorial waters
Status of Espoo ratification in the Baltic Sea subregion

- Eight of nine Baltic Sea states are Parties to the Convention

- Russia is a signatory to the Convention but has not ratified
Cooperation of Parties during the EIA procedure

- Parties of Origin’s Points of Contact and Focal Points formed an informal coordination group

- The group has met 16 times since April 2006 in Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Russia

- Parties that are only Affected Parties have participated in most meetings and key stages in the procedure
Early Espoo application decisions

- Appendix I project → Convention applies
- Four Parties of Origin → Joint responsibilities
- Russia’s role → PoO as far as legislation
- Eight Affected Parties → All Baltic Parties are Affected Parties
- Common goal → Coordinated procedure
Parties of Origin/Affected Parties - "Only Affected Parties" and Russia

Parties of Origin/Affected Parties

- Finland
- Russia
- Estonia
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Poland
- Germany
- Sweden
- Denmark

Only Affected Parties
Espoo procedure

- coordinated notification with common scoping document and timing for commenting for nine countries

- all countries agreed to have public participation in notification phase (even when not all normally have requirements)

- two additional consultations due to new alternatives

- coordinated view of minimum Espoo requirements on EIA documentation

- coordinated consultations until 8 June 2009
EIA documentation

- Common understanding of minimum content requirements of Espoo Convention, namely Appendix II

- EIA documentation more than 4000 pages
  - one report for whole project including transboundary impacts in 10 languages
    - I-III volumes and map atlas
  - 5 National EIAs and map atlases
Challenges 1

• Relationship between Espoo and UNCLOS

• Five "national" route sections = five different permits

• Parties of Origin were also Affected Parties

• Five national EIAs versus one overall EIA
Challenges 2

• Specific issues in each “national” route section

• Project developed and changed, additional consultations for new alternatives needed
Main conclusions concerning developer

• need to understand the Convention

• need to have highly qualified environmental expertise

• need to understand different national EIA and permit granting procedures

• need to understand the role of PoO
Conclusions concerning the Parties of Origin

- Understand each other’s legislation, administrative culture and procedures
- plan timeframe and administrative resources carefully
- good coordination between developer and PoO is needed
- Espoo serves as an important intergovernmental environmental tool