

Forum Summary, ANNEX IV (V)
Baltic Sea NGO Forum 2006, Stockholm, Sweden
5-7 October 2006
www.bsngoforum.org

ANNEX IV

Summary of the Seminar Environment and Sustainability, October 6

Plenary 1: HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan and the role of NGOs _____	2
Plenary 2: Radioactive Contamination of the Baltic Sea Region _____	9

Please observe that this is an annex of the document "6th Baltic Sea NGO Forum Summary", which can be found at www.bsngoforum.org.

Plenary 1: HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan and the role of NGOs

Moderator: Ms. Pauli Merriman, WWF

Organizer and rapporteur: Ms. Maret Merisaar, Coalition Clean Baltic

The aim of the Environment seminar of the 6th Baltic Sea NGO Forum was to introduce the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM) Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP) as the regional implementation plan for the EU Marine Strategy. It was discussed, how the grass-root environmental NGOs can contribute to the drafting process (until November 2007) and how they can cooperate with the governments for realising and supervision the set objectives. The workshop participants formulated concrete ideas on how their organisation could contribute to the BSAP process, who would they like to see as cooperation partners and what kind of certain responsibilities they might take during the period before the next forum.

The Baltic Sea Action Plan was introduced by Mr. Jon Kahn, Director at the Swedish Ministry of Sustainable Development and Swedish representative in the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan Task Force (jon.kahn@sustainable.ministry.se). He gave a brief overview of the history of the Helsinki Convention and Commission (www.helcom.fi) and described the goals in the chapters of the BSAP: limiting of eutrophication (lead parties Finland and Latvia), protection of the biodiversity including fisheries (lead parties Poland and Estonia), securing the safety of shipping (lead party Denmark and Russia) and abatement of toxic pollution (lead parties Sweden, Germany and Lithuania). Some issues that need special attention are: sustainable agriculture, efficient treatment of effluents from cities, treatment of effluents from single family houses, reducing emissions from ships and sustainable fisheries. In March 2006 HELCOM invited all possible stakeholders to contribute to the elaboration and implementation of the BSAP process. Background studies of the four mentioned areas plus Climate Change in the Baltic Sea Area were published. These studies are also available on the 6th NGO Forum homepage. According to the EU Marine Strategy, adopted in 2006 all seas under the EU jurisdiction (Baltic Sea, Mediterranean Sea, Northern part of the Atlantic Ocean and Black Sea) must be in a good ecological status by the year 2020...2025. The plans for measures for different eco-regions should be finalized by the year 2010.

Questions: Gitte Jutvik, WWF Sweden (gitte.jutvik@wwf.se) asked what is the difference between HELCOM and Baltic Agenda 21. The reply was that HELCOM is an intergovernmental body making more legally binding commitments (called recommendations) while BA21 is a participatory process working in various sectoral areas like Agriculture, Transport, Forestry, Industry etc. One of the most developed chapter in BA 21 is Environmental Education.

Ms. Maret Merisaar, water policy officer of the CCB secretariat in Estonia (maret.merisaar@ccb.se) introduced the Coalition Clean Baltic as a network of Baltic Sea grass root environmental movements (see www.ccb.se) created in 1990 and having half a million members altogether. CCB is working for finding positive solutions for the protection of the Baltic Sea Environment and works on local, national and international level. The recent participation in the consultation process of the EU Draft Marine Strategy was given as an example of CCB international work. The CCB proposals for the Draft EU Marine Strategy will be listed below under each chapter of the Baltic Sea Action Plan separately. (remark: Please observe that these proposals represent the view of CCB)

CCB supports the position from WWF et al. from November 2004, that the existing EU sectoral policies having impact on the state of the marine environment, such as CAP, CFP, Transport Policy, chemicals policy, etc, must be enhanced by the strategy but at the same time it is equally important that these policies should not undermine the protection of the environment of the European seas. Any contradictions emerging during the development of the Marine Strategy should be recorded and subjected to public discussion.

Question: There was a question asked how other organizations not belonging to the CCB could join the CCB work for BSAP, and the answer was that the BS NGO Forum thematic working groups could be one of the ways to involve more people interested in one or another chapter of the BSAP.

Ms. Pauli Merriman, project manager from the WWF Baltic Marine Ecoregions' Programme, Ulriksdals Slott, Sweden (pauli.merriman@wwf.se) spoke about the importance of the BSAP and invited all NGOs to give an input to this process. She also described WWF activities for the protection of the Baltic Sea. See more on www.wwf.org

Questions: What does the expression "Baltic fatigue" mean?

Answer: This a concern, whether it is possible to save the Baltic Sea Biodiversity or not. Mr. Charles Berkow from the Swedish Green Party asked if it is problematic that countries like Russia and Germany have their attention in other directions than the Baltic Region. Ms. Pauli Merriman hoped that they are interested in the BSAP process. Mr. Jon Kahn said at this is sometimes a problem.

Eutrophication/Sustainable Agriculture

Dr. Artur Granstedt from the Järna Biodynamic Research Institute in Skilleby, Sweden (arturgranstedt@jdb.se) gave a lecture on limiting of N and P loads to the Baltic Sea by developing ecological recycling agriculture. According to his words, Poland, Sweden and Finland contribute the biggest amounts of these nutrients to the sea from agricultural activities. The new EI member states still have a considerable part of agriculture kept in extensive way and they should try to maintain it. The slide show by Mr. Artur Granstedt will be available in the Forum Syd office.

Questions: Ms. Charlie Hulten asked how can the small farmers' food processing units (diaries, slaughterhouses etc.) be maintained in the market competition. How can environmental NGOs inform them about the ecological farming systems.

Discussion on networking: Maret Merisaar (CCB) described how the Estonian Environmental NGOs lobby for the best sustainable way for using the EU Rural Development money. They have been invited to the advisory roundtable of the Ministry of Agriculture as an official cooperation partner. She invited the other green organizations to share experience of national level work in this field.

Dr. Ruzena Svedelius (Green Library, Lund) expressed her will to cooperate for the projects for decreasing the nutrient pollution. The representatives from a Latvian Agricultural NGO Ventspils District Agricultural Union were interested in this topic as well.

The CCB proposals for the EU Marine Strategy chapter on Eutrophication were as follows:

- *Fighting eutrophication starts from limiting the land based diffuse sources, that contribute with approximate 70% of N&P load to the Baltic Sea .*
- *One of the biggest hazards has been and is the industrial livestock farming, e.g. new pig-farms in Poland (Smithfield), and Lithuania (Danish developer).*
- *Modernising infrastructure (housing, slurry and manure storage facilities, the animal breeding waste utilization industry, also avoiding atmospheric emissions of ammonia from animal production);*
- *More efficient manure application techniques.*
- *Reducing industrial farming to sustainable levels in sensitive areas;*
- *Maintaining extensive farming systems;*
- *More efficient use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides;*
- *Creation of multi-species buffer zones for protecting water courses;*
- *Creation of constructed wetlands as sustainable pollution control structures,*
- *Haymaking in floodplains.*

On the discussion on 7 October Dr. Ruzena Svedelius added to these points that fighting with eutrophication starts from limiting the land based diffuse sources that contribute with approximate 70% of N & P load to the Baltic Sea and from changing management of biomass in solid and liquid waste. In addition to industrial livestock farming one of the biggest hazards is the present way of using the wastewater treatment plants. We should start to design novel more sustainable local systems where energy and nutrients in biomass from solid and liquid waste is used for production of biogas and biofertilizers. Industrial farming should be reduced in all areas and bigger support should be given to ecological farming. Dr. Svedelius is not supporting the constructed wetlands as these are accumulating nutrients and not helping to recycle them.

Sustainable Fisheries

Mr. Staffan Danielsson from the Swedish Fisheries' Secretariat (Staffan.Danielsson@fishsec.org) described the state of the stocks of different fish species in the Baltic Sea. Cod stocks (in particular the alarming state of the eastern stock) are in urgent need for EU level recovery actions. One of the main problems is the high level of IUU fishing in the Baltic Sea (illegal, unreported and unregistered landings). Fisheries is quite weak in the BSAP as it is not part of HELCOMs mandate, therefore links with other relevant bodies and processes are important in order for the BSAP target of Sustainable Fisheries to be met. The role of environmental NGOs should be public awareness rising, advocacy and participation in stakeholder forums. Cooperation between NGOs working with Sustainable Fisheries is important. (see www.fishsec.org)

Mr. Charles Berkow from the Swedish Green Party (Charles.Berkow@riksdag.se) who was invited to the forum to introduce the Green Parties' Network around the Baltic Sea and their recent declaration for saving the cod and salmon stocks, could not do that due to limited time for interventions.

Comment by Ms. Charlie Hulten, Swedish Anti Nuclear Movement: Fish stocks are also threatened by the waters contaminated with nuclear waste.

Discussion on possible networking: EU level lobby for promoting regulation on more sustainable fisheries is undertaken by the Swedish Fisheries Secretariat and there is another possibility to participate in the EU level work in the Regional Advisory Committee for Fisheries (RAC) based in Copenhagen. A lot of NGOs are represented there. As for the grass-root environmental NGOs they could also work on national level with the fisheries' organisations to raise awareness on fisheries policies. Mr. Stuart Thompson from the Forum

Syd Lake Victoria Program introduced the problem of over-fishing Nile-perch in that East-African lake and proposed the fisheries topic as one of co-operation areas with the Tanzanian, Kenyan and Tanzanian NGOs. If anyone is struck by an idea for a joint activity, they are welcome to contact Stuart.Thompson@forumsyd.org

CCB proposals (tasks for the governments) for the EU Marine Strategy chapter on Biodiversity decline and habitat protection:

- *Studies on fish populations quality and quantity on the wellbeing of the fish.*
- *Limitation of damaging fishing gear like bottom trawling etc.*
- *Establishing temporary bans on e.g. cod fisheries, to safeguard the agreed Spawning Stock Biomass*
- *Improving the inspection capacities checking fishing activities, illegal landings and catches of e.g. juvenile populations.*
- *Limit construction of small hydro-energy development in rivers with migratory fish, e.g. wild Baltic salmon.*

Sustainable Shipping

Ms. Agni Kaldma from Estonian Fund for Nature (agni@elfond.ee) demonstrated a video (TV clip) and photos on the voluntary work of schoolchildren and students to wash the oiled birds after a mysterious oil spill accident in winter in NE Estonia. Her proposal was to close the Danish Straits for outgoing vessels after information of such accidents is spread, as it is very difficult to identify the escaping polluters. This case described the cooperation of many different national NGOs and members of the public to help the government in crisis situation. Also it was an example of international cooperation as the experts from WWF UK came to teach Estonians the right techniques of saving, cleaning and releasing the birds. Estonian Fund for Nature also initiated the roundtable with Estonian authorities and oil transfer business sector to create national oil fund. The objective of that Fund is to collect a small percentage of money for each transferred oil barrel from the business sector for liquidating the oil accidents. This should not be only a cost for the government.

Question: Can this money be used for doing lobby work and awareness rising?

Answer: no it can only be used for creating the rescue system.

The CCB proposals (tasks for governments) for the Draft EU Marine Strategy Maritime transport chapter had been the following:

- *Compulsory pilotage in international straits and environmentally sensitive areas of the Baltic Sea PSSA, and for all navigation lines within territorial waters for vessels transporting oil-products, chemicals, gas and other dangerous goods.*
- *Introducing proper Vessel Traffic Monitoring and information system*
- *Comprehensive study on investigating the economic and environmental feasibility of routes, especially the alternatives to current maritime route for transportation of crude oil through sensitive Baltic Sea Area.*

The proposals for the chapter on Chronic oil pollution were the following:

- *Deliberate oil spills and accidents should be dealt with money from the national oil funds*
- *Double hull tankers are not enough- double navigation systems and mandatory pilotage in PSSA are also needed;*
- *Moratorium on the extraction of oil in the open sea*
- *Development and implementation of the Polluter Pays Principle (PPP).*

Discussion on networking: There were no definite initiatives to establish new NGO networks or partnerships in the shipping issue revealed during the final discussion. But during the preparation of the forum, there were several NGO experts on sustainable shipping consulted, and several of them expressed their interest to participate in the NGO Forum in 2007 (Ms. Susanne Ortmanns from Swedish Nature Conservation Society, Mr. Peter Blanner from WWF Denmark to mention a few). So there was a proposal made to look into this issue more closely next year.

Toxics and Radioactivity

See also the report from the Plenary 2 below.

The CCB proposals (tasks for governmental bodies) for the EU Marine Strategy Hazardous Substances chapter are as follows:

- *Eco-labelling of fish (environmental toxins, e.g. dioxins, cadmium, PCBs)*
- *Contamination with radionuclids: Ban on shipment of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive wastes via waterways. Find solutions for reducing environmental risks for hazardous storage of spent nuclear fuel e.g. Sosnovy Bor, in St Peterburg region.*

Discussion on networking: The environmental impact assessments and public hearings for creating new nuclear power plants must be carried out according to the requirements. They should not be just cosmetic events after the decisions are taken (case in Finland).

Climate Change

Mr. Alexey Kokorin, WWF Russia (akokorin@wwf.ru) gave an interesting lecture on the relations of Climate Change in the Baltic Sea Region with changes in the hydrological conditions and biodiversity. The global warming is not only a natural process but it is very much dependent on human behavior causing the emissions of green house gases. The projected increase in the temperature of the upper water layers will affect the circulation and distribution of nutrients. The input of nutrients from the catchment area will be dependent on the possible increase of the flow rates from rivers. The large decrease of ice cover will have a negative impact on the ringed seals and grey seals that breed on ice. On the other hand the increased temperature might have a positive impact for harbor seals and harbor porpoises. The migrating/wintering birds might winter farther north in the Baltic Basin than previously. The slide show is available on request from the Forum Syd Office.

Question from Mr. Charles Berkow: Russia is the major exporter of hydrocarbon fuels, what can be done for reduction of emissions?

Answer: Climate Change has been called just a PR trick of ecologists but it is a process that does exist in reality. Clear-cutting of forests has an influence for climate as well. Negative for Russia, mild winters.

Dr. Ruzena Svedelius from Green Library, Lund (rsvedelius@hotmail.com) spoke about the novel approach for more efficient biogas and biofertilizers production from biomass versus incineration as a tool for reducing negative impact on climate, cultivated soils and water as well as on food quality.

Mr. Piotr Kuropatwinski, from the Gdansk University and Polish Ecological Club (piotr.kuropatwinski@gnu.univ.gda.pl) presented an example of good public transport as means of reducing green house gas emissions. Cycle friendly cities are also people friendly

cities. He spoke about the popular joint bicycle campaigns in Sopot that attract thousands of participants. The development of Euro-Velo routes is a good tool for public awareness rising.

A broader Bremen-Gdansk twin city project with German-Polish NGO cooperation in the fields of ecology/culture, tourism, education, sports and leisure, social affairs and others (www.hb-gd-ngo-act.de) was presented by Ms Frauke Rubert, from the EU-Office of Cultural Centre Lagerhaus in Bremen, Germany (FraukeRubart@aol.com) during the discussion of future networking.

Mr. Helmut Hallemaa from Tartu University, Estonia and Estonian Society for Nature Conservation (Helmut.Hallemaa@mail.ee) introduced a study on sustainability of energy use. Among other things, Mr. Hallemaa explained the meaning of two indexes used in measuring the efficiency of energy use and improving the ecological and energetic sustainability in Estonia. Emergy is the solar energy required to generate a flow or storage. Exergy is characterising the maximum work that can be extracted from a system when it moves towards the thermodynamic equilibrium. The activities of different environmental NGOs since the year 1991 to lobby for better energy policies in the Ministry of Economy were introduced (slide show available).

Questions: Mr. Saulius Piksrys from Community Atgaja, Lithuania (saulius@atgaja.lt) asked, if Estonian NGOs would join their fight against the Ignalina nuclear power plant.

Mr. Hallemaa remained pragmatic and replied that although no one wants a dangerous polluter in their backyard, there will be either a new nuclear power plant probably constructed in Finland anyway or the old one in Ignalina will be reconstructed. Estonian Green Movement is supporting the Lithuanian colleagues in their demand to close down Ignalina.

It was discussed whether Climate Change could be an overarching topic of a wider public awareness rising campaign in the Baltic Sea region, taking into account that eutrophication, biodiversity and shipping of oil are all somehow related to this topic. Climate change will also be a topic for the EU election campaign by the European Green Parties, so in this way the NGOs could also help in increasing the voter turnout during the next EU Parliament elections. Mr. Per Hegelund from MILKAS explained that Climate Change must not be related to fight against nuclear contamination as the nuclear power industries often use the climate change as an argument for protecting their business plans.

Climate Change was considered a good topic for the future cooperation of the NGOs of the Baltic Sea region: One of the ideas was to try to extend the bicycle way along the coasts of the sea, as in many places such ways already have been established. For example annual bicycle tours of Finnish, Russian and Estonian NGOs are organised around the Gulf of Finland. Mr. Piotr Kuropatwinski from PKE was ready to take part of the responsibility to help to create a network of NGOs interested in this matter. Addressing general public to change the behaviour and lifestyles is much more important than addressing the authorities with concerns on environment. We can start with simpler issues like the need to guarantee the safety of road users and limit the air pollution. There is a possibility to co-operate with the Scandinavian NGOs in this matter.

Jens William Grav from Severin Education (jwg@mail.dk) said that the Baltic Sea NGO network should not have too many lead agencies. One lead agency for environment should be determined so it could be a mailbox. One of our activities could be exchanging the experiences on 3...4 issues that people are most interested in. For example in Denmark the

government has invested some money in renovation of the flats, in childcare and culture institutions and there is a possibility for the public to control these investments.

It was said that the transport and energy development plans on various governance levels should be sustainable and take into account the green house gas emissions. Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments (SEAs) of such plans and policies should be done according to the requirements and give the proper choice between the alternatives.

There was an interest to work in the area of demanding proper Environmental Impact Assessment for the German Russian Gas Pipeline expressed by Mr. Alexander Shkrebet, Transboundary Environmental Information Agency, Russia (sasha@teia.org) and Ms. Anne Wittich, Naturschutzbund, Germany (aniaa2002@yahoo.com) . A permanent working group could be established for organising a public control over the construction activities. Mr Alexander Shkrebet expressed his readiness to be the focal point for that activity.

In the final plenary Ms Charlie Hultén from the Swedish Anti Nuclear Movement expressed her concern, whether the NGO fights against intensification of agriculture or over-fishing are not just hopeless because they going against the market forces. It was explained that the topics of sustainable agriculture, fishing and shipping were chosen for possible networking because of the ongoing process of drafting the Baltic Sea Action Plan. The role of grass-root environmental NGOs is not to take over the role of governments but rather support the achievement of goals by public awareness rising and supervision of the local implementation activities. While governments usually deal with large point pollution sources, NGOs can be useful in limiting the pollution loads from diffuse sources, where lot depends on the behaviour of the people.

Plenary 2: Radioactive Contamination of the Baltic Sea Region

Moderator: Mr Per Hegelund, The Environment Movement's Nuclear Waste Secretariat, MILKAS, valiantdk@yahoo.com

Rapporteur: Charly Hultén, Swedish Anti-Nuclear Movement,

The session had the following structure. Presentations from CBSS and HELCOM MORS, respectively, followed by a break. Then, a short film, "Prohibited Manifestation" from Russia, followed by four presentations from environmental NGOs.

Mr. Philipp Schwartz, Senior Advisor at the CBSS Secretariat and Secretary to the WGNRS

The aim of the CBSS Working Group on Nuclear and Radiation Safety is to aid member states in their work to ensure and improve radiation protection. Toward this end the WGNRS collect information, identify objects that may require measures. Priority objects are installations at Paldiski (EST), Sosnovy Bor (RUS), Ignalina (LT) and Greifswald (D, now shut down). Priority activities include: information exchange between military and civilian authorities; an inventory of radiation sources, their handling and control with a view to improving emergency preparedness; illicit trafficking in radioactive materials; and an annual communication exercise (mock event at unannounced time). Harmonisation of intervention levels (e.g., when evacuation or distribution of iodine is to be recommended) is another ongoing process.

Radiation monitoring data are exchanged between countries, but is not made available to the public, as it is believed that members of the public would be unable to interpret them. No plans to make such information available in an easily digested form were forthcoming. More general information is available on the CBSS website, including the newsletter, *BaltInfo*.

Questions:

- *A map showed major differences in density of the member states' monitoring stations. Germany is virtually packed with stations, whereas Scandinavia has rather few. Mr. Schwartz explained that the German case is partly an artefact of the historical fact that Germany once had reason to fear a nuclear attack.*

(Please also see Mr. Philipp Schwartz' powerpoint presentation, at www.bsngoforum.org)

Mr. Sven P Nielsen, HELCOM-MORS

MORS is the division of HELCOM that deals with monitoring of radioactivity and radiation protection. HELCOM-MORS has several monitoring programs: discharges from sources to the sea, environmental levels of radioactivity, indicator levels, a sediment baseline study (spatial distribution of nuclides). The unit conducts recurrent validations of measuring stations and produces thematic reports. The sediment baseline project is currently focused on improving inventory estimates.

It is the explicit goal of HELCOM to restore radioactivity levels in the Baltic Sea to pre-Chernobyl values. [A catalogue of observations of various nucleides followed.]

In terms of individual radiation doses to individuals in critical groups, the contribution of nuclear facilities is small in comparison with residual radiation fallout from Chernobyl from atmospheric testing, and the nuclear reprocessing plant at Sellafield (northwestern England).

It should be noted that individual doses are not empirical, but are calculated on the basis of modelling.

Questions:

- *MORS' diagrams are illegible online; they are also difficult interpret because the vertical scales differ between diagrams. Surely, something can be done about this?*
- *Information about empirically observed values would be appreciated. Mr. Nielsen responded that raw data could be made available, but not in summary form.*
- *A map indicated observed concentrations of plutonium off the Finnish coast. These may be due to the fact that plutonium adheres to organic material. Thus, effluents of organic material from the Finnish mainland may explain the concentrations. That the locations coincide with the two loci for Finland's nuclear energy reactors is sheer coincidence.*
- *That Sellafield is the source of a good measure of the radioactivity in the Baltic is demonstrated thanks to fingerprinting, i.e., tracking of clusters of nucleides from Germany, through the Skagerak and Kattegatt and into the Baltic.*

(Please also see Mr. Sven P Nielsen's powerpoint presentation, at www.bsngoforum.org)

FILM

Per Hegelund, The Environment Movement's Nuclear Waste Secretariat, MILKAS (Sweden)
Presentation: Documentation from the Swedish Defence Research Establishment (FOA) shows us, that routine releases from one country's nuclear installations (Sellafield) can pollute all of our waters and be an even greater factor (north of Scandinavia and Murmansk), than the accident at Chernobyl (*1). Also, many scientists caution that the radioactivity from so-called background radiation is not comparable to that from man-made elements. Human beings have evolved in the presence of background radiation, we do not interact biologically with these elements to the extent we may do with brand new radioactive elements.

The Baltic Sea is the most radioactive sea in the world.(HELCOM,*2). The Chernobyl accident, atmospheric nuclear bomb tests and Sellafield's releases are the main contributing factors. We cannot influence these historical contributions, done is done, but we can influence the contributions of current nuclear activities in the region. At the top of our agenda at present is the question of nuclear waste management and storage. Both Sweden and Finland are planning final repositories for their spent nuclear fuel – and plan to locate these final repositories at the shore of or below the Baltic Sea, and local authorities describe the sea as a “recipient” for expected releases! The sea has only 1% exchange with the ocean. What we put into it more or less stays there.

In Sweden localization of nuclear waste repositories has been left in the hands of the industry. Why should we trust the region's most polluting nuclear facilities with the task of caring for highly radioactive waste, the most dangerous waste in human history? We must influence our own governments to protect our common marine environment. If they do not, how can we expect other countries' governments to cease their pollution?

Reference *1: Radioactive sources of main radiological concern in the Kola-Barents region. See illustrations page 19 and 15. (Publication nr: FOA-B--98-00343-861-SE)

Reference *2: Info from HELCOM – ‘The levels of antropogenic radionuclides are higher in the Baltic Sea than in any other water bodies around the world’ (from ‘Hazardous substances in the Baltic Sea’ – Draft Helcom Thematic Assessment in 2006).

[Please also see ‘The Radioactive Contamination of the Baltic Sea’ – version of the presentation distributed at the workshop, to be found at www.bsngoforum.org]

Saulius Piksrys, Lithuanian Green Movement, Community Atgaja

The Lithuanian case: Lithuania was the energy production centre in the western part of the former Soviet empire. We have a tremendous capacity: nuclear energy (2 x 1500 MW), hydroelectric and gas-fired electricity production.

The Green Movement opposes nuclear energy on the grounds that it is dangerous, polluting, unhealthy and expensive. What is more, the industry is corrupt/corrupting.

In juridical terms, the Lithuanian nuclear regime has largely been “legislated by decree”. This applies to the localization of a site for the nuclear waste repository, Stabatiskes, as well. The site has poor geological conditions, but has the advantage of being already owned by the nuclear industry. The Green Movement has cooperated with local trade unions and some municipalities to limit the area of localization to a 30 km zone around Ignalina and to limit the social ills that might follow decommissioning of Ignalina. In this latter context, the Green Movement has liaised with groups in Slovakia, who face similar problems in the case of Bohunice.

- In Spring 2006, the governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania resolved to conduct a feasibility study for the renewal of a nuclear capacity in Lithuania, probably at Ignalina.

- Plans to establish a grid connection between Lithuania and Sweden, and with Poland have also been announced. What will come of these proposals remains to be seen..

(Please also see Mr. Saulius Piksrys’s powerpoint presentation at www.bsngoforum.org)

Rashid Alimov, Bellona, St. Petersburg

Bellona is an international actor in environmental issues.

Four issues concerning nuclear pollution are focal:

- *Illegal life-term extension* of 11 reactors, that are past their 30-year design lifetime. The decision to renew capacity is a breach of Russian law.
- Bellona equates *the export of nuclear-generated electricity* to Finland with importing nuclear waste: The benefits of the technology land in Finland, the waste remains in Russia.
- *A dry waste storage facility* has been built – without a building permit and without an EIA (environmental impact assessment) only 90 metres from the Gulf of Finland.
- *Uranium tailings are being imported through the Baltic* to St. Petersburg from Germany and France – 9740 tonnes from Germany alone in recent years, with a uranium content of 15 tonnes.

(Please also see Mr. Rashid Alimov’s powerpoint presentation at www.bsngoforum.org)

Gerd Söderholm, Women Against Nuclear Power, Finland

A freelance journalist, Ms Söderholm has a particular interest in how issues relating to nuclear energy have been treated (or rather not been treated) in Finnish mass media, how the industry seems to have silenced public debate.

The decision to OK the fifth reactor depended on a solution to the problem of nuclear waste. The Eduskunta (Parliament) simply decided that the problem was solved.

Nuclear matters are totally controlled by the Ministry of Trade and Industry. The Chief Inspector of Mining, Christer Söderholm, in the Ministry is a mining industry man, who will soon return to the mining industry.

On uranium prospecting: Trade unions accepted the Areva (previously Cogéma) initiative on uranium prospecting for reason of job opportunities in exploration and mining. The meeting on permission to look for uranium in Finland was closed to the public and the media. A local meeting at Askola in January 2006, where a decision was taken to authorize drilling, was likewise closed to the public.

Women Against Nuclear Power have, in collaboration with Réseau Sortir du Nucléaire in France, spread information about the environmental consequences of uranium mining in Limousin.

Observations

All presentations contained some aspect of communication difficulties. E.g., a belief that the lay public would not understand technical information, a lack of transparency in decision-making, (self?)-censorship on the part of mass media.

Information gaps of this sort are a hindrance to cooperation Bridging the gap requires work on the part of all parties.

All parties are agreed that nuclear installations do contribute to the radioactivity of the Baltic Sea. There is some disagreement, however, as to whether this is serious. The environmental NGOs believe it is, and expressed mistrust of the companies and, to some extent, their governments in issues relating to nuclear energy. Greater transparency would help clarify this issue.

Contact/ Information:

If you want to be kept updated on continual developments in the issues of this workshop, send an email to the moderator – Per Hegelund. Email: valiantdk@yahoo.com

'The levels of antropogenic radionuclides are higher in the Baltic Sea than in any other water bodies around the world.'

(Quote from 'Hazardous Substances in the Baltic Sea – Draft HELCOM Thematic Assessment in 2006' – found at www.bsngoforum.org)

On the 6.th of October 2006, participants in the workshop on the Radioactive Contamination of the Baltic Sea, conclude:

Knowing the serious condition of the Baltic Sea, as exemplified by the statement above from Helsinki Commission experts 2006,

- 1) we demand, as a minimum, a moratorium – a stop for any additional nuclear facilities to be located at the waters of the Baltic Sea!
- 2) we urge the governments of the Baltic Sea States not to plan new nuclear projects in the region, unless they are necessary to ensure decommissioning of existing nuclear power plants.
- 3) we hope that environmental NGO's of the Baltic Countries will take proactive position to ensure minimization of radioactivity in the Baltic Sea region.

The resolution found support at the Environment Action Plan meeting on Saturday 7.th of October.