1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces.

- Reduction of traditional industry
- Dominance of one sector - as to economy and power.
- Increased inequality
- Uncertainty with one-sidedness
- Discussion of social system, because of higher geographical mobility.

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered.

- What could be consumed in the Norwegian economy without being one-sided.
- Security in the oil production.
- Full employment
- Foreign investment
- Help to developing countries
- Some economic growth, but not high
- Increased efficiency in all parts of society in order to make it more easy to use oil revenue without reservations.

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

- 70 million t.o.e. or less should be the outcome of the decision process. But the main problem is to develop a solidariy and consumer understanding in the public of what this is good for.
- Create new industry in the Northern part of Norway.
- How with a high production of oil.
- Revenue from oil production a help.
- High increase in production → Lower increase in competence among the workers.
- Unprofessionalism.
3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

I would propose that the production starts also outside northern Norway, if this can be done within the total production limit of 50-60 million t.o.e., and of course, take care of the security and pollution aspect. These are most problematic in the far north.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

Goksøyr -- concerns for security. Insecurity remains considerable - it counts in favor of a slow development.

Goksøyr/Schreiner: Considerations to other countries - possible to argue in favor of Norway's role as a protector of resources.
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

I recommend that at the time being the government should not exceed the present production level (50-60 mill t.o.e.) for four basic reasons:

1) It is important to preserve the relative freedom of choice also in the future. The higher production level, the less freedom of choice. Actually it will be impossible to reduce the rate, but always (given the resources) possible to raise the level.

2) It is important to avoid too rapid changes in the structure of society. Partly due to the oil sector the changes are already exceeding what is politically possible to handle.

3) A relatively low rate of production will make it more likely that
4) The lower rate, the less chance of heavy pollution damages.

Additional recommendations:

1) Not producing oil above 62° N.
2) Great effort to explain to the public and the international society the reason for the oil policy.
3) Careful analysis of the role of oil in near and more distant future.
4) Resources (large) to research on the economic and societal effects on the oil policy.
5) Willingness to revise the position to-day in view of new insight and learnings. Stress the willingness to go for the policy combined with stressing the uncertainty that are involved.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

_Kvanmo:_ Before we develop oil production in the north, we must develop new industry/ies in other fields._

_Kvammen:_
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

One aspect of increased oil production is that the exploration we did north of 62° latitude. Then the government leaves to chance the industries in the north part, particularly the fishing industries which would lose possibility to give sufficient benefit to all employed in this field.

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered.

It would be necessary to create new industries which can employ workers who lose their residence, perhaps due to the decrease in the fishing industry, but also due to other industries that can no longer exist because of the increased cost. The main problem is to find new industry which can be situated in the north of Norway, what kind of industries shall we create? We have to have for a lot of them...
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

To keep oil exploration at a moderate level. Particularly not to be exposed to strong variations in oil prices and to use the net income for rational purposes and protect the non-petroleum industry so that it may stay competitive. Another task will be to plan which fields are to be exploited. Furthermore, to keep the development at a stable level, so that the offshore industry may have a stable level of employment.

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

Comprehensive studies of consequences should be used to counter the influence of the holders of exploitation rights on the Norwegian shelf. Elaboration of plans for how to locate industry in weak districts in the north.

A considerable development of our institutions for teaching and research to improve our ability of exploitation in a responsible way, both technically and with regard to resources, in order to make a better society.

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

A moderate exploitation of approximately 90 million t.o.e. which is spread along the whole coast. There should be opportunity to reevaluate the level of exploitation in the light of the development. The work to coordinate the economic policy shows that all aspects of administration should be reinforced/developed.
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

1. At the present stage I would not recommend any extraction of oil and gas to the North of the 62. 1. The level of production in the South is already high enough. The problems connected with the oil-revenue, i.e. cost of living, lack of skilled persons not only in the oil industry, but also in every other industry that needs technical personnel, the demand for higher wages and so on, will lead to unemployment for almost every other group than well educated men between 20 and 45 years of age. We should learn to cope with these problems first.

2. If the level of production can be held as low as possible, i.e. about 50-60 mill. toe, it will give Norway time to adjust to an industry which till now has been strange and badly conducted
3. The next ten years should be used to build up a lasting basic foundation for the future society such as communication-means, i.e. roads, extend the rails into the north etc., education and social welfare for those who are in need.

4. I go against export of capital because it means exploitation of cheap labour.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

As I have only been present for the last half of the session, I have not heard every statement.

I have mostly agreed with the statements given by Mr. Gokøyr and Mr. Eskeland (environment-caution). Mr. Schreiner has irritated me by accusing me of pessimistic views - while he himself recommended means and imagination of all the things we have in store by increasing the oil-production.

I can see a lot of good things connected with oil - but I don't want to shut my eyes to the bad things.
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

- Danger of blow-out
- (Bad) Pollution-control facilities (→ seabirds)
- High production rate → sequits problem
- Centralization problems - development of one-sided dependency on the oil activity
- Break-down of traditional trades and infrastructures

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

- Control of the oil production rate independent of the oil companies and IEA.
- Development of security & pollution control and legislation on pollution control.
- Focus on negative consequences on the society and nature (research) - can we afford them?
- Decentralization and full employment.

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

- Be careful!
- Keep a low production rate
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

No production outside northern Norway.
Research on ecological and social impacts in northern Norway.
Low production level with good future planning on use and
which fields to be built out.
Development of security and pollution control facilities

Reasons: Northern Norway represents important fishery resources.
Most of Europe's bird mountains are found on the coast-
line of Troms and Finnmark.
Some species of seabirds are already threatened by
extinction.

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)
There are so many uncertain factors concerning ecological impacts of acute and permanent oil pollution, that we should take us time to research on them.

Then we also have the clima factor. Northern Norway represents an environment which, by and large, is much harder to work in than the North Sea. Given the pollution control facilities of today, a blow-out or any other oil accident could be disastrous.

The argument of employment is not very good, because the production will not start until some 10-15 years have passed. The northern areas of Norway need something to give them employment, work and development, but that should be done independent of the oil activities.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

Most of what has been said here, have given birth to thoughts and ideas. In my opinion, Eskeland, Screiner and Kvanmo's opinions may have given me most to think about, but I am not able to point out any special ideas that turned up. (One: Schreiner → global aspects of oil production).
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

- Even with rapid oil expansion the major part of Norwegian national income will come from other sources. One problem is to maintain concern and understanding of how difficult it is to steer this general socio/economic development.
- What will the role of oil well into the next century - will the real price fall? Or will such hydrocarbons be scarce for other purposes than energy. Do we have a resource conservation obligation for the future (\( ? \) in US).
- Our obligation to consider world energy balances in the "short run".

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

- Increased private and public consumption? The willing desired - but not at any price.
- Norwegian extraction policy must be defined in a global setting, is the world best served by a limited extraction rate? Probably.
- Environmental and personal? 
- Investment and general activity must be managed with careful concern for the domestic economy.

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)

- More use of imported resources should be considered as a? for the domestic economy.
- No automatic use of increased revenues resource or increased volume or priva.
- An active international information campaign to build up understanding or consensus that a very long time petroleum role to Norway is a global interest that with some feed back to reconsider this standpoint.
- Make it clear that Norway has no possibility to compensate on short term an OPEC price increase/volume reduction any way.
- Maintain 90 mill. t.o.e. as objective - but study very carefully
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)
   - Maintain overall productive ceiling for the time being.
   - But critically consider an increased prices/role in society late in next century.
   - Because of shortages/world economy difficulties in the next decade or so.
   - Produce north of 62° because large probability of gas which will increase industrial base of North Norway/North cakotte (also Sweden/Finland).
   - Consider lower production south of 62° to maintain ceiling. (But no hurry - dead times are long).
   - Encourage in formation and critical discussion - much og the disagreement on issue - 15410173 -
- Concepts. Major argument against oil activities is that easily earned income disrupts community's sense of reality.
- There is no hurry - both technically and socially there is a need for maturing. Norway is a rich country - most problems can be solved without additional income. If we try that we will also benefit more form the oil income. And if not there is a risk that oil activity/oil income will be detrimental to other activities/income so that the total effect is negative.
- Activity must be organized so that local communities do not suffer in order to provide gains for the nation.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

Kvannmo: Avoid "Bamble effects", where the local community suffers an initial net loss to obtain (possible) future gains and - (certain) national gain.

Kvannmo: Total fish stock not influenced - only a possible increased cost of catching.

Eskeland: Importance of avoiding excessive rate of expansion lacking so far (Bravo and Alexander Kielland were limited accidents)

Goksøyr: Role of blow outs to threatened species of birds.

But mainly a repetition of well known issues. Little movement of opinions/conceptions?
1) A general statement of the problem that Norway faces

2) The policy objectives that ought to be considered

3) Your policy recommendation at this stage (if any)
   1. Jeg anser det viktig at vi avdekker så langt det er mulig hvor meget olje vi har på vår del av kontinentalsokkelen.
   2. Dette vil avverge at vi får uventede overraskelser; og gir en fast og trygg styring.
   3. Unasett hvor meget olje som finnes på norsk side vil jeg anbefale å holde produksjonen på det kvantum som vår totale nasjonaløkonomi er tjent med - altså strekke produksjonen ut i tid. Hvor stort kvantum som antas å gi best resultater for norsk økonomi er avhengig av hva vi bruker inntektene til - d.v.s. politisk mål-setting. Sannsynligvis vil en produksjon på ca. 90 mill t.o.e. et kvantum vi skulle ta sikte på å beholde, selvom våre reservene skulle være langt større enn åttvi har oversikt over 01 07 1987.
Please mention the persons in this game who have made statements that have influenced your ideas during the course of the game. Each time you mention such a person, please note what the idea was.

Av økonomene leser jeg gjerne uttalelser fra Skånland og Aukrust.

Sistnevnte har endret syn på bruken av våre oljeinntekter - men han holder fast på at vi ikke må bruke dem til å ytterligere heve vår egen levestandard.

Per Kleppes praktiske politikk har skremt meg.