



FACULTY
OF SOCIAL
SCIENCES

Colliding interests: Examining Sami rights amidst the green transition

A comparative study of the Norwegian and Swedish Sami
communities' power in wind turbine licensing

Karin Ehn Magnusson
Linn Lyckdal
Bachelor thesis

Abstract

This thesis is a comparative case study of the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities' power in the licensing process for wind turbines on their land. The study aims to identify the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities' power and whether it differs between the two countries. Robert Dahl's theory about power and influence is employed to approach the question. Based on Dahl's three approaches to measuring power, the phenomenon of power is investigated using a qualitative content analysis method to investigate and interpret official documents from the licensing process. Considering limitations, our findings indicate a disparity between the Sami communities' formal power and their experienced and exercised power in both countries. The power of the Sami communities' is, within the scope of this study, considered weak and marginalized. However, the Norwegian Sami communities demonstrated a slightly higher power level in the process than the Swedish. The results and findings have opened up more questions regarding the rights of the Sami people and Indigenous rights.

Keywords: *Green transition, Indigenous rights, Norway, Power, Robert Dahl, Sami community, Sweden, Wind power.*

Words: 9,978

Table of contents

Abstract.....	1
1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Background.....	3
1.2 Research question.....	4
1.3 The Sami Parliaments in Norway and Sweden.....	4
1.4 Literature review.....	5
1.5 Ethical reflection.....	6
2. Theory.....	7
2.1 Four approaches to measure power by Robert Dahl.....	7
3. Method and Material.....	9
3.1 Case selection.....	9
3.2 Material selection.....	10
3.3 Research design.....	11
3.4 Operationalization.....	12
3.5 Limitations.....	13
3.6 Credibility and criticism.....	13
4. Results.....	14
4.1 Formal power.....	14
4.1.1 Norway.....	14
4.1.2 Sweden.....	15
4.2 Experienced power.....	16
4.2.1 Norway.....	17
4.2.2 Sweden.....	17
4.3 Exercised power.....	18
4.3.1 Norwegian influence during the process.....	19
4.3.2 Norwegian influence on the final decision.....	20
4.3.3 Swedish influence during the process.....	22
4.3.4 Swedish influence on the final decision.....	24
5. Discussion.....	26
5.1 Formal power.....	26
5.2 Experienced power.....	27
5.3 Exercised power.....	27
5.4 Summarizing discussion.....	29
6. Closure.....	31
6.1 Concluding reflection.....	31
6.2 Future research.....	32
7. References.....	33

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Sami are one of the world's Indigenous peoples, spread over Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia, with an estimated population around 80 000 people (The Swedish Institute, 2023). Reindeer husbandry is essential for the Sami people and preserves their culture, traditions, and language (Regjeringen, 2015). The Sami people have gradually been forced to give up land to industries such as farming, forestry, and mining (The Swedish Institute, 2023). Now, a new industry is taking place on their land - the green transition. Wind turbines are a vital part of the green transition, and their effect on reindeer husbandry and the Sami people's rights to land and water is a well-debated topic in academic literature and the news media. While scientific research shows that wind turbines have comprehensive consequences on reindeer husbandry, actors interested in energy and wind turbine business appear to be primary stakeholders in the debate (Naturvårdsverket, n.d.). The recent demonstration in Norway on the 27th of February 2023, highlights the dissatisfaction of the Sami people. Activists protested for days, demanding wind turbines in the Norwegian Fosen to be demolished after the Norwegian supreme court ruled that the turbines are preventing the Sami from reindeer herding in the area, thereby contradicting the rights of Indigenous people (Sandén, 2023).

From a broader perspective, this debate is about the complexity between democracy, participation, and sustainable development. Democracy is essential for environmental decision-making because it involves an extensive range of voices and allows all information to be gathered, enabling rational decision-making (Carter, 2018, pp. 323–327). According to the United Nations (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), every human is born equal in rights, without distinction. Yet, human rights do not explicitly mention the right to participate. However, Article 19, the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and 21, the right to take part in the government, are closely related to this (UN, 1948). According to the UN's Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) article 18, "Indigenous people have the right to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights" (UN, 2007, p. 15). The UN Committee against racial discrimination and the UN Committee for human rights have, several times, criticized Sweden for not allowing Sami people to participate effectively in decisions that affect them (Larsson & Linna, 2015).

Moreover, Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is a universal agreement for sustainable development, including 17 goals. Two goals are particularly related to the study; Goal 10, that a sustainable society requires that all human beings have the same opportunity and rights to participate in and influence the development of society, and Goal 16, that fair, inclusive, and accountable institutions are required for good governance and that all human beings are equal before the law and should have the same possibility to exercise influence over decision-making (UN, n.d.).

In response to extreme climate events affecting Indigenous peoples worldwide, threatening their livelihoods, the Indigenous Peoples' Biocultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative (IPCCA) was created. Indigenous people are considered vulnerable to climate change as they rely on fragile ecosystems for livelihood and have a disadvantaged socioeconomic standing. However, Indigenous knowledge, wisdom and experiences of the natural world are considered essential for addressing climate change, and Indigenous participation in global processes related to climate change is essential (IPCCA, n.d.).

1.2 Research question

The Sami peoples' possibility to participate in and influence society has historically been marginalized. The present shows a continuing trend as the Sami people continue to voice their discontent. To approach this dilemma, this paper will compare Norway and Sweden by investigating each country's legal framework and five most recently completed wind turbine projects to identify the Sami communities' role and power in the licensing processes. 'Sami communities' refers to the Sami Parliaments, the Sami villages, and the reindeer herding districts, which are the actors representing Sami activities in the investigated cases. The research question for this paper is thus;

What power do the Sami communities of Norway and Sweden have to influence the licensing process for wind turbines on their land?

1.3 The Sami Parliaments in Norway and Sweden

The Sami Parliaments in Norway and Sweden constitute publicly elected representative bodies for the Sami people, considered independent institutions. The parliaments' primary

function is to protect and foster Sami culture and livelihood. To some extent, the parliaments have different tasks in Norway and Sweden, regulated by The Norwegian Sami Act and the Swedish Sami Parliament Act (Sametinget, 2016). *Image 1* illustrates Sápmi, the traditional land of the Sami people.



Image 1: Sápmi. (Samer.se, n.d.).

Furthermore, Sápmi is divided into districts, called reindeer herding districts or Sami villages. These areas are complex administrative and economic unions with a specific geographic area where its members have the right to engage in reindeer husbandry (The Swedish Institute, 2023). When referring to the Sami Parliaments, Sami villages, and reindeer herding districts, all together, “Sami communities” is used.

1.4 Literature review

Extensive literature analyzes conflicting interests between Indigenous people and the green transition. Previous research regarding the Sami people comes from many different disciplines and covers various methodological approaches.

A solid foundation for our study to build upon is the previous research which establishes the negative effects which wind turbines have on reindeer. The Sami people have already attested to this for a long time, and numerous scientific studies solidify this claim (Skarin et al., 2021). Therefore, this issue is of relevance to the rights of the Sami People and warrants our further study.

Within the political science discipline, the topic has been discussed repeatedly and with various approaches. Frequently the topic of the Sami people's rights and the green transition has been analyzed through the settler colonial perspective, which problematizes the state's relation to the Sami people as the settlers on the Sami people's traditional land. Åsa Össbo, a researcher from the Centre of Sami Research (Várdduo), employs the settler colonial perspective to review the expansion of hydropower on Sami land in Sweden. From a historical perspective, Össbo argues that Sami land rights had been devalued through the colonial settler policies regarding hydropower expansion (Össbo, 2022, p. 1). Moreover, in the same field, Rasmus Kløcker Larsen investigates Indigenous people's opportunity to participate in impact assessments of environmental projects on their lands. The study was conducted in five different countries, including Sweden and Norway, and assessed the degree of participation Indigenous people had in impact assessments. Although having a different methodology than we aim to, the study provides valuable knowledge to build upon as it investigates Indigenous people's influence in green transition projects (Kløcker Larsen, 2018).

Prior literature, both inter- and intradisciplinary, is essential for the essay as they provide a foundation for the research to build upon. However, much research is still to be done on the topic and, to our knowledge, no studies have approached the problem in the same way as we intend to, theoretically and methodologically.

1.5 Ethical reflection

As this study intends to research a topic related to a marginalized group, ethical dilemmas must be carefully considered. It is important to emphasize that we, the authors, are not a part of this group, nor do we aim to speak on their behalf. Furthermore, we know that the results do not represent all cases in Norway and Sweden, nor does the analysis capture all aspects of power. Instead, we hope to contribute to the discussion, both within the political science field and outside the academic world.

To navigate how to conduct our study fairly, we draw on the ideas of L. Nachet and C. Bylund with colleagues and scholars within the Indigenous field. Their studies reiterate the same guiding principle for approaching Indigenous studies: research should be done with Indigenous people, not on them (Nachet et al., 2022, p. 2). Furthermore, the research should

generate knowledge that is advantageous for the group because otherwise, the studies are seldom beneficial to Indigenous groups and can instead be harmful (Bylund & Sehlin MacNeil, 2022, p. 87; Nachet et al., 2022, p. 2). To address these principles, Indigenous perspectives will be addressed in this study to the extent possible given the limitations.

2. Theory

This section will present the theoretical framework by Robert A. Dahl, on which the thesis question is based. The theory is considered suitable for the thesis question from several perspectives. Firstly, the study aims to investigate the phenomenon of "power," which is relevant to addressing power and the measurement of power. Dahl theorized four approaches for measuring and observing power, which is a sound basis for the operationalizations. Secondly, Dahl's theories are well-recognized within the academic literature, which supports the belief that his theory of power is useful and relevant.

Earlier studies of the phenomenon of power have also used the definitions by Steven Lukes and Michel Foucault. Lukes and Foucault also highlight invisible power (Gottardis, 2009, pp. 14-18). Within this thesis, their views are excluded since their ideas are too broad in perspective of what the study aims to describe. Therefore, Dahl's view has been deemed most relevant for the study. As previously mentioned, Dahl's theory has not previously been used to identify the Sami people's influence and power. Therefore, including this will offer a new perspective.

2.1 Four approaches to measure power by Robert Dahl

The phenomenon of power is challenging to measure since it is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that can be expressed in multiple forms and contexts. Robert Dahl describes power as a critical concept in political science, characterized by the absence of agreed terms and conditions (Dahl, 1970, p. 15). His theory about power argues that power is a relationship between actors in a given social context. The actors can be individuals, groups, roles, or governments. Dahl's general definition of power is: "A has power over B to the extent that he can get to do something B would not otherwise do" (Dahl, 1957, pp. 202-203).

Dahl continues his discussion of power by distinguishing between the task of defining power and observing power and how to measure how power is distributed among actors in the political system. Dahl presents influence as power and that competing actors in society seek to influence decisions by exercising the ability to make others do what they want them to do. Dahl presents four approaches to measuring relationships of influence and power to discern how power is distributed within the political system. All four approaches include risks of errors, and no one is entirely reliable. The approaches, including advantages and disadvantages, will now be presented, as argued by Dahl (Dahl, 1970, pp. 26-27).

The first approach assumes that the extent of an actor's power closely correlates with its position in the hierarchy. This could include both official and semi-official hierarchies. The advantage of this approach is its simplicity, with readily available information. The disadvantage is its simplified view of power and influence, whereby a high formal position does not necessarily correlate with power (Dahl, 1970, pp. 26-27).

The second approach is to rely on well-placed judges. The advantage of this is that it is cheap in time, economy, and severity. The disadvantage is that this approach makes us vulnerable to the judges and their biases. It is difficult to know who the best judge is, and we can't be sure if prejudices and misinformation mislead the judge (Dahl, 1970, p. 27).

The third approach includes what the actors *do* and their participation in decision-making. Which actors participate most often in decision-making, and to what extent? Do the actors participate in various activities? The advantage of this approach is that it focuses on what the actors do, or what is reported that they do. The disadvantage is that participation in decision-making is not necessarily equivalent to power (Dahl, 1970, p. 27).

Finally, the fourth approach regards the weight of the different participants' activities in decision-making. According to Dahl, you can assign weight using an operational definition of one or more of the previously discussed measures. An advantage of this approach is that it enables a more profound appraisal of power, but disadvantageous as it may be time consuming (Dahl, 1970, p. 27).

3. Method and Material

This section begins with a presentation and motivation of the selected cases, followed by a description of the materials used. Afterwards the study's research design and methodology are explained, followed by the operationalization of Dahl's theory. Lastly, the section discusses the study's limitations, credibility, and criticism of the chosen method.

3.1 Case selection

This case study is composed of chosen wind power projects from Norway and Sweden, the two countries with the largest Sami populations (The Swedish Institute, 2023). Five cases were selected from each country due to the assignment's constraints, and the selection was made concerning three criteria based on relevance and limitations in the data. The criteria for the selection were the following:

1. The wind power projects must have a potential energy production above 10 MW or consist of five wind turbines which are approximately equivalent.
2. The project must be onshore, and in an area the Sami Parliaments consider "Sami territories."
3. The case must be closed, meaning the decision or possible appeals cannot be ongoing during the study period.

Furthermore, we also chose to exclude cases of renewals, except for expansions of two or more new turbines and meeting our other criteria. After these selections were made, the following 10 most recent cases were chosen:

	Name	Date intital decision	County	Municipality	Applicant	Last Update
Sweden	Klöverberget	25/11/2021	Västerbotten	Skellefteå	WPD Onshore Klöverberget AB	31/03/2023
	Botsmark	29/1/2021	Västerbotten	Umeå	European Energy	15/02/2023
	Lantvallen	12/05/2020	Västerbotten	Robertsfors	European Wind farms	28/02/2022
	Fäboliden II	12/12/2019	Västerbotten	Vindeln	Fred Olsen Renewables AB	12/12/2019
	Hällberget	04/12/2019	Norrbottn	Överkalix	Vasa Vind AB	24/06/2021
Norway	Rakkocearro (Raggovidda)	7/6/2010	Troms og Finnmark	Berlevåg	Varanger Krafthydrogen AS	7/6/2021
	Maurneset	14/02/2014	Troms og Finnmark	Nordreisa	Vindkraft Nord AS	18/01/2019
	Rieppi	10/11/2015	Troms og Finnmark	Storfjord-Omasvuotna-Omasvuono	Troms Kraft Produksjon AS	11/10/2015
	Kvitfjell	15/02/2001	Troms	Tromsø	Tromsø Vind AS	13/03/2020
	Fálesrášša	11/1/2013	Troms og Finnmark	Hammerfest	Aurora Vindkraft AS	2/3/2015
Explanation	Granted, no appeal					
	Granted, appeal refused					
	Granted, appeal led to changed conditions					
	Granted, appeal led to withdrawal					
	Not granted					

Table 1: Cases. (Nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonssaker, n.d; vbk.lansstyrelsen.se, n.d)

The data was collected from NVE's official website and Vindbrukskollen, a national wind turbine mapping service.

3.2 Material selection

The study is based on official documents for the selected cases. The primary information sources are license applications, consultation statements, environmental impact assessments, and decision statements. In the case of Norway, these documents are collected from the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) and the Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (OED). In the case of Sweden, these documents are collected from the County Administrative Boards (CAB) concerned and the Land and Environment Court (LEC). Additionally, letters and statements from the Norwegian and Swedish Sami Parliaments have been included in the document selection. These documents were more challenging to find for Sweden and necessitated phone calls and emails to obtain these. The Norwegian documents, on the other hand, were easily accessible on NVE's website. The selected documents contain information about the process, the Sami people's standpoint, and what consideration has been given on behalf of the Sami people.

The primary motivation for our material selection was access and what documents we could reach and request for each country. This includes limitations since we had to exclude the documents we could not request or obtain, including records from open hearings since we did not participate. Secondly, the documents presented are considered credible because they are regulated by law and peer-reviewed. Finally, these documents contain similar information, making them comparable to each other. Unfortunately, there is room for error as our comprehension of a case may be flawed due to the translation of material or lack of awareness of discussions behind closed doors.

3.3 Research design

This thesis is a comparative case study limited to two units of analysis, the Sami communities of Norway and Sweden. The advantage of a case study is that it allows for a more detailed analysis of the specific cases and reaches an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of power. It also makes it possible to use several analytical strategies (Yin, 2009, p. 4). Moreover, the comparative design aims to describe and compare two units of analysis, the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities, including the Sami Parliaments, Sami villages, and reindeer herding districts. A comparative study between two units makes it possible to find patterns of similarities and differences among them and opens up an eventual broader perspective of certain phenomena (Teorell & Svensson, 2007, pp. 108-109).

Within the frames of a comparative case study, qualitative content analysis has been used to systematically investigate and interpret the selected materials' contents, in this case, primary official documents (Bryman, 2008, p. 526). Based on the theoretical framework, a conceptualization has been developed as a basis for analyzing the material to systematically identify patterns and themes related to the Sami people's influence and power in the licensing process for wind turbines in the documents.

Quantitative elements have been incorporated to organize the analysis. These elements consist of different categories and questions to describe the generality of certain phenomena studied and provide more precise estimates (Bryman, 2008, pp. 597-599). By incorporating quantitative elements in the study, it has been easier for us, as two researchers in the study, to agree on how to interpret what we read, which has strengthened the internal reliability of the study (Ibid., p. 376). The content in the selected documents has later been analyzed to

identify patterns and themes related to the Sami people's influence and power in the licensing process for wind turbines (Ibid., pp. 529-531).

The primary idea was to include interviews in the study to gain a deeper understanding of the Sami peoples' power. We reached out to the Sami Parliaments and specific employees in Norway and Sweden with negative results. The answers we got were that their time to participate was lacking, or no answer at all.

3.4 Operationalization

The operationalization of the study is anchored in Dahl's theory about power and his four approaches to measuring power. It will now be presented step by step.

There is a risk that an individual indicator classifies power in an incorrect way, which Dahl himself points out. Therefore, the operationalization consists of three indicators based on Dahl's first three methods. By combining these three approaches, which Dahl advises in the fourth approach, the operationalization aims to compensate for the eventual effects of inaccuracies. The indicators, or approaches to measure power, are described below:

1. The first approach concerns formal power, which relates to Dahl's assumption that influence correlates with an actor's position in a hierarchy. Legislation acts as a framework for the hierarchical structure, enabling and constraining the exercise of power. Therefore, formal power will be identified by reviewing the Sami communities' constitutional and international rights in the licensing process. For this approach, more protection and rights to participate in the process will indicate more power.
2. The second approach concerns experienced power, resulting from Dahl's assumption that well-placed judges within a hierarchy can reveal who has influence. For this approach, we will rely on the Sami representatives as judges. Their experienced power will be interpreted from official statements from the Sami Parliaments and information about the cases. For this study, fewer complaints, demands and dissatisfaction with the process will indicate more power.
3. The third approach concerns the Sami communities' exercised power, which comes from Dahl's assumption that how much actors participate in decision-making reveals

who has influence. The approach reviews license application information, consultation, and decision statements. The third approach was divided into two parts. The first concerns the participation during the process, and the second concerns the outcome of each case. For the first part, more participation will indicate more power; for the second part, decisions that benefit Sami's interests and rights indicate more power.

3.5 Limitations

The scope of this study is restricted to the theoretical framework of Robert Dahl's theory on power and influence. Thus, the research question and empirical material are explored through an operationalization based on interpretations of Dahl's approaches to measuring power. The licensing process for wind turbines includes several actors, and to include all in the study would have been too challenging due to restrictions in time and space. Therefore, the study is limited to the Sami Parliaments, villages and reindeer districts in Norway and Sweden and the five latest cases from each country that fulfill our selection criteria. The number of cases, and criteria for the selected cases, is restricted due to the time limitations for the study, relevance and in the hope of conducting a deeper and more accurate analysis of the few selected cases. Furthermore, the Sami Parliaments, reindeer districts, and the Sami villages are the units of analysis for the study, hence limiting the Sami population to these units, to target those with formal power in the licensing process. Additionally, the study only investigates one perspective of power, and conclusions outside the research view of the Sami peoples' power, in more general terms, should not be drawn.

3.6 Credibility and criticism

The study aims to measure how much power the Sami communities in Norway and Sweden have to influence the licensing process for wind power by employing Dahl's approaches to measuring power. Good internal and external validity is crucial for achieving high credibility of the results. The internal validity, measuring what we claim to measure without systematic and unsystematic errors, is strengthened by the study's high conceptual validity, grounded in Dahl's theory (Esaiasson et al., 2017, p. 58-59). Additionally, selecting multiple cases from each country, employing multiple indicators and utilizing different source materials further strengthen the internal validity (Teorell - Svensson, 2007, p. 267).

The external validity, or ability to generalize a study's results, is also essential to achieve credible results (Esaiaasson et al., 2017, p. 59). However, one disadvantage with case studies is that while the method can produce results with good validity, it comes at the expense of generalizability as they rarely produce results that can be applied to a larger population. Therefore, the study does not aim to produce generalizable results (Teorell - Svensson, 2007, p. 267-268). However, hopefully the results can contribute to the larger discourse about Indigenous people's rights in Sweden and Norway. Lastly, a comparative study has limitations, such as differences in contexts, languages, and accessible documents. This risk is minimized by choosing similar countries with languages we comprehend and using comparable material.

4. Results

The following sections present each approach's results separately for each country, beginning with Norway, then Sweden. First, the results regarding formal power for each country are demonstrated, then experienced power and last, exercised power.

4.1 Formal power

In this section, the first approach to measure power is employed by reviewing laws and conventions which concern the Sami communities, their rights and opportunities to participate in the licensing process.

4.1.1 Norway

In Norway, the Sami peoples' rights are primarily protected by the Sami Act of 1987 and the Article 108 of the Norwegian Constitution, which includes that the Sami people are granted a constitutional right to safeguard and develop their way of life, language, culture, and society. The Reindeer Act regulates reindeer husbandry in better detail (Regjeringen, 2015). The Finnmark Act of 2005, specific legislation for the Finnmark region in Norway, recognizes the Sami people's ownership of water and land (Finnmark Act, 2005). Further, human rights are protected in Norway's constitution (The Constitution of the Kingdom of Norway, 1814). Norway was also the first country to ratify the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention 1989, number 169, in 1990, which entered into force in 1991 (ILO, n.d.). ILO states that the

governments shall ensure that Indigenous people are protected and respected, and decision-making should be open for them to participate in (ILO 169, 1989).

Several laws and regulations regulate the licensing process. Licenses for wind power plants exceeding 10 MW are overseen by the NVE, which the OED governs. This means that the process occurs at the state level. The concerned municipality has a central role in the process. However, they do not have the authority to stop the process. The process begins when NVE is notified of the plan and requires the project to follow the Planning and Building Act's regulations on impact assessments. Next, the initiative holder must implement an impact assessment program. Then, the municipality is required to arrange an open hearing about the project. After that, NVE decides based on the application, impact assessments, the open hearing and comments from NVE specialists (NVE, 2023). All decisions regarding licenses for wind power can be appealed by people with a legal interest in the case, and a final decision is made by the OED (NVE, 2021).

More specifically, regarding the legal framework for consultations in the licensing process, these are primarily regulated in the Energy Act (Energiloven) and the Planning and Building Act (Plan- og bygningsloven). According to the Energy Act, when a license is needed, the process requires consultations with concerned parties and stakeholders (Energiloven, 1990). The projects must follow the Cultural Heritage Act, the Pollution Act and the Natural Diversity Act (NVE, 2022b).

4.1.2 Sweden

In Sweden, the Sami people's rights are protected by several laws. Firstly, their rights are protected by the provision on property protection in Chapter 2, section 18 in the Instrument of Government (Regeringsformen) (SFS: 1974:152). Additionally, human rights are protected in Swedish constitutional law. The Reindeer Herding Act (Rennäringslagen) (1971:437) further protects the rights of reindeer husbandry (Energimyndigheten, 2020). The Environmental Code (SFS 1998:808) requires authorities to consider the Sami people's knowledge and use of natural resources when making decisions that affect their traditional lands. Moreover, Sweden has not ratified the ILO Convention as it does not meet the obligations of Article 14, including "Indigenous peoples' ownership and possession of the land they traditionally inhabit. Measures must be taken to protect their right to use land not exclusively occupied by them" (Kommittédirektiv 1997:103).

The licensing process always begins with investigating the potential area for the wind turbines to be located, how it can affect humans and animals, and how critical stakeholders are contacted. After that, consultations must be held with those affected by the project. Everything is compiled in a consultation statement. Next, the application is submitted to a county council's Environmental Assessment Delegation (EAD). In addition to the consultation statement, an environmental impact statement must be included. Furthermore, a license can only be granted if approved by the concerned municipality. The decision can be appealed to the next instance, the LEC, and the final legal instance, the LEC of Appeal (Vattenfall, n.d.).

The legal framework for consultations in the licensing process is primarily regulated in the Swedish Environmental Code. This law states that if the activity is considered to have significant environmental effects, consultations must be held with the CAB, the permit authority, affected individuals, state authorities, municipalities, the public and organizations. Before the consultation, the operator must invite stakeholders to the consultation meeting and provide information about the project's location, scope, and environmental impact (SFS 1998:808). In 2022, a new law was implemented regarding the consultation with the Sami Parliament and the Sami villages to ensure Sami people's rights to participate and influence decision-making processes (Sametinget, 2023). However, this law does not apply to the cases since it was implemented after they were closed.

4.2 Experienced power

In this section, the second approach to measure power is employed by reviewing official statements from the Sami Parliaments to uncover their experienced power rather than the surface-level formal power described in the previous approach. The statements examined are all from the Sami Parliament, as there were no available statements from the Sami Villages and reindeer husbandry districts.

Unfortunately, relevant statements could not be found for each case, nor in the news media. Specifically, sufficient information could not be obtained in the cases of Maurneset and Rieppi. Lastly, the statements do not explicitly state that the Sami communities experienced power. Instead, it becomes evident through their concerns and requests.

4.2.1 Norway

In the background for the case of Rakkocearro, a letter from the Sami Parliament was included, in which the parliament expressed their concerns regarding the project. In the letter, they claim that the impact assessment is not a holistic representation of the possible consequences. Furthermore, they point to Section 9 of the Cultural Heritage Act, which protects cultural heritage sites and puts the responsibility on the project planner to investigate if there are protected monuments in the area and claimed that the responsibility hadn't been met (Cultural Heritage Act, 1978; NVE, 2010, p. 17).

In the case of Kvitfjell, the Sami Parliament again pointed out how the project contradicts the human rights protecting the Sami people. In a letter to NVE, the parliament claimed that if the project results in them being unable to use their traditional herding grounds for winter pasture, it would violate international law (NVE, 2022a, p. 7). Moreover, the parliament is critical of the process, expressing that it seems like most questions are aimed at the concessionaire, and the ones aimed at the parliament were challenging to answer. The parliament sees the need for input from and use of reindeer husbandry experts during the investigations and to strengthen knowledge (Sametinget, 2022, p. 2).

Lastly, for Fálesrášša, the Sami Parliament again employs legislation to point out injustices in the process. The parliament claimed and emphasized that there had been no actual consultations with the parliament regarding the decision to grant the license. Further, they claim that they have not received any information about NVE's assessments or proposals for the decisions. In the parliament's opinion, excluding the Sami Parliament contradicts the administrative law and makes the decision to grant the license invalid (Sametinget, 2013, p.1).

4.2.2 Sweden

First, in two of the statements concerning Fäboliden and Hällberget, the Sami Parliament emphasizes that the Sami people have the right to influence and must be able to do so regarding decisions that concern their traditional land. Further, in both statements, the Sami Parliament laid out requirements that should be met in negotiations to respect this right. The requirements are essential to guarantee effective participation and real influence. Including the right to all information to make decisions, sufficient time and economic resources, respect

for Indigenous knowledge and the absence of factors that determine the outcome prematurely (Sametinget, 2018a, pp. 2-5; Sametinget, 2021, p. 1). Furthermore, in the statement regarding Hällberget, the Sami Parliament also urged that the report from The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency regarding the project's consequences be seriously considered (Sametinget, 2018b, p. 2).

In the statements regarding Klöverberget and Botsmark, the Sami Parliament expressed that consultations should be considered obsolete and unsuitable for making decisions if older than one year. This is because climate change and the exploitation of their traditional grounds can change the conditions of reindeer husbandry, thus making previous consultations and statements outdated (Sametinget, 2019a, p. 4; Sametinget, 2019c, p. 2).

In all the statements, the Sami Parliament takes a critical stance regarding the projects and warns of the possible consequences on reindeer husbandry and their cultural practices. Particularly in the statements for Klöverberget, Botsmark and Lantvallen, the Sami Parliament urges the EAD to remember the cautionary principle in decisions since, without caution, the consequences on reindeer are challenging to predict (Sametinget, 2019a, p. 4; Sametinget, 2019b, p.3-4; Sametinget, 2019c, p. 2).

4.3 Exercised power

This section employs the third approach to measure power by reviewing background documents, license decisions, letters and court decisions. For clarity, the section is divided into two parts for each country.

The first part looks deeper into the process for each case and the participation of the Sami communities by examining four questions for each case. The questions asked are: Were the Sami parliament and Sami villages/ reindeer districts invited to the consultation? Were they given the same opportunity to participate as the other invited parties? Did they receive sufficient information ahead of time to make an informed decision? Moreover, finally, were they involved in several stages of the process? The findings will be presented in a table. The second part examines the Sami parliaments', and Sami villages/ reindeer districts' influence on the final decisions and outcomes by reviewing the license decisions and court appeals case by case.

4.3.1 Norwegian influence during the process

The findings for Norway are presented in the ‘*Table 3*’ and discussed question by question.

Norway Participation in the Process				
Case/Name	Were the Sami communities invited to the consultation ?	Were they given the same opportunity to participate as other invited parties?	Did they receive sufficient information ahead of time to make an informed decision?	Were they involved in several stages?
Rakkocearro (Raggovidda)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Maurneset	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Rieppi	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Kvitfjell	Only the SCHC was invited	Partially	No	No *No mention of contact in the early stages with the Sami Parliament or reindeer district
Fálesrášša	Yes	Yes	No	No * The Sami Parliament claim that there were no consultations regarding the decision

Table 3: Norway Participation in the Process (NVE, 2001; NVE, 2004; NVE, 2010; NVE, 2013; NVE, 2014).

For the first question, regarding invitations to the consultation, the Norwegian Sami Parliament and reindeer districts were invited in all cases except for Kvitfjell. In the case of Kvitfjell, the Sami Cultural Heritage Council (SCHC), an underlying administrative body to the parliament, was invited but no indication of the Sami Parliament or reindeer districts (NVE, 2001, p. 2). Regarding the other cases, the invitations were sent out and announced in public channels, like local newspapers and radio channels (NVE, 2004, p. 2; NVE, 2010, p. 13; NVE, 2013, p. 8; NVE, 2014, p. 7).

Regarding the second question, whether the Sami parliament and reindeer district were given the same opportunity to participate in the consultations as other actors, the answers arrived at similar results. For the same four cases, the opportunity to participate was the same as other actors because the Sami community was invited to participate in the hearings, meaning they

had the chance to speak and leave comments. However, Kvitfjell stands out again because only the SCHC was invited to the meeting, not the whole Sami Parliament or reindeer district.

For the third question, asking if the Sami community received sufficient information before the consultation, the Sami Parliament was dissatisfied, in all cases with the information given before the meetings. There were many reasons for their discontent, mainly that the material was not precise enough and underestimated the consequences for reindeer husbandry. Recurring was also the claim that the background material did not sufficiently account for historical monuments in the area, a requirement in Section 9 of the Cultural Heritage Act (NVE, 2010, p. 17; NVE, 2014, pp. 8-9, 40). Furthermore, in the cases of Kvitfjell and Fálesrášša, the Sami Parliament even expressed that the material was so flawed that it should not be used to make decisions (NVE, 2001, p. 8). Lastly, in the case of Rieppi, the parliament responded with a letter where they stipulated eight necessary points to make the project more accurate and in accordance with the Heritage Act (NVE, 2004, p. 6; NVE, 2013, p. 10).

For the final questions regarding the involvement throughout the process, the results were ambiguous. For Rakkocearro, Maurneset and Rieppi, the parliament and NVE had contact and meetings several times. Mainly in the initial stages, however, contact was sustained throughout the process. Additionally, meetings were held with the herding districts, as well as dialogue (NVE, 2004, p. 6; NVE 2010, p. 55-57; NVE, 2014, p. 8). In the case of Kvitfjell, neither the Sami Parliament, underlying bodies, nor herding districts seem to have been involved in the process after the consultation (NVE, 2001). Finally, for Fálesrášša, the Sami Parliament complained in a letter to the OED, after the NVE decided to grant a license, that there had been no consultations with or information about NVE regarding the decision to grant the license (Sametinget, 2013, p.1).

4.3.2 Norwegian influence on the final decision

In this section, the Sami communities in Norway's influence on decisions and the outcomes from appeals will be reviewed in broad terms, case by case.

In the case of Rakkocearro, the Sami Parliament and the reindeer herding district were initially hostile to the project, arguing it would have devastating consequences. After that, the project decreased significantly in size and gained the reindeer district's approval, leading to

NVE assessing the impacts on reindeer husbandry as acceptable and granting the license with conditions connected to reindeer husbandry (NVE, 2010, p. 4, 25, 53). The project was later split into three stages, whereby the concessionaire applied to postpone the deadline for stage three. The Sami Parliament and the reindeer herding district objected, arguing that knowledge about wind turbines' consequences on reindeer husbandry had developed since the project was first approved. OED agreed and refused the application for postponing the project, however the license was not withdrawn (OED, 2021, p. 1-6, 12).

Regarding Maurneset, the Sami Parliament objected and was pessimistic about the application. NVE assessed that societal benefits were more significant than the damage caused and granted the application with conditions connected to reindeer husbandry (NVE, 2016, p. 1, 2, 5, 6). After, several complaints were sent to NVE, who forwarded the complaints to OED. One complaint included that the area is essential for reindeer husbandry and that the project would have consequences for the calving period and grazing. OED agreed and withdrew the license (OED, 2019, pp. 1-3).

Regarding Rieppi, the Sami Parliament raised objections to the application. NVE's assessed the project as socially irrational, as the disadvantages would exceed the societal benefits. Additionally, the wind power plant would negatively affect a key area for the Helligskogen reindeer herding district. Due to uncertainty regarding wind turbines' effects on reindeer husbandry, the decision should be based on the precautionary principle. The NVE rejected the application, and the decision was not appealed (NVE, 2015, p. 1, 9-19).

For Kvitfjell, NVE assessed consequences and effects on the cultural environment acceptable. Based on the lack of practical experience on wind turbines' effects on reindeer husbandry, NVE assessed that it is conceivable that reindeers will get affected negatively but will get used to the wind turbines after construction (NVE, 2001, p. 1, 2, 15-17, 27). NVE granted the license application with conditions. The first decision was not appealed. When the concessionaire applied to build a new road, the reindeer herding district sent in a complaint stating it would make reindeer husbandry impossible in that area. The OED stated that increased construction traffic would disturb reindeer husbandry only to a small extent, and to pause the construction during the calving period would be a significant economic loss. The complaint was dismissed (OED, 2018, p. 1, 5, 6, 9).

Regarding Fálesrášša, the Sami Parliament was pessimistic about the project. The project was granted with conditions since NVE assessed societal benefits greater than disadvantages. However, the project's size was significantly reduced, partly due to the effects on the reindeer husbandry and the comments from the Sami Parliament (NVE, 2013, p. 1, 37-40, 76-78). After that, the Sami Parliament appealed the decision. From the reindeer herding district, youths also complained about NVE's decision in letters twice. The complainants argued that the wind power plant would breach Article 27 of the ILO Convention. The complaints from the Reindeer Herding District 21 and Youth in Gearretnajárga were successful, and the decision was reversed (OED, 2015, p. 1-7).

4.3.3 Swedish influence during the process

The findings for Sweden are presented in the table below, 'table 4', and discussed further next.

Sweden Participation in the Process				
Case/Name	Were the Sami communities invited to the consultation?	Were they given the same opportunity to participate as other invited parties?	Did they receive sufficient information ahead of time to make an informed decision?	Were they involved in several stages?
Klöverberget	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Botsmark	Yes	Yes	No	Partially *Rans Sami village argue that they were involved too late
Fäboliden	Yes	Yes	No	Partially *Only meeting and no information about further contact with Grans Sami village
Lantvallen	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Hällberget	Yes	Yes	No	No *Only individual consultation meetings with Ängeså and Gällivare Sami villages in the initial stages

Table 4: Sweden Participation in the Process (Enetjärn Natur AB, 2016; European Wind Farms - Enetjärn Natur AB, 2014; Fred. Olsen Renewables, 2018; Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2019; Wpd Scandinavia AB, 2017).

For the first question, regarding if the Sami Parliament and villages were invited to the consultations, the Swedish Sami Parliament and villages were invited for all projects (Enetjärn Natur AB, 2016, p. 5; European Wind Farms - Enetjärn Natur AB, 2014, p. 5; Fred. Olsen Renewables, 2018, p. 5; Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2019, p. 7; Wpd Scandinavia AB, 2017, p. 17).

Regarding the second question, whether they were given the same opportunity to participate in the consultations as other actors, the Sami parliament and Sami villages were invited and allowed to speak and leave comments for all cases.

For the third question, asking if the Sami communities were given sufficient information before the meeting, the Sami Parliament was dissatisfied with the information for all cases. Their discontent often stemmed from inadequate environmental assessments that underestimated the impact on reindeer and reindeer husbandry. For Botsmark, supplementary information was provided at the consultation meeting. Nonetheless, it still made it challenging to make an informed decision (European Wind Farms - Enetjärn Natur AB, 2014, p. 7). Regarding Klöverberget, Lantvallen and Fäboliden, the parliament was unhappy with the significant uncertainties in the reports, which again made it difficult for the parliament to assess consequences (Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2019, p. 33; Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2020, p. 17; Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2021a, p. 60). Similarly, points were expressed regarding Hällberget, and additionally, the parliament urged for new research to be used and for Indigenous knowledge to be valued higher (Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2019, p. 36).

For the final question regarding the involvement throughout the process, the degree of involvement varied. For two cases, Klöverberget and Lantvallen, the Sami parliament and villages were involved throughout the process, both through meetings and by phone calls and email throughout the process (Enetjärn Natur AB, 2016, p.11; Wpd Scandinavia AB, 2017, p. 176). Particularly in the case of Lantvallen, where a consultant met with the Sami Parliament and Rans Sami village on four different occasions. Additional meetings were also held for drafting contracts, and they were both allowed to give further comments regarding the project (Enetjärn Natur AB, 2016, p. 11). However, in the case of Botsmark and Fäboliden, the results are more ambiguous, as they were involved in the initial stages but less afterwards. For Botsmark, there were continued discussions with the three Sami villages concerned and two meetings with each village. However, one village, Rans, argued they were involved too

late in the process (European Wind Farms - Enetjärn Natur AB, 2014, p. 11,103). As for Fäboliden, there were initial meetings which continued. However, after the one initial meeting with Grans Sami village, there was no more mention of further contact or meeting (Fred. Olsen Renewables, 2018, p. 7). Lastly, for Hällberget, initial meetings were held with two Sami villages. However, this seems to be the extent of their involvement, as no further evidence about their involvement after the initial consultations can be found (Vasa Vind AB, 2018, p. 2).

4.3.4 Swedish influence on the final decision

In this section, the Sami communities in Sweden's influence on decisions and the outcomes from appeals will be reviewed in broad terms, case by case.

Regarding Klöverberget, Svaipa Sami village presented several problematic consequences with the project, but the area concerned is not a key area for reindeer husbandry. The Sami village and the concessionaire agreed on measures to minimize consequences. Additionally, the comments from Svaipa Sami village reduced the number of wind turbines from 23 to 19. According to the EAD's assessment, the activity was considered acceptable. The license application was granted with conditions connected to the Sami village (Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2021a, p.1). When the concessionaire appealed the decision, the Svaipa Sami village was the counterpart in the case, and the Sami Parliament intervened in the appeal, arguing for additional conditions and precautionary measures. The LEC made a few changes for the license. However, the Sami people were still unsatisfied with the license (Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 3410-21 judgment 2023-03-31, p. 1-4, 10, 11).

Regarding Botsmark, Grans Sami village initially did not want to participate in the consultation since the concessionaire could not accept their conditions for participation. When they did, they stated that the project was problematic for reindeer husbandry, referring to research. Rans Sami villages agreed with Grans Sami village. The EAD granted the project with conditions connected to the Sami villages. The motivation for the assessment was that consequences could be mitigated with precautionary measures and that the project would not make reindeer husbandry significantly challenging (Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2021b, p. 1, 5, 6). After that, Grans Sami village appealed the decision and added that if the license was approved, the wind turbines must be turned off during specific periods. Grans Sami village

argued that research and their comments should be enough for the LEC to refuse the license, which they did (Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 530-21 judgment 2023-03-15, p.1, 4, 10, 19, 20).

In the case of Lantvallen, Rans Sami village stated that the area is essential for reindeer husbandry and that the project would have serious consequences. The EAD refused the application, arguing that damage for reindeer husbandry weighed more than societal benefits (Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2020, p. 1, 3-6). The concessionaire appealed the decision. The CAB and the Sami Parliament opposed the appeal, while Rans Sami village supported the appeal after agreements about compensation with the concessionaire. The LEC rejected the appeal, and the application was still refused (Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 1841-20 judgment 2022-02-28, p. 1-6, 11, 12, 19, 20).

Regarding Fäboliden II, the Sami Parliament stated that the consequences would be severe and make reindeer husbandry even inoperable. Grans Sami village stated that follow-ups from existing wind turbines only showed a small impact on reindeer husbandry and that the location was acceptable. The EAD argued that consequences were negligible and would not stop the project and granted the application with some conditions connected to reindeer husbandry. The Sami village agreed on this, and the decision was not appealed (Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten, 2019, p. 1-4, 9-11, 25, 26).

Regarding Hällberget, Gällivare Sami village argued that it is impossible for reindeer husbandry to coexist with more wind turbines and that the consequences would be severe. Ängeså Sami village expressed similar views but agreed on measures after the consultation. The Sami Parliament was against the project and referred to new research regarding the consequences for reindeer husbandry. According to the decision by the EAD, reindeer husbandry will be affected but can coexist with the project. The project was granted with conditions for reindeer husbandry (Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2019, p. 1-5, 15, 17-19). After, Gällivare Sami village appealed the decision, claiming that the license should be refused or be joined by more comprehensive conditions (Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen, n.d., p. 2). The LEC changed the decision and added a few conditions, but it was not refused (Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 3771-19 judgment 2021-06-24, p. 1, 2, 10, 21-23, 57).

5. Discussion

In this section, the results from Norway and Sweden will be compared to identify similarities and differences in the parliaments' influence in the countries. Next, the theory and results will be linked together in the summarizing discussion to identify what power the Sami communities have, according to the operationalization of Dahl's theory.

5.1 Formal power

The results for the first approach, studying the Sami communities' formal power, indicate that the Sami people have protected legal rights in Norway and Sweden, which should give power in the licensing process.

The Sami people's rights are protected in several Acts, both on an international and a national level, and the Sami people are considered to have a strong position in the official hierarchy. However, a significant difference between the countries is that Sweden has not ratified the ILO convention. That Sweden does not meet the obligations of Article 14, "Indigenous peoples' ownership and possession of the land they traditionally inhabit," is an indicator that other actors exercise more significant influence and power in decisions regarding the Sami peoples' land, making the Sami people get along with decisions they otherwise would not.

A myriad of laws also regulates the licensing process. Generally, the process and its requirements are similar in Norway and Sweden, The decisions can also be appealed to higher instances. In both countries, the municipalities have a central role in the planning process, for example, regarding where wind turbines are localized. In Sweden, a license cannot be granted if not approved by the municipality concerned. In Norway, the municipalities do not have the authority to stop the process but are still considered to have a high impact on the planning process. This makes municipalities appear to have more power in the process, albeit slightly more in Sweden.

The legal framework for consultation in the licensing process is similar in Norway and Sweden. In both countries, the legislature requires similar consultations with concerned parties, making it difficult to state that there is a visible difference in power in this aspect.

5.2 Experienced power

The results for the second approach, experienced power, indicate a disparity between the formal power they should have from legislation and their actual experiences in both countries.

In Norway, the Sami Parliament expresses that the proposed projects and granted decisions conflict with international agreements and national legislature. Furthermore, they are repeatedly dissatisfied with the level of inclusion in the decision-making process. The Sami Parliament also spoke about their experience of consequences for their reindeer husbandry not being adequately assessed or considered in the final decision.

Similarly, the Swedish Sami Parliament also emphasizes the importance of listening to experts and Indigenous people's experiences when assessing the consequences of wind power projects. The Parliament also takes it further by directly laying out demands for ensuring effective participation in the process, such as requiring more consultations, updates and resources to make informed decisions.

Despite many similar and shared experiences between the two parliaments, notably the advocacy for giving expert and Indigenous knowledge greater importance and extended inclusion in the process, there are significant differences. The main distinction is the Norwegian Sami Parliament's approach to voicing wrongdoings in the process by claiming that decisions can be deemed invalid since they do not align with the legislature. On the other hand, the Swedish Parliament does not refer to laws to the same extent and instead explicitly demands change.

5.3 Exercised power

When examining the results for the third approach, exercised power, it becomes apparent that the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities had varying degrees of influence throughout the decision-making process.

For Norway and Sweden, the requirements for participation in the initial stages are mostly fulfilled. For all cases, except Kvitfjell, the Sami Parliaments were invited to the open consultations and given the same opportunity to participate in meetings. However, one

significant aspect which stands out for both countries is the dissatisfaction with the information provided before the consultation meetings. In all cases, in Norway and Sweden, the parliaments complained about the background material, mainly due to the impact assessments not being thorough enough or flaws in assessing the consequences of reindeer husbandry. Furthermore, Norway and Sweden showed varying results regarding the Sami Parliament's involvement throughout the process. The irregular involvement of the Sami Parliaments suggests that inclusion is only consistent in the initial stages of the process, with no assurance of continued Sami participation in both countries.

Regarding influence on decisions, it is visible that the Sami Parliaments, reindeer herding districts, and Sami villages, in all cases, find the projects problematic and warn that the projects will have damaging consequences for the reindeer and the reindeer husbandry. In Norway and Sweden, there was only two instance in which the damaging consequences of the project outweighed the benefits, and the license was refused, Rieppi and Lantvallen. For the other eight cases, both countries' decision-makers assessed the consequences as acceptable and granted the licenses. However, for Klöverberget, the project was reduced in size before approval. Additionally, for two Norwegian cases, Rakkocearro and Fálesrášša, NVE admitted that the comments from the Sami people were considered and at least changed the scope of the projects. For all approved projects, conditions were included that aimed to minimize consequences for reindeer husbandry.

Although conditions aimed to protect reindeer husbandry may indicate awareness of the possible consequences and suggest that the Sami Parliaments' had influence in the process, most cases were still appealed by the parliaments. The Norwegian Sami Parliament appealed all decisions, whereas the Swedish Sami Parliament only appealed three of the decisions. However, the appeals have shown to be partly successful. The OED in Norway reversed decisions for Maurneset and Fálesrášša but upheld them for Kvitfjell, while the appeal for Rakkocearro resulted in minor changes favoring the Sami people. In Sweden, only one appeal demonstrated a favorable outcome, Botsmark, which was reversed. Regarding Klöverberget and Hällberget, the appeals solely led to changes in the license with additional conditions added. Although some appeals led to changes, it is interesting to consider whether the additional requirements indicate a certain degree of influence and power or just a formality to look good on paper.

5.4 Summarizing discussion

This study is based on Robert Dahl's theory about power, which sufficed three different approaches to measuring the power of the Norwegian and Swedish Sami Parliaments during the licensing process for wind turbines on their traditional lands. At the core, Dahl theorizes that power is when agent 'a' makes agent 'b' do something which they would not have otherwise. The different approaches to measuring power each build upon the previous approach, delving deeper into how power takes form. Throughout the study, each approach problematizes the preceding one, which makes for an interesting discussion about how much power the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities possess.

Regarding formal power, the main difference between the countries is that Sweden has not ratified the ILO Convention. The fact that Sweden does not meet the requirements of Article 14 indicates that Sami people in Sweden have less to say in the process and that other actors exercise more significant influence in decisions regarding their traditional land. Beyond this, the legislation is similar in Norway and Sweden regarding Indigenous rights and rights to participation in the licensing process and is also backed up by several international regulations. Therefore, in terms of formal power and according to the legislature, Sami people in Norway and Sweden are rights holders who can participate in and influence decision-making. Other actors do not have the formal power to make the Sami people agree to decisions they would otherwise not.

However, as evident by statements from the Sami Parliaments, their legal entitlements to influence the process fails to translate into real power. The official statements make it clear that they often do not enjoy the degree of influence they are promised. The Norwegian and Swedish parliament repeatedly expressed discontent with their involvement, the flawed impact assessments and the exclusion of Indigenous knowledge and expert opinions. Based on the assumption that the Sami representatives are the best "well-placed judges" in the licensing process, it can be argued that the parliaments have an inadequate degree of power because of their experiences. Moreover, the licensing process seems modeled in such a way that other actors have more influence over the outcome and the Sami communities are forced to agree on decisions they otherwise would not have.

Although the third approach contradicts the previous conclusion to some extent, it primarily strengthens the view that formal power does not translate into real power. In most cases, in both countries, the Sami Parliaments were invited and given the same opportunity to influence in the early stages of the licensing process. However, their involvement in the later stages varied. Ultimately, four out of five licenses were granted in both countries, despite the Sami Parliaments opposing the projects, which led to appeals to higher courts. Interestingly, in the appeals, the Sami communities seemed to have more influence in the process for both countries. Arguably the mechanism of appeals was more successful in Norway, where it led to two withdrawals and one change in the conditions of the projects, whereas it led to one withdrawal and two instances of changing the project in Sweden. If outcomes that favor the Sami Parliament's interests are assumed to indicate more power, then the parliaments arguably possess less power in the initial decision despite having influence in the early stages of the process but a partially higher degree of power when appealing.

So, what power do the Sami communities have in the licensing process in Norway and Sweden? In comparison, the Norwegian Sami communities seem to have more influence in the licensing process than the Swedish Sami communities. According to the formal power, they have more international agreements protecting their rights and more success in the final outcome of the studied cases. Nonetheless, they were still displeased with their experienced power, mirroring Sweden's discontent too. Additionally, Norway and Sweden's Sami Parliaments criticized wind power project investigations for undervaluing reindeer consequences. However, ultimately, the Norwegian Sami communities demonstrate more significant influence by more often achieving their desired outcomes, possibly attributable to the formal power they can reference as justification for safeguarding their rights. However, simply drawing the conclusion that the Sami communities have more power in Norway because more appeals result in withdrawals or changes in the licensing conditions seems unfair. In the cases where appeals lead to changes in the licenses, the Sami communities still do not get their demands through, and wind turbines were still, or will be, built on traditional Sami land, generally without the Sami people's approval.

Ultimately, measuring power is a complex task. Adapting Robert Dahl's three approaches to measuring proved both useful and intricate. Much can be said about the Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities' power and the different forms it assumes. However, beyond the minor differences in the degree of power between the two counties, it is evident that the

Norwegian and Swedish Sami communities have weak power and face significant challenges in effectively exercising power in the process and outcome of the wind power licensing process on their traditional land.

6. Closure

6.1 Concluding reflection

The expansion of wind power is crucial to the green transition, and a trade-off between societal benefits and damage caused characterizes the licensing process. The Sami Parliaments and Sami communities are not against the green transition and wind turbines but against the terms on which decisions are taken and the fact that they are implemented on their traditional land, generally without their approval. Decisions are taken in an unsustainable way, and power structures appear unbalanced. According to Dahl's definition of power, 'a' makes agent 'b' do something which they would not have done otherwise, the Sami people's power in the licensing process for wind turbines is perceived as marginalized. In some cases, the decision-makers even granted licenses due to lacking knowledge, even though the Sami people had expressed the consequences of reindeer husbandry and that the evidence that wind turbines negatively affect reindeer husbandry today is robust. Additionally, in all cases, the Sami representatives criticized the information provided for being inadequate to make decisions. Their advocacy for more research and giving greater significance to Indigenous knowledge in discussions, is upheld by the IPCCCA.

Finally, the study and its findings provoke broader and more significant inquiries about the licensing process and the Sami people's power. Participation in society plays a vital role in democracy, social inclusion, and the improvement of human and Indigenous rights stated in UDHR and UNDRIP, putting this dilemma in the context of the risk of violating human rights. However, the Sami communities can participate due to the legislature and the fact that they were invited to consultations. Nevertheless, what is the value of participation if no attention is paid to it? According to the SDGs, sustainable development requires that all humans have the same opportunity to participate in and influence decision-making. Given the significant green transition the world must undergo, it would be foolish to leave out the visions of the Sami people, who possess essential knowledge and experience. After all, the

Sami are among the more vulnerable to climate change, leaving them with a lesser degree of power than actors interested in energy and wind turbine business in the licensing process for wind turbines, risks placing them in a further vulnerable, unfair position in society.

6.2 Future research

As previously mentioned, the study's ambition has not been to draw large generalizations regarding the Sami communities' power. Instead, the focus was on a specific area of their power. However, the limitations and the results have opened up questions that would have been interesting for further research.

Firstly, it would have been a crucial contribution to add interviews to this study, to include the Sami people's perspective more in the research, and to be able to understand the contexts and the relations among the actors to a greater extent. On the same path, it would have been interesting to participate in the consultations, to gain transparency regarding how much space the Sami people get in the consultations, and to understand actual social relations between the actors. Secondly, if Sweden ratified the ILO Convention on the Rights of Indigenous peoples in the future, it would have been interesting to use the periodization strategy to investigate differences before and after ratification. This could be interesting to investigate to understand further what difference an accession to international conventions makes in practice.

7. References

Act concerning the cultural heritage (Cultural Heritage Act). (1978).
<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1978-06-09-50>

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bylund, C. & Sehlin MacNeil, K. (2022). Att forska med, inte på: två former av kritisk metod. In [ed] Silow Kallenberg, K., von Unge, E. & Wiklund Moreira, L. *Etnologiskt fältarbete: nya fält och former*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 2022, p. 85-103.

Carter, N. (2018). *The politics of the environment: Ideas, activism, policy*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, R. (1957). *The concept of power*. Department of Political Science, Yale University.
https://fbaum.unc.edu/teaching/articles/Dahl_Power_1957.pdf

Dahl, R. (1970). *Modern political analysis* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J. London: Prentice-Hal.

Det kongelige olje- og energidepartement (OED). (2015, March 2). *Aurora Vindkraft AS - klagebehandling av konsesjon til etablering av Fålesrásša vindkraftverk i Kvalsund kommune* (ref.: 13/101-).
<https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201002742/1383392>

Det kongelige olje- og energidepartement (OED). (2018, April 18). *Planendringssøknad Kvitfjell og Raudfjell vindkraftverk - klagebehandling* (ref.: 17/2078-).
<https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/200700282/2382859>

Det kongelige olje- og energidepartement (OED). (2019, January 18). *Maurneset vindkraftverk - klagebehandling* (ref.: 16/1936).

Det kongelige olje- og energidepartement (OED). (2021, June 7). *Varanger KraftHydrogen AS - Klage på avslag på søknad om utsatt frist for idriftsettelse og rettslig gjennomgang av konsesjonsvedtakene etter energiloven og forvaltningsloven* (ref.: 20/1719). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/e7826331-810e-4165-8294-52f7147b4ccc/200707841/3423835><https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/e7826331-810e-4165-8294-52f7147b4ccc/200707841/3423835>

Energimyndigheten. (2020). *Rennäring*. <https://www.energimyndigheten.se/fornybart/vindkraft/vindlov/planering-och-tillstand/medel-stora-anlaggningar/inledande-skede/planeringsforutsattningar/naringsverksamhet/rennaring/>

Enetjärn natur AB. (2016). *Samrådsredogörelse*.

Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., Ann, T., & Wägnerud, L. (2017). *Metodpraktikan*. 5:e uppl. Nordstedts förlag.

European Wind Farms - Enetjärn Natur AB. (2014). *Samrådsredogörelse*.

Finnmark Act of 2005, No. 85. (2005). <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/244972>

Fred.Olsen Renewables. (2018). *Samrådsredogörelse*.

Gottardis, A. (2009). *Introduktion*. I Beckman, L (red.), *Texter i samtida politisk teori*. 2:a uppl. Malmö: Liber, 13-19.

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention No. 169 (ILO 169), 1989. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:55:0::NO::P55_TYPE,P55_LAN G,P55_DOCUMENT,P55_NODE:REV,en,C169./Document#:~:text=Indigenous%20and%20tribal%20peoples%20shall,female%20members%20of%20these%20peoples.

International Labour Organization (ILO). (n.d.). *Ratifications for Norway*. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:11200:0::NO::P11200_COUNTRY_ID:102785

Kløcker Larsen, R. (2018). Impact Assessment and Indigenous Self-determination: A Scalar Framework of Participation Options. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 36:3, 208-219. Stockholm Environment Institute. <https://www.sei.org/publications/impact-assessment-indigenous-self-determination-scalar-framework-participation/>

Kommittédirektiv 1997:103. *ILO:s konvention nr 169 om ursprungsfolk och stamfolk i självstyrande länder*. https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/kommittedirektiv/ilos-konvention-nr-169-om-ursprungsfolk-och_GLB1103

Larsson, S., Linna, K. (2015, June 10). *Regeringen kränker samers mänskliga rättigheter*. Sametinget. <https://www.sametinget.se/11877>

Lov om produksjon, omforming, overføring, omsetning, fordeling og bruk av energi m.m. (energiloven). (1990). <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1990-06-29-50?q=energiloven>

Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten. (2019, December 4). *Tillstånd att anlägga och driva en vindkraftsanläggning inom ansökningsområdet på fastigheterna Talljärv 1:3, 2:3, 2:4 och Törefors 3:3 i Överkalix Kommun* (case number 551-12653-14, 2513-4102)

Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten. (2019, December 12). *Tillstånd till uppförande och drift av vindkraft vid Fäboliden II, Vindelns kommun* (case number 551-10570-2018).

Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten. (2020, May 15). *Ansökan om tillstånd enligt miljöbalken till uppförande och drift av vindkraft vid Lantvallen, Robertsfors kommun* (case number 551-5774-16).

Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten. (2021a, November 25). *Tillstånd till uppförande och drift av vindkraft vid Klöverberget, Skellefteå kommun* (case number 551-12-2018)

Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten. (2021b, January 29). *Tillstånd om uppförande och drift av vindkraft vid Botsmark, Umeå kommun* (case number 551-7354-2014).

Nachet, L., Beckett, C., & MacNeil, K. S. (2022). Framing extractive violence as environmental (in) justice: A cross-perspective from indigenous lands in Canada and Sweden. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 12, 100949. <https://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1577347/FULLTEXT02.pdf>

Naturvårdsverket. (n.d.). *Vindkraftens påverkan på däggdjur på land*. <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/om-miljoarbetet/forskning/vindval/vindkraftens-paverkan-pa-daggdjur-pa-land/>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2001, February 15). *Norsk Miljøkraft Tromsø AS: Kvitfjell vindkraftverk - konsekvensutredning og konsesjonssøknad. Sammenfatning av høringsuttalelser og bakgrunn for konsesjonsvedtak*. (ref.: 200100469-6). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/200100469/914098>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2004). *Bakgrunn for KU-program*. <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/200400206/995089>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2010, June 7). *Varanger KraftProduksjon AS - Råkkoecharro vindkraftverk - Bakgrunn for vedtak* (ref.: NVE200707841-28 kn/iHW). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/200707841/308951>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2013, January 11). *Aurora Vindkraft AS. Fálesrášša vindkraftverk. Kvalsund kommune, Finnmark fylke. Bakgrunn for vedtak* (ref.: 201002742-122). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201002742/660731>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2014, February 14). *Vindkraft Nord AS - Søknad om konsesjon for Maurneset vindkraftverk i Nordreisa kommune, Troms - Bakgrunn for vedtak* (ref.: NVE 201104217-49). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201104217/836483>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2015, November 10). *Vedtak - avslag på søknad om konsesjon* (ref.: 201101686-72). <https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201101686/1582862>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2016, January 29). *Vedtak - Søknad om ekspropriasjon og forhåndstiltredelse for Maurneset vindkraftverk - Vindkraft Nord AS* (ref.: 201104217-85).

<https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201104217/1642067>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2021, June 23). *Licensing*.

<https://www.nve.no/licensing/>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2022a). *Kvitfjell vindkraftverk og Raudfjell vindkraftverk - Varsel om at NVE vurderer å sette nye vilkår i konsesjonene av hensyn til samiske interesser* (ref.: 200701246-334/200700282-206).

<https://innsyn.onacos.no/sametinget/postliste/norsk/wfdocument.ashx?journalpostid=2021072292&dokid=1144426&versjon=1&variant=A&>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2022b). *Lover og regler*.

<https://www.nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonsbehandling-og-oppfoelging-av-vindkraft-paa-land/konsesjonsbehandling-av-vindkraftverk-paa-land/lover-og-regler/>

Norges vassdrags- og energidirektorat (NVE). (2023, March 17). *Konsesjonsbehandling av vindkraftverk på land*.

<https://www.nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonsbehandling-og-oppfoelging-av-vindkraft-paa-land/konsesjonsbehandling-av-vindkraftverk-paa-land/>

Nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonssaker. (n.d). *Konsesjonssaker: Saker knyttet til energiutbygging, samt tiltak i vann og vassdrag*. <https://www.nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonssaker/>

Regjeringen. (2015, January 5). *Reindeer husbandry and indigenous peoples' rights*.

<https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/food-fisheries-and-agriculture/reindeer-husbandry/reindeer-husbandry-indigenous-peopl-rights/id2339777/>

Samer.se. (n.d.). *Karta över Sápmi*. <https://www.samer.se/karta>

Sametinget. (2013, January 31). *Vedrørende NVEs konsesjonsvedtak for Fálesrásša vindkraftverk i Kvalsund kommune, og Sørfjorden vindkraftverk i Tysfjord kommune* (ref.: 10/4320-59).

Sametinget. (2016). *Organization*. <https://www.sametinget.se/9690>

Sametinget. (2018a, July 4). *Samråd for vindkraftverk på Fäboliden i Vindelns kommun*. (Dnr.: 5.2.2-2018-825).

Sametinget. (2018b, November 13). *Yttrande om Vasa Vind ABs bemötande av de yttranden som inkommit i ärendet om etablering av vindkraftverk vid Hällberget, Överkalix kommun, ärende 551-12653-14*. (Dnr: 5.2.1-2018-1255).

Sametinget. (2019a, November 5). *Remissvar avseende ansökan om tillstånd enligt 9 kap. miljöbalken för en ny vindkraftpark, Klöverberget, Skellefteå kommun i Västerbottens län*. (Dnr.: 5.2.1-2019-1192).

Sametinget. (2019b, January 30). *Yttrande avseende ansökan om tillstånd enligt 9 kap. miljöbalken till uppförande och drift av vindkraftsanläggning i Botsmark, Umeå kommun i Västerbottens län*. (Dnr.: 5.2.1-2019-16).

Sametinget. (2019c, May 3). *Yttrande avseende ansökan om tillstånd enligt 9 kap. miljöbalken till uppförande och drift av vindkraftsanläggning vid Lantvallen, Robertsfors kommun i Västerbottens län*. (Dnr.: 5.2.1-2019-505).

Sametinget. (2021, October 13). *Yttrande avseende ansökan om nätkoncession i linje för en dubbel 150 kV och överföra producerad el till transmissionsnätet*. (Dnr.: 5.2.2-2021-1560)

Sametinget. (2022). *Sametingets kommentarer til begjæringen om endring av vilkår for Kvittfjell og Raudfjell vindkraftverk* (ref.: 22/9094). <https://innsyn.onacos.no/sametinget/postliste/norsk/wfdocument.ashx?journalpostid=2021048566&dokid=1098469&versjon=2&variant=A&>

Sametinget. (2023). *Konsultation med Sametinget.*
<https://www.sametinget.se/konsultationsordning>

Sandén, T. (2023, February 28). *Samiska aktivister protesterar mot vindkraftverk - tillsammans med Greta Thunberg.* Göteborgs-Posten.
<https://www.gp.se/nyheter/varlden/samiska-aktivister-protesterar-mot-vindkraftverk-tillsammans-med-greta-thunberg-1.93252329>

SFS: 1971:437. *Rennäringslag.* <https://lagen.nu/1971:437>

SFS: 1974:152. *Kungörelse (1974:152) om beslutad ny regeringsform.*
https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/kungorelse-1974152-om-beslutad-ny-regeringsform_sfs-1974-152

SFS 1998:808. *Miljöbalk.* <https://lagen.nu/1998:808>

Skarin, A., Sandström, P., Brandåno Niebuhr, B., Alam, M., Adler, S.(2021). *Renar; rensköttsel och vindkraft.* Vindval. Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet. Naturvårdsverket.
<https://www.naturvardsverket.se/om-oss/publikationer/7000/renar-renskotsel-och-vindkraft/>

The Constitution of the Kingdom of Norway. (1814).
https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1814-05-17#KAPITTEL_5

The Indigenous Peoples' Bio cultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative (IPCCA). (n.d.).
History. <https://ipcca.info/about-ipcca-history>

The Swedish Institute. (2023). *With a culture that remains strong, some 20,000 Sami live in Sweden.* <https://sweden.se/life/people/sami-in-sweden>

Teorell, J., & Svensson, T. (2007). *Att fråga och att svara: samhällsvetenskaplig metod.* Liber.

Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen. (n.d.). *Överklagan av Miljöprövningsdelegationen vid länsstyrelsen Norrbottens beslut avseende tillstånd för*

uppförande och drift av vindkraft vid Talljärv och Törefors, Överkalix kommun. Dnr 551-12653-14, 2513-4102.

Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 1841-20 judgement 2022-02-28.

Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 3410-21 judgement 2023-03-31.

Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 3771-19 judgement 2021-06-24.

Umeå Tingsrätt Mark- och miljödomstolen case nr M 530-21 judgement 2023-02-15.

United Nations (UN). (n.d.). *The 17 goals*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>

United Nations (UN). (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

United Nations (UN). (2007). *United Nations Declaration On The Rights Of Indigenous Peoples*. <https://social.desa.un.org/issues/indigenous-peoples/united-nations-declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples>

Vasa Vind AB. (2018). *Samrådsredogörelse*.

Vattenfall. (n.d.). *Hur fungerar tillståndsprocessen för en vindkraftpark på land?* <https://group.vattenfall.com/se/var-verksamhet/vindprojekt/faq-vindkraft/hur-fungerar-tillstandsprocessen-for-en-vindkraftpark-pa-land>

Vbk.lansstyrelsen.se. (n.d). Vindbrukskollen. V.6.1.1. <https://vbk.lansstyrelsen.se/>

Wpd Scandinavia AB. (2017). *Klöverberget miljökonsekvensbeskrivning*.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed). sage.

Össbo, Å. (2022). *Hydropower company sites: a study of Swedish settler*

colonialism, Settler Colonial Studies.

<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1637041/FULLTEXT01.pdf>