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**Section 2****: General summary of national implementation progress and challenges**

**In your country, in the past triennium (i.e., since COP13 reporting):**

A. What have been the five most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) A large number of wetlands have been restored during 2018-2020 in different projects. This has been possible due to additional funds for wetland restoration from the government and a large Life-project, Grip on Life. |
| 2) The progress of protecting marine and limnic habitats have increased much compared with earlier trienniums. |
| 3) New legislation and additional governmental funds have made it possible to reconsider old permits for hydroelectric power stations and other dams as well as demanding that dams established before the modern legislation was in place should get a permit according to the present legislation. New and renewed permits will include new or updated conditions making it better for biodiversity. For example, create a better water flow in the water course, building passages so the fishes and other species can migrate in the water course even if there are dams along the migrations route. In 2018-2020 some new permits for old dams have been established or updated so that environmentally conditions have been added or improved. |
| 4) A number of projects eliminating or reducing the population sizes of invasive wetland species have been conducted. |
| 5) There has been a lot of education measures like webinars, infosheets etc with the focus on wetland restoration, green infrastructure and wetland ecosystem services. |

B. What have been the five greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Even if protection and restoration measures have taken place during the triennium, the funds used are quite small compared to the need. Protecting and restoring wetlands is time-consuming and dependent on long-term work. Threats against wetlands are often considered to be smaller compared to natural forests and most national resources the establishment of nature reserves are therefore mainly used to protect forests. While wetlands wait for their turn to be protected, they are affected negatively by for example forestry. |
| 2) Achieving wise use, (sustainable use of wetlands and their ecosystem services) and favourable conservation status, is an on-going challenge.  The report 2019 to the EU on the conservation status of the habitats in the EU Habitats Directive showed that one assessed wetland unit only had improved its conservation status, (units=all combinations of each wetland habitats in the EU biogeographical region they occur) and a handful of units had changed to bad compared with the report in 2013. |
| 3) Impact from climate change is a problem not just for the palsa mires but in parts of the country other wetland types are under stress, due to years with unusually low precipitation, hot temperatures and lacking snow cover (creating a loss of high water levels during snow melting and also resulting in lower flows during summer). |
| 4) Difficulties with water flows in water courses. The authorities don’t have enough resources to check the legislative compliance for conditions in the existing permits. There are examples where water flows and water levels aren’t in line with existing conditions in permits, even some in protected areas. The lack of natural water flows affects both the water courses and the surrounded area that under natural conditions should be flooded regularly. |
| 5) Most nature reserves include freshwater habitats, there are however, needs to investigate the reserves further for aquatic values and subsequently strengthen regulations. Better knowledge of the marine areas is required, even if progress have been made. |

C. What are the five priorities for future implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Better consideration for the wetlands, rivers, lakes and coastal areas in conjunction with the use of land adjacent to wetlands. Two main threats are intensive forest management and ditch cleaning in the management of arable land and forests. The most important driving forces are increased demand for wood/biomass and the risk that crops will be damaged by too wet soils. |
| 2) Increase the area of protected areas, especially marine and limnic habitats as well as sites in the mire protection plan. |
| 3) Continue to restore wetlands (hydrology, vegetation, eradicate invasive species) and increase the affected area of restoration per year. |
| 4) There is a big need to make new and modern permits that include environmental conditions for a number of hydroelectrical power plants (dams etc) built in water courses before there was any environmental legislation. New permits may include measures that reduce the environmental impact of hydropower without hazarding the production of energy needed to meet future energy demands. Continued work to eliminate obstacles in order to let fish and other aquatic organisms migrate freely along the water courses is needed. |
| 5) Get better knowledge on how to cope with a changed climate and the effect it will have on the distribution of water in the landscape and increased changes in wetlands, for example overgrowth with bushes and trees in wetlands. |

D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning priorities for implementation assistance and requirements for such assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?

|  |
| --- |
| The best way for the Secretariat to assist Sweden in its implementation is to provide information from research about ecosystem services and their values (especially the hydrological ones on for example flood regulations), interesting development on restoration techniques and other methods needed for different measures. Spreading other kinds of results from interesting wetlands projects that may inspire Contracting Parties and others are also helpful. It's important that the Ramsar secretariat continue to take an active part in the Climate convention. Some measures suggested for climate adaptation are good for wetlands and others are not, and it is recommended that the Ramsar Secretariat take part in the discussions and negotiations. Resolutions about how to cope with opposing interests are recommended in both conventions and in the CBD as well. |

E. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Convention’s International Organisation Partners (IOPs)? (including ongoing partnerships and partnerships to develop)

|  |
| --- |
| Continue to provide information about wetlands and do restoration/preservation projects that serve as good examples. |

F. How can national implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with implementation of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), especially those in the ‘biodiversity cluster’ (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), World Heritage Convention (WHC), and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)?

|  |
| --- |
| The Swedish EPA started to gather the different NFP’s in the biodiversity cluster working at the Swedish EPA for discussing on-going issues on a few meetings, but this stopped due to the limited time available, other tasks had to be prioritised. The last years we have exchanged info on e-mail only, unless there are some tasks that needs a meeting. But exchange of information etc with the ones working with HELCOM and OSPAR still have to be established. |

G. How is the Ramsar Convention linked with the implementation of water policy/strategy and other strategies in the country (e.g., on sustainable development, energy, extractive industries, poverty reduction, sanitation, food security, biodiversity) and how this could be improved?

|  |
| --- |
| The knowledge of the Ramsar Convention could increase within a lot of sectors. Guidance from governmental authorities could improve. |

H. According to paragraph 21 of Resolution XIII.18 on *Gender and wetlands*, please provide a short description about the balance between men and women participating in wetland-related decisions, programmes and research

|  |
| --- |
| There is no official national analyse on gender balance for people working with wetland issues. So, we have chosen to do some minor studies for the gender balance in certain wetland areas where we at least have some recordings of gender or some activities that we know are made for increasing gender balance. It does not give the full picture but gives us a hint on how the present situation looks like.  *Research -* In 2019 there was a special grant for research about wetland and their ecosystem services with focus on hydrological services and climate mitigation and adaptation. The applications have been analysed from a gender-perspective. The gender for individuals with an annexed CV was counted (some researchers occurred in more than one application and was then counted more than once). The result was that males (67 individuals) were almost twice as many as females (34 individuals) occurred in the CWs in the applications.  *Wetland restoration staff at the Swedish EPA -* During the triennium there was a total dominance of women working with wetland restoration tasks (full or part time) at the Swedish EPA. Among the ones in the staff who worked in the project on wetland restoration there was one man and six women. This differ from the general gender balance at the department where the wetland staff is working, where the overall gender balance is good.  *Regional Wetland restoration staff -* In 2018 the list on regional wetland restoration staff there was a good gender balance, 22 men and 18 women. At the department where the wetland staff is working the overall gender balance is good.  *The Swedish delegation at COP13 –* The delegation consisted of two men and one woman, difficult to improve the balance further with three participants.  *The forestry sector* –The Swedish Forest Agency has been working with increased gender balance in the forestry sector for many years and nowadays more females are active, 12 of 16 indicators shows an increased gender balance. But still more need to be done to achieve better results. In 2019 the Swedish Forest Agency made a report with suggestions on what to address and how. <https://www.skogsstyrelsen.se/globalassets/om-oss/publikationer/2019/rapport-2019-04-atgarder-for-en-jamstalld-skogssektor.pdf> |

I. Do you (AA) have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| In Sweden, the environmental quality objectives apply to all sectors of society and set the framework for conservation and sustainable use of wetlands. Most important are the objectives for limnic water, coastal water and wetlands. These objectives include for example conservation, restoration, sustainable use and ecosystem services. Other environmental objectives are also important for wetlands for example the ones on climate change. The aims of the Ramsar Convention are satisfyingly implemented in the environmental quality objectives of the society.  Every four years, an in-depth evaluation is made of the progress towards achieving the environmental quality objectives, and the results are presented to the Government and Parliament as a basis for Sweden’s environmental policy in the years to come. There was an in-depth evaluation of the objectives reported in 2019. The evaluation covered state for wetlands, how the society copes with the environmental issues and the conditions and possibilities to reach the objectives. The results show that there is still a lot to do to reach the objectives.  The 2020 interim target of the protection of land, freshwater and marine habitats from 2012 include that at least 20 % of Sweden's land and freshwater areas and 10 % of Sweden's marine area should be protected by 2020. This will be achieved through protection or other conservation measures in areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services. The formal protection of wetlands will be increased by about 210 000 hectares by the protection of mires with high conservation value in the national mire protection plan. The formal protection of lakes and rivers will be increased by at least 12 000 hectares and the formal protection of marine areas will be increased by at least 570 000 hectares. Through the development and strengthening of green infrastructure, the ecological relationships are strengthened so that sheltered and preserved areas and habitats are connected and integrated into the landscape, including the marine environment. When assessed early in 2020 the interim targets had not been reached except for the marine habitats. |

J. Please list the names of the organisations which have been consulted on or have contributed to the information provided in this report:

|  |
| --- |
| The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, The Species Information Centre at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, the Swedish Forest Agency, the Swedish Board of Agriculture, the Ministry of Environment, WWF Sweden and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation have been asked for comment. The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management have provided suggestions for improvements that have been included. |

**Section 3: Indicator questions and further implementation information**

**Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation**

*[Reference* to *Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15]*

***Target 1.*** *Wetland benefits are featured in national/ local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level.*

*[Reference to Aichi Target 2]*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
| 1.1 Have wetland conservation and the identification of wetlands benefits been integrated into sustainable approaches to the following national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i | | | |
|  | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant | | |
| a) | National Policy or strategy for wetland management: | A | |
| b) | Poverty eradication strategies: | Y | |
| c) | Water resource management and water efficiency plans: | A | |
| d) | Coastal and marine resource management plans: | A | |
| e) | Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan: | C | |
| f) | National forest programmes: | A | |
| g) | National policies or measures on agriculture: | A | |
| h) | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD: | A | |
| i) | National policies on energy and mining: | C | |
| j) | National policies on tourism: | C | |
| k) | National policies on urban development: | C | |
| l) | National policies on infrastructure: | C | |
| m) | National policies on industry: | C | |
| n) | National policies on aquaculture and fisheries {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i: | C | |
| o) | National plans of actions (NPAs) for pollution control and management: | B | |
| p) | National policies on wastewater management and water quality: | C | |
| 1.1 Additional information: | | | |

***Target 2.*** *Water use**respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone.*

## *[Reference to Aichi Targets 7 and 8], [Sustainable Development Goal 6, Indicator 6.3.1]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 Has the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands been assessed to support the implementation of the Guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands (Resolution VIII.1, VIII.2) ? 1.24. | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.1 Additional information:  Sweden assesses the overall water quality and quantity within the framework of the relevant EU directives, especially the EU Water framework Directive. How climate change will change the availability of water for wetlands is on agenda for agencies working with wetlands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.2 Have assessments of environmental flow been undertaken in relation to mitigation of impacts on the ecological character of wetlands (Action r3.4.iv) | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.2 Additional information:  When a permit for something that affects water is applied for, the responsible authority/court has to consider if a permit should be given or not concerning the quantity and quality of water. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.3 What, if any, initiatives have been taken to improve the sustainability of water use (or allocation of water resources) in the context of ecosystem requirements across major river basins (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12 )?  (Action 3.4.6.) | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; O= No Change; X= Unknown |
| 2.3 Additional information: There is on-going work with renewal of permits for dams, trying to mitigate impacts from existing dams. There have also been funds for re-wetting drained areas, restoring or re-establish wetland ecosystem and a lot of restoration measures have taken place. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.4 Have projects that promote and demonstrate good practice in water allocation and management for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands been developed (Action r3.4.ix. ) | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.4 Additional information: No, but project that restore wetlands often have activities about spreading the results from the project. There are also separate conferences having restoration of wetlands etc as a theme including site visits. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.5 Percentage of households linked to sewage system ?  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | % |
| 100 |
| 2.5 Additional information:  100 % of the Swedish households are linked to sewage systems. Around 10 % of these systems are small scale on-site wastewater treatment plants (OSWT). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.6 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country?  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | G |
| 90  E=# percent;  F= Less than # percent;  G= More Than # percent;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.6 Additional information:  Approximately 90 % of the Swedish population is connected to a municipal sewerage system. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.7 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine if relevant to your country? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | F |
| 10  E=# percent;  F=Less Than # percent;  G= More Than # percent;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.7 Additional information:  In Sweden less than 10 % of the population are connected to on-site wastewater treatment systems. Most of the OSWTS:s have septic tanks with additional treatment. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.8 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology?  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | C |
| A= Yes, B= No; C= Partially, D=Planned X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.8 Additional information:  The number of OSWTS:s that use constructed wetlands or ponds as the main treatment are close to zero percent. In some cases, it can be used as a precautionary step after the main treatment.  A small number of urban wastewater treatment plants use constructed wetlands/ponds, primarily to reduce nitrogen or as a precautionary treatment step after the main treatment. The wetlands are sometimes regarded as a formal part of the treatment plant, thus included in the discharge permit, and sometimes as an informal, supplementary measure prior to discharge in the main recipient. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.9 Number of wastewater treatment plants (or volume treated exist at national level)?  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | G |
| E= # plants;  F= Less than #;  G=More than #;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.9 Additional information:  In Sweden there are more than 1400 treatment plants that treat wastewater from urban areas with more than 200 pe (population equivalents). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.10 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants? If relevant to your country  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | A |
| A=Good; B=Not Functioning; C=Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.10 Additional information:  For treatment plants that treat wastewater from urban areas with more than 2000 pe the functional status is good. Monitoring data for smaller treatment plants are not collected nationally. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.11 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is?  SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | 13 % |
| A=Good; B=Not Functioning C=Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.11 Additional information:  More than 13 % of the population is connected to decentralized wastewater treatment technology. This can also include systems where several households are connected to the same treatment plant, mostly privately run. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.12 Number of wastewater reuse systems (or volume re-used) and purpose? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | # |
|  |
| 2.12 Additional information:  There is a growing interest, amongst owners of OSWTS:s, in systems for reuse of wastewater, but we have no such statistics. There are a few urban wastewater treatment plants that have systems for reuse of wastewater, but the number is low. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.13 What is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system if relevant to your country ? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1. | R/X |
| R=Agriculture; S=Landscape; T=Industrial; U=Drinking; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 2.13 Additional information: Please indicate if the wastewater reuse system is for free or taxed or add any additional information.  Irrigation and regaining of nutrients. The public are not taxed for the specific reuse systems. We have no information about any taxing of farmers who utilize the re-used wastewater. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.14 Does your country use a wastewater treatment process that utilizes wetlands as a natural filter while preserving the wetland ecosystem? | A |
| A=Yes; B=No;  X= Unknown; |
| 2.14 Additional information:  There are a few urban wastewater treatment systems that utilize natural wetlands, as an additional step after the main treatment. During the permit process it is safeguarded that the use of wetlands as a natural filter for pre-treated wastewater will not endanger the ecosystem of the wetland. If there is a risk of affecting the ecosystem mitigation measures must be taken, or else the use of wetlands would be prohibited, according to the Swedish Environmental Code. | |

***Target 3.*** *Public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands.* {1.10}

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 3, 4, 7 and 8]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.1 Is the private sector encouraged to apply the Ramsar wise use principle and guidance (Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1} KRA 1.10.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 3.1 Additional information:  The national environmental quality objectives and the Environmental Code, and their implications for sustainable development, apply to all sectors of the Swedish society. The Ramsar wise use of wetlands is necessary to reach the environmental quality objectives. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.2 Has the private sector undertaken activities or actions for the conservation, wise use and management of? {1.10.2} KRA 1.10.ii:  a) Ramsar Sites  b) Wetlands in general | A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| a) A  b) A |
| 3.2 Additional information:  a, The private sector is often involved in the management measures that carry on grazing and mowing at the sites that require such management.  b, All sectors of society are obliged to take environmental consideration in accordance with the Environmental Code. This is particularly relevant within forestry, as regulated by the Forestry Act. Landowners, especially farmers are relatively active in restoring wetlands. The private sector is also locally involved in different wetland projects. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.3 Have actions been taken to implement incentive measures which encourage the conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.1} KRA 1.11.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned |
| 3.3 Additional information:  There is a possibility to restore wetlands in several different funding programmes, the total amount has been considerably higher that earlier trienniums. The programmes have included webinars on restoration of wetlands. The Swedish Rural Development Programme provides support for management (grazing and mowing). The protected area of mires and forests in the national mire protection plan has been increased with about 20 000 hectares during 2018-2020. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.4 Have actions been taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.2} KRA 1.11.i | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 3.4 Additional information: | |

***Target 4.*** *Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment.*

*{Reference to Aichi Target 9]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 Does your country have a national inventory of invasive alien species that currently or potentially impact the ecological character of wetlands? {1.9.1} KRA 1.9.i | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 4.1 Additional information:  For a few invasive wetland species there have been regular inventories. For a few species, there is quite a good knowledge of where they occur. Many observations are received by citizens reporting in national on-line system for species observation. <https://artfakta.se/rapportera/invasiva-arter/skapa> | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.2 Have national policies or guidelines on invasive species control and management been established or reviewed for wetlands? {1.9.2} KRA 1.9.iii | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 4.2 Additional information:  The environmental quality objectives about wetlands and aquatic habitats include clarifications on alien species and genotypes as well as GMO, having the objective that invasive species are not to interfere with habitats status. There is EU legislation on invasive alien species that is applied in Sweden, all wetland species on the EU-list are covered by this legislation. There is an action plan on how to cut the ways the species listed by the EU legislation spread. The Environmental Code contains provisions concerning the release of alien species, in line with Sweden’s commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity.  There is information (guidelines, description of the legislation and facts about a number of species) about invasive alien species at <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Amnen/Invasiva-frammande-arter/>. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.3 Has your country successfully controlled through management actions invasive species of high risk to wetland ecosystems? | A  A=Yes; B=No;  X= Unknown |
| 4.3. Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please provide examples, including the species name and the successful management actions.  During the triennium there have been measures to limit some invasive species, some measures are more successful than others. There have for example been projects on limitation of populations of *Nyctereutes procyonoides, Lysichiton americanus, Alopochen aegyptiacus, Lepomis gibbosus, Ameiurus melas and Ondatra zibethicus.* These species have been successfully eradicated from at least some of the sites where they did occur earlier or at least haven’t been able to spread further.  Some vertebrate species are hunted (with traps or shot) when reported to occur in an area. Others are taken away by removal of plants including roots.  Yearly reports on results for invasive vertebrates (summary in English): <https://jagareforbundet.se/vilt/invasiva-frammande-arter/arsrapporter-och-informationsmaterial/> | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.4 Are there invasive species of high risk to wetland ecosystems that have not been successfully controlled through management actions? | A  A=Yes; B=No;  X= Unknown |
| 4.4 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please provide examples, including the species name and the challenges to management)  Yes, several, some have not been targeted for projects at all yet, others have been the target for eradication projects but those need more activities to get rid of the species. Species that have been difficult to eradicate are for example *Neogobius melanostomus, Nymphoides peltata, Eriocheir sinensis, Elodea nuttallii* and different species of water turtles Trachemys sp. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.5 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed? | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 4.5 Additional information: During these three years the focus have been on starting processes, programmes and eradication projects as well as capacity building and raising awareness about invasive species. Assessment will be a later step when enough measures have been taken for making an assessment. | |

**Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network**

*[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 6, 11, 13, 14, 15]*

***Target 5.*** *The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 6,11, 12]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the *Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List*? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 5.1 Additional information:  Altogether, Sweden has 68 Ramsar sites. There are no plans nor any strategies for designating more Ramsar sites in the next coming years. Other wetland work, for example restoration, is much higher prioritised right now. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.2 Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its tools being used in national identification of further Ramsar Sites to designate? {2.2.1} KRA 2.2.ii | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 5.2 Additional information:  There are no plans nor any work going on for designating more Ramsar sites. But they have been used in earlier triennia designating sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.3 How many Ramsar Sites have a formal management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i | 66 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.4 Of the Ramsar Sites with a formal management plan, for how many of these is the plan being implemented ?  {2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i | 66 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.5 Of the Ramsar sites without a formal management plan, for how many is there effective management planning currently being implemented through other relevant means e.g. through existing actions for appropriate wetland management? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i | 0 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.3 – 5.5 Additional information:  All Swedish Ramsar sites are either completely or partly designated Natura 2000 sites. Most of the sites are completely or partly protected as NR (nature reserves) or NP (national parks). One single Ramsar site can contain several NRs. Regulations for the NPs and NRs are included in the decision about establishing them.  According to Swedish legislation, a management plan is required for NRs and NPs and a conservation plan is required for Natura 2000 sites. Altogether, there are about 350 management/conservation plans for the 68 existing Ramsar sites. There is no compilation containing information about which of the management plans that are under revision for the time being. Several of the conservation plans for the Natura sites at the Ramsar sites have been updated.  The sites Mannavuoma, Sikåsvågarna and Hovranområdet lack management/conservation plan or only have it for a small part of the site. There are no plans to make management plans for the unprotected parts within the Ramsar sites. For the time being it's considered that the general legislation will be enough to maintain the ecological status in those parts. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with either a formal management plan) or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management ? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 5.6 Additional information:  Most of the management plans and conservation plans are based upon sound scientific research, including research on potential threats in general, and partly at site level. There is a system to follow up management (selected parts only). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.7 How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv | 66 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X=Unknown, Y=Not Relevant; |
| 5.7 Additional information (If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites):  The County Administrative Boards have the main responsible for the management of protected areas. When updating regulations, borders and management all stakeholders are invited in the process. Many locals participate by arranging grazing and mowing. For some Ramsar sites, management responsibility is delegated from the County Administrative Board to e.g. foundations established to convene different stakeholders. Community involvement has high priority in nature conservation in Sweden, and efforts are being made to increase the participation of different stakeholders in the management of protected areas. But formal committees are not established even if there are local involved in most of the sites management. | |

***Target 7.*** *Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}.*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11, 12]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.1 Are mechanisms in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of negative human-induced changes or likely changes in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.1} KRA 2.6.i | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites; D=Planned |
| 7.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some sites’, please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established):    All Swedish Ramsar sites are either completely or partly protected as nature reserves and/or Natura 2000 sites. Management plans for nature reserves and Natura 2000 sites shall include monitoring measures, in respect of follow-up of identified conservation status targets.  If accidents or other unexpected impacts happen, the county Administrative Boards contact the Swedish EPA (the AA). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.2 Have all cases of negative human-induced change or likely change in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites been reported to the Ramsar Secretariat, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.2} KRA 2.6.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases; O=No Negative Change |
| 7.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some cases’, please indicate for which Ramsar Sites the Administrative Authority has made Article 3.2 reports to the Secretariat, and for which sites such reports of change or likely change have not yet been made):  Information have been reported in the RIS for each affected site. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.3 If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, such as requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 7.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the actions taken): | |

**Goal 3. Wisely using all wetlands**

*[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]*

***Target 8.*** *National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 12, 14, 18, 19]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.1 Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| 8.1 Additional information:    There are a number of surveys, inventories and monitoring programmes about wetlands in Sweden.  The Swedish wetland survey (not including all aquatic habitats) was initiated in 1981 and completed in 2004. It covers the whole country except the alpine zone. Individual County Administration Boards with support from the Swedish EPA have conducted the survey. Approximately 35 000 wetlands, generally larger than 10 hectares (50 hectares in the northernmost part of the country), have been studied on aerial photographs and 12 % of the objects have been visited in the field. The objectives for the survey included mapping the distribution of wetlands throughout the county, as well as studying their environmental assets and the extent to which they have been affected by human activities. In 2014 a compilation of the final results was published in English; it is available at <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/978-91-620-6618-5>.    Furthermore, complementary inventories of alkaline fens (rich fens) have been done in the framework of an action programme for rich fens and associated threatened species which was established by the Swedish EPA. The state and trends of alkaline fens with respect to the impact of human activities on hydrology and biodiversity will be monitored in the Swedish national environmental monitoring programme in the years to come.  The project 'Base survey of Natura 2000 and protected areas' lasted from 2004  to 2008. The aim was to collect information about habitats, structures, functions  and species within Sweden’s Natura 2000 areas and protected areas. For wetland habitats, this inventory was based on the national wetlands survey and partly uses the same methodology. It gave updated information for some of the areas with high conservation values, as well as additional information about mountainous wetlands and some of the smaller habitat types, such as springs and rich fens.  Results from a detailed survey about palsa mires were published in 2014 and are available at http://www.lansstyrelsen.se/norrbotten/SiteCollectionDocuments/Sv/publikationer/miljo%20och%20klimat/Tillst%c3%a5ndet%20i%20milj%c3%b6n/4\_2014\_Kartering%20av%20Sveriges%20palsmyrar.pdf  Both marine and inland waters lack a comprehensive national inventory. The database ‘Valuable water’ is a compilation of valuable freshwater environments based natural, fish, fishing and cultural values. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.2 Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade? | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; C1= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 8.2 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.3 Is wetland inventory data and information maintained? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 8.3 Additional information:  There is still on-going work making quality controls on the Wetland Survey data.  Data from the survey of alkaline fens (rich fens) is available at the county administrative boards concerned. The data will be maintained in the national environmental monitoring programme in the years to come, by monitoring the state and trends of hydrology and biodiversity.  Measures have been done to make parts the old survey digitalised. The work will continue if funds are available.  Data from the satellite-based monitoring programme for open mires is available on the internet.  There is a website VISS (Water Information System Sweden), where many of the results from different surveys are available. http://www.viss.lansstyrelsen.se/.  The information in the database ‘Valuable water’ is accessible to all stakeholders (https://www.havochvatten.se/hav/samordning--fakta/kartor--gis/karttjanster-fran-hav/karttjanster/vardefulla-vatten.html. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.4 Is wetland inventory data and information made accessible to all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 8.4 Additional information:  Information from the inventory has been communicated to and used by a wide range of stakeholders. There is an on-going project to make all reports from the survey more easily available in a digitalised format. The reports and some unpublished manuscripts are now digitalised, but they still have to be published on the internet. There is on-going work digitalising the remote sensing interpretation maps from the inventory and creating new better GIS-files. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.5 Has the condition\* of wetlands in your country, overall, changed during the last triennium? {1.1.3}  a) Ramsar Sites  b) wetlands generally  Please describe on the sources of the information on which your answer is based in the green free- text box below. If there is a difference between inland and coastal wetland situations, please describe. If you are able to, please describe the principal driver(s) of the change(s).  \* ‘Condition’ corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention | N=Status Deteriorated; O=No Change; P=Status Improved |
| a) P  b) N |
| 8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b):    a, In general available information indicate that the ecological character of Ramsar Sites has been improved the last years. There have been measures restoring damaged wetlands and measures against invasive alien species have been done. But climate change has caused problems the last decade. For example, are the palsas in some of the northern Ramsar sites slowly deteriorating.  b, A lot of the wetlands are affected by on-going densification of trees and bushes. The main explanation for the overgrowing of wetlands is that the old large-scale drainage started a process of change in vegetation that takes a long time and that vegetation changes continuously. Another important cause of changes in vegetation are the changes in management regimes (mowing and grazing), in some wetland types these changes go fast and in others they take a lot of time.  Nitrogen deposition is also a part of the changes in the south of the country and climate change may affect the northern parts. The ongoing National Inventory of Landscapes in Sweden (NILS, http://nils.slu.se/) and The Swedish National Forest Inventory (RIS, http://www.slu.se/en/collaborative-centres-and-projects/swedish-national-forest-inventory/), has and will further improve the monitoring of ecological character of the Swedish wetlands. A number of small studies show that wet forests, peatlands, natural springs are in a worse condition then earlier.    Following the EU Habitats Directive, Sweden has an obligation to preserve the included species and habitats. Their status is monitored and assessed in accordance with Article 17 of the Directive. The last evaluation was done in 2019, and it includes state and trends. There is a publication presenting the results, (includes English summary and parts of figure texts) available at <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publ-filer/6900/978-91-620-6914-8.pdf?pid=27007>. For many wetland types the conservation status have declined and/or the trend is negative. Habitats that have declined from unfavourable status to bad, was mainly the ones in the marine regions and the “terrester” ones in need of mowing and grazing.  Reasons for unfavourable conservation status are river damming, wetland drainage, lack of grazing/mowing, sewage effluents and excessive use of fertilisers that have caused severely disturbed hydrological conditions and eutrophication. The continuous exploitation of coastal regions poses a great threat to the coastal environment. Restoration of water courses, mires and other wetland types continues but the pace is slow even if it has been better the last three years.  The water quality of lakes, water courses and parts of the coastal areas of the Baltic Sea has improved in some areas regarding acidification, eutrophication and toxic substances. The concentrations of certain substances, such as PBDEs and mercury in aquatic biota are still so high that they contribute to a negative environmental impact in many lakes and water courses. The water has also become increasingly brown in lakes and water courses due to inflow of humic substances, particularly in southern Sweden. The brownification combined with eutrophication or leakage of metal etc makes it more and more difficult to separate causes for the changes and to predict future changes in the aquatic ecosystems in some parts of Sweden. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.6 Based upon the National Wetland Inventory if available please provide a figure in square kilometres for the extent of wetlands (according to the Ramsar definition) for the year 2020 and provide the relevant disaggregated information in the box below. This Information will also be used to report on SDG 6, Target 6.6, Indicator 6.6.1, for which the Ramsar Convention is a co-custodian. | X |
| E= # Km 2 ;; G=More than # Km 2; X= Unknown |
| 8.6  According to the Ramsar definition and classification of wetlands, the disaggregated information on wetland extent is as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Area by type of wetland | | | | Total area by category of wetland | | **Marine/Coastal** | e.g Coral Reefs:  0 Km2 | e.g Estuarine waters  Unknown Km2 | e.g Coastal brackish/saline lagoons:  Unknown Km2 | Unknown | | **Inland** | e.g Permanent freshwater marshes/swamps:  Unknown Km2 | e.g Non-forested peatlands (includes shrub or open bogs, swamps, fens):  Unknown Km2 | e.g Permanent freshwater lakes:  Unknown Km2 | Unknown | | **Human-made** |  |  |  | Unknown | | **Total** | | | | Unknown Km2 | | **Date of the inventory:** There is no inventory covering the wetland types by the Ramsar convention. Inventories existing aren’t covering the whole territory or not all subtypes included.  There is an ongoing project on making a new land cover classification. The new system will be better determining different wetland types in different regions in the country. Data will probably improve to the next report.  **Reference or link:** | | | | |   Note:  The minimum information that should be provided is the total area of wetlands for each of the three major categories; ‘marine/coastal’, ‘inland’ and ‘human-made’.  If the data on inventories are partial or not complete, use the information that is available.  Guidance on information on national wetland extent, to be provided in Target 8 ‘National Wetlands Inventory’ of the National Report Form can be consulted at: <https://www.ramsar.org/document/guidance-on-information-on-national-wetland-extent> | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years. Please note: For the % of change in the extent of wetlands, if the period of data covers more than three years, provide the available information, and indicate the period of the change. |
| 8.7 Please indicate your needs (in terms of technical, financial or governance challenges) to develop, update or complete a National Wetland Inventory |
| The funds available for nature conservation and inventories/surveys are very limited. Other issues than updating the wetland inventory and completing it with the mountainous region and more wetland habitats are more urgent. On the other hand, there are a lot of development in remote sensing that may improve the knowledge on the present status for wetlands. |

***Target 9.*** *The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone {1.3.}.*

## *[Reference to Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7].*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.1 Is a Wetland Policy (or equivalent instrument) that promotes the wise use of wetlands in place? {1.3.1} KRA 1.3.i  (If ‘Yes’, please give the title and date of the policy in the green text box) | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 9.1 Additional information:  The national environmental quality objectives (EQOs); for example, 'Thriving Wetlands' and 'Flourishing Lakes and Streams' and partly some of the other objectives is seen as the fundamental National Wetland Policy. The Swedish Parliament adopted them, and they are described further at http://www.miljomal.se/sv/Environmental-Objectives-Portal/. The objectives describe the environmental state needed in order to achieve sustainable development (wise use) and favourable conservation status. The EQOs apply to all sectors of the Swedish society.  In addition, there are several policy documents as a part of implementing the EQOs. For example, 'National Strategy for Thriving Wetlands' was established by the Swedish EPA in cooperation with the National Board of Forestry, the Swedish Board of Agriculture and the National Heritage Board and presented to the Swedish government in October 2005. The strategy is available in English at http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/620-1253-3.pdf?pid=2657.  The Mire Protection Plan, which identifies around 600 mires that are given priority for legal protection, was revised in 2007.  The EU Water Framework Directive is being implemented in Sweden. The Ordinance on Water Quality Management (Förordningen om förvaltning av kvaliteten på vattenmiljön) is the Swedish legislation pursuant to the directive. Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) applied to water bodies were adopted in 2009. River basin management plans and Programme of measures for each river basin district were also adopted in 2009. The Marine Strategy Framework Directive is being implemented in Sweden. The directive was transposed into Swedish legislation through the Marine Environmental Regulation in 2010. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.2 Have any amendments to existing legislation been made to reflect Ramsar commitments? {1.3.5}{1.3.6} | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| 9.2 Additional information: On invasive species and minor administrative issues about Ramsar sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.3 Are wetlands treated as natural water infrastructure integral to water resource management at the scale of river basins? {1.7.1} {1.7.2} KRA 1.7.ii | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 9.3 Additional information:  Continued works on wetlands are important measures in water management, to achieve good water status relating to the EU Water Framework Directive. Environmental Quality Standards (EQS), River basin management plans and Programme of measures for each river basin district all link to wetland management. The River basin perspective is also important when working with wetlands and the surrounding landscape while establishing a functional green infrastructure. That is also the case when planning for restoration of wetlands and the climate adaptation. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.4 Have Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) expertise and tools been incorporated into catchment/river basin planning and management (see Resolution X.19)? {1.7.2}{1.7.3} | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 9.4 Additional information:  Yes, when it comes to certain measures, for example wetland restoration and in projects for eradication of invasive species. More measures are needed. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.5 Has your country established policies or guidelines for enhancing the role of wetlands in mitigating or adapting to climate change? {1.7.3} {1.7.5} KRA 1.7.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.5 Additional information:  The Environmental Quality Objectives and the National Wetland Strategy address climate change mitigation and adaptation, but more detailed decisions and measures are needed.  We also have several funding programmes for restoration of wetlands for the improvement of different ecosystem services and for biodiversity, some of the also play a role in mitigation and adaptation to climate change. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.6 Has your country formulated plans or projects to sustain and enhance the role of wetlands in supporting and maintaining viable farming systems? {1.7.4} {1.7.6} KRA 1.7.v | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.6 Additional information:  The creation of wetlands in agricultural areas helps to achieve the aims of water management. There are several funding programmes for restoration of wetlands for the improvement of different ecosystem services and for biodiversity, some of the also play a role in maintain water in the landscape for farming purposes. During the severe drought in 2018 several farmers expressed that having established wetlands on their land had been a fortunate measure. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.7 Has research to inform wetland policies and plans been undertaken in your country on:  a) agriculture-wetland interactions  b) climate change  c) valuation of ecoystem services  {1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i | A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) A  c) A |
| 9.7 Additional information:  a). Research in the agricultural field has been focused on the ability of wetlands to reduce nutrients in the aquatic environment.  b). Different universities and institutions have performed research relating to effects of climate change, e.g. the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute, the University of Lund and the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.  c). This issue is high on the political agenda in Sweden. Different universities and institutions have performed research on valuation of ecosystems. In 2019 eight research projects started covering hydrological ecosystem services. The projects include present situation and future changes in hydrology due to modelled climate change. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ? | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.8 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate How many request have been submitted): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.9 Has your country made efforts to conserve small wetlands in line with Resolution XIII. 21? | D |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.9 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate what actions have been implemented): Not during the triennium asked for. We already had some legislation protecting small wetlands when the resolution was adopted. In 2021 there will be a project on how to improve the legislation for wetland further. | |

***Target 10.*** *The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels.*

*[Reference to Aichi Target 18]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.1 Have case studies, participation in projects or successful experiences on cultural aspects of wetlands been compiled. Resolution VIII.19 and Resolution IX.21? (Action 6.1.6) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.1 Additional information: (If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.2 Have the guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities’ and indigenous people’s participation in the management of wetlands been used or applied such as   1. stakeholders, including local communities and indigenous people are represented on National Ramsar Committees or similar bodies 2. involvement and assistance of indigenous peoples and community-based groups, wetland education centers and non-governmental organizations with the necessary expertise to facilitate the establishment of participatory approaches;     (Resolution VII. 8) (Action 6.1.5) | a, B  b, B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| Sweden doesn’t have specific guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities’ and indigenous people’s participation when it comes to wetland. It is regulated in the Environmental Code that such groups should be consulted for example when there are suggested changes on degree of protection and updated management plans in protected areas. Stakeholders are also often invited to participate or are consulted in different projects on how to develop nature preservation further at different sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.3 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their  application encouraged (Action 6.1.2 ) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.3 Additional information:  No measure this triennium. But investigations have been done earlier. | |

***Target 11.*** *Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.}*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 14]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.1 Have ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands been researched in your country, recorded in documents like State of the Environment reporting, and the results promoted? {1.4.1} KRA 1.4.ii | D |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.1 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, how many wetlands and their names): No measure this triennium. But investigations have been done earlier, for example at the Ramsar site Helge å. Eight new research projects on hydrological ecosystem services were started in 2019. Parts of the results are included in the assessment of the EQOs and other documents. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.2 Have wetland programmes or projects that contribute to poverty alleviation objectives or food and water security plans been implemented? {1.4.2} KRA 1.4.i | **Y** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.2 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 11.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):  Many Ramsar Sites and other protected wetlands are important for recreation and out-door activities, which are normally reflected in the management of the sites. Other socio-economic issues are seldom reflected in management plans for protected areas. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19)? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 11.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):  All the sites that include wetlands that are grazed or mowed have such measures included in management plans for the protected area/-s at such sites. For example: Foteviken-Falsterbo, Vassikkavouma, Hornborgasjön, Ottenby and Getterön. The local community is often involved in the management measures that carry on the cultural heritage. | |

***Target 12.*** *Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation. {1.8.}*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 14 and 15].*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12.1 Have priority sites for wetland restoration been identified? {1.8.1} KRA 1.8.i | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 12.1 Additional information:  When the big restoration programme started in 2018 there was also a report made on what wetland types and what geologicial location would be the best sites to restore in general, but no individual sites have been listed.  For some wetland types there are more detailed information. 'Valuable waters' (Värdefulla vatten) is a national database used for prioritizing restoration actions in streams. The Swedish county administrative boards have developed planning documents for restoration of wetlands in the agricultural landscape. Areas where wetland restoration will be particularly important to increase biodiversity and/or reduce the loss of plant nutrition are pointed out. Landowners and other relevant parties are involved throughout the process of planning and restoration. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12.2 Have wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes, plans or projects been effectively implemented? {1.8.2} KRA 1.8.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 12.2 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored):  For the years 2018 and 2019 altogether 8 300 hectares of “terrester” wetlands, (excluding lakes, water courses and coastal waters), was affected by restoration measures. Data from 2020 isn’t compiled yet. Restoration measures including creating more natural water flows have also been performed in many rivers in accordance with the strategy for the restoration of valuable rivers. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12.3 Have the Guidelines for Global Action on Peatlandsand on Peatlands, climate change and wise use (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.11) been implemented including? | A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| a) Knowledge of global resources | C |
| b) Education and public awareness on peatlands | C |
| c) Policy and legislative instruments | B |
| d) Wise use of peatlands | B |
| e) Research networks, regional centres of expertise, and institutional capacity | C |
| f) International cooperation | C |
| g) Implementation and support | B |
| 12.3 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, the progress in implementation:  a) There are on-going projects trying to increase the knowledge on peatland area and volume in the country.  b) A few nature centres have been involved in peatland restoration and have had guided tours about peatlands and restoration.  e) Some of the research programmes started have included peatlands and they have been encouraged to work together. While having a lot of restoration programmes ongoing there have been new staff recruited and the capacity for restoration of peatlands have been increased.  f) peatlands are part of the CAFF wetland project where the CAFF-countries co-operate about inventories and policy issues to implement the Ramsar resolution on Arctic wetlands. | |

***Target 13.*** *Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods.*

## *[Reference to Aichi Targets 6 and 7].*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13.1 Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? {1.3.3} {1.3.4} KRA 1.3.ii | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 13.1 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13.2 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands? {1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases |
| 13.2 Additional information: EIAs are used for all kinds of cases when activities are planned to change, and the impact isn’t of minor importance and new permits etc are necessary. | |

**Goal 4. Enhancing implementation**

*[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17]*

***Target 15.*** *Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15.1 Have you (AA) been involved in the development and implementation of a Regional Initiative under the framework of the Convention? {3.2.1} KRA 3.2.i | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 15.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Planned’, please indicate the regional initiative(s) and the collaborating countries of each initiative):  Sweden is normally is involved in the NorBalWet, but during the last triennium there hasn’t been any on-going project. All countries have too much national measures to take care of. Right now, we think that prioritisation is a good one. Other countries in the NorBalWet are; FI, DK, NO, IS, LT, EE, LV, the most western parts of RU. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15.2 Has your country supported or participated in the development of other regional (i.e., covering more than one country) wetland training and research centres? {3.2.2} | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 15.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the name(s) of the centre(s): | |

***Target 16*.** *Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}.*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 18].*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.1 Has an action plan (or plans) for wetland CEPA been established? {4.1.1} KRA 4.1.i   1. At the national level 2. Sub-national level 3. Catchment/basin level 4. Local/site level   (Even if no CEPA plans have been developed, if broad CEPA objectives for CEPA actions have been established, please indicate this in the Additional information section below) | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| a)B  b)B  c)B  d)B |
| 16.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘In progress’ to one or more of the four questions above, for each please describe the mechanism, who is responsible and identify if it has involved CEPA NFPs): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.2 How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii  a) at Ramsar Sites  b) at other wetlands | E= # centres; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X=Unknown; y=Not Relevant; |
| a) 0  b) 1 |
| 16.2 Additional information (If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks): During 2018-2020 there is only one visitors centre established, the Oresund naturum, specialised in the marine and coastal biodiversity. [www.naturumoresund.se](http://www.naturumoresund.se) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.3 Does the Contracting Party:  a) promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management  b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management? {4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) C |
| 16.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved):  A, The issue of community involvement has high priority in nature conservation in Sweden. It constitutes a cornerstone in the Swedish government’s policy. Local stakeholder involvement is central in the designation of Ramsar sites and protected areas, and in the implementation of Natura 2000 (EU Habitats and Birds Directives).  Due to regulations concerning land tenure and the strong position of landowners in Sweden, their involvement is a prerequisite in wetland restoration. Further, the Swedish Environmental Code states that in connection with the consultation process which takes place prior to the drafting of an environmental impact statement, the operator must obtain and compile available data and consult the other local stakeholders, authorities and organizations concerned.  B, Stakeholders are consulted about suggestions for new or extended Ramsar sites and if protected areas inside the Ramsar sites are going to change their border, management och regulations for forestry etc. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.4 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 16.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has):  The former Swedish Ramsar Committee that was constituted by the Swedish EPA and a number of NGOs, is since many years no longer active. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.5 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral body equivalent to a National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 16.5 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has):  There are fora where wetland matters may be discussed and handled, primarily within the framework of the Environmental Quality Objectives, where it is possible to involve central government agencies, county administrative boards, local authorities, non-governmental organizations and the business sector.  Further, concerning the EU Water Framework Directive, The EU Marine Strategic Framework Directive and the Ordinance on Water Quality Management there are five Water Authorities in charge of water work in their respective district, and each Water Authority has a Water Delegation as a governing board. The Water Delegations are comprised of representatives from different sectors of society. There are also water management associations and coastal water management associations coordinating local and regional stakeholders. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.6 Are other communication mechanisms (apart from a national committee) in place to share Ramsar implementation guidelines and other information between the Administrative Authority and:  a) Ramsar Site managers  b) other MEA national focal points  c) other ministries, departments and agencies {4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) C  c) C |
| 16.6 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please describe what mechanisms are in place):  The AA usually informs the relevant stakeholders about new resolutions etc. This can take place by e-mail, at different kinds of conferences etc, but there is no fixed structure for it. The earlier existing mechanism have degenerated. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.7 Have Ramsar-branded World Wetlands Day activities (whether on 2 February or at another time of year), either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out in the country since COP13? {4.1.8} | A |
| A=Yes; B=No |
| 16.7 Additional information: We try to have conferences or similar about wetlands at or in the same week as the Wetlands Day and then we raise the issue on the World Wetland Day.  31 January 2020; small seminar on paludiculture 3 February 2020; conference on peatlands, restoration and GHG  1 February 2019: wetland meeting for those involved in restoration  There have also been celebrations arranged on a sub-national/local level. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP13 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9} | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 16.8 Additional information (If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this):  There was a large CEPA campaign included in the programme for wetland restoration. | |

***Target 17.*** *Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}*

## *[Reference to Aichi Target 20]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.1  a) Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2018, 2019 and 2020? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| b) If ‘No’ in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment: | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.2 Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to non-core funded Convention activities? {4.2.2} KRA 4.2.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No |
| 17.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ please state the amounts, and for which activities):  Travel costs for some delegations from Contracting Parties going to the COP13. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.3 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only (‘donor countries’)]: Has the agency provided funding to support wetland conservation and management in other countries? {3.3.1} KRA 3.3.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the countries supported since COP12 (2015):  The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency supports numerous organisations that arrange projects in recipient countries. Wetlands are likely to be included in some of the projects on climate adaptation and biodiversity. It is too difficult to compile the amount of the support or what countries have been involved since the wetland often are part of larger projects. A large investigation must be made to see what projects that include wetlands or not and in what countries they take place. We have refrained from doing such investigation. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.4 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only (‘donor countries’)]: Have environmental safeguards and assessments been included in development proposals proposed by the agency? {3.3.2} KRA 3.3.ii | X |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.4 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.5 [For Contracting Parties that have received development assistance only (‘recipient countries’)]: Has funding support been received from development assistance agencies specifically for in-country wetland conservation and management? {3.3.3} | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.5 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate from which countries/agencies since COP12): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.6 Has any financial support been provided by your country to the implementation of the Strategic Plan? | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.6 Additional information (If “Yes” please state the amounts, and for which activities):  Not dedicated for the strategic plan as such, but there have been funds for wetland issues (conservation, restoration, management etc). Difficult to separate the wetland parts of accounts that are used for all conservation etc. | |

***Target 18.*** *International cooperation is strengthened at all levels* ***{****3.1****}***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.1 Are the national focal points of other MEAs invited to participate in the National Ramsar/Wetland Committee? {3.1.1} {3.1.2} KRAs 3.1.i & 3.1.iv | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.1 Additional information: As long as no such Committee exist, no one can be invited. However, there is a regular exchange at the Swedish EPA with other NFP and others involved in the work about international conventions. The exchange is about what is happening in the different conventions and what kind of issues that are of importance for Sweden. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.2 Are mechanisms in place at the national level for collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO)? {3.1.2} {3.1.3} KRA 3.1.iv | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.2 Additional information: No collaboration between the Ramsar AA and the focal point of different UN bodies. Co-operation exists when called for with other NFPs for environmental Conventions or international co-, especially the CBD, the UNFCCC, CAFF and the AEWA. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.3 Has your country received assistance from one or more UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO) or the Convention’s IOPs in its implementation of the Convention? {4.4.1} KRA 4.4.ii.  The IOPs are: BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), Wetlands International, WWF and Wildfowl & Wetland Trust (WWT). | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 18.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ please name the agency (es) or IOP (s) and the type of assistance received): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.4 Have networks, including twinning arrangements, been established, nationally or internationally, for knowledge sharing and training for wetlands that share common features? {3.4.1} | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate the networks and wetlands involved): No formal networks established. As a member state of the EU, Sweden has many opportunities for knowledge sharing in matters relating to biodiversity matters, among many other things. There are also several active national networks involving national and regional authorities, as well as other stakeholders, concerning e.g. sustainable use, nature conservation and integrated water management. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.5 Has information about your country’s wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites and their status been made public (e.g., through publications or a website)? {3.4.2} KRA 3.4.iv | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.5 Additional information: The web-based information is well developed in Sweden, and national and regional agencies, as well as NGOs provide wetland information. www.naturvardsverket.se. There is a webpage about Swedish Ramsar sites <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/Var-natur/Skyddad-natur/ramsaromraden/> with links to the RSIS etc. The Ramsar sites are also available at the web site ‘Skyddad natur’ (protected nature). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.6 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 18.6 Additional information:  There are hundreds of shared transboundary wetland systems with Norway in the form of small lakes and peatlands to larger water courses, for example the river Trysil-Klarälven. The river Könkäme-Mounio-Torne älv is the border between Sweden and Finland. There are also two coastal marine areas that are transboundary, but only small parts fulfil the criteria for Ramsar, the depth of the water is usually more than six metres. The first area is the archipelago south of Haparanda (SE) and Tornio (FI), the second is the inner part of the fiord Idefjorden shared between (NO) and (SE).  There are no transboundary Ramsar sites designated but there are ramsar sites that are adjacent along the border that have been disignated separately.  The Ramsar sites of Storkölen (SE) and Kvisleflået (NO),  The Ramsar sites of Mannavuoma (SE) and Lätäseno-Hietajoki (FI). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.7 Is effective cooperative management in place for shared wetland systems (for example, in shared river basins and coastal zones)? {3.5.2} KRA 3.5.ii | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; Y=Not Relevant |
| 18.7 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place):  There are several co-operations etc with Denmark, Finland and Norway especially for water quality and fishing issues. Some examples below.  Agreement about the border river to Finland; https://www.havochvatten.se/planering-forvaltning-och-samverkan/internationellt-samarbete-och-konventioner/internationellt-samarbete/tornealven---gransalvsoverenskommelse.html  Agreement with Norway about a shared water basin, that river and fishing; <http://www.regeringen.se/49c82a/contentassets/d54b46955cd943448650df1a4d26bc13/avtal-med-norge-om-forvaltingen-av-lax-och-oring-i-svinesund-idefjorden-och-enningdalsalven>  Project with Norway about a shared water basin, the river and fishing;  <https://tvalanderenelv.eu/> | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.8 Does your country participate in regional networks or initiatives for wetland-dependent migratory species? {3.5.3} KRA 3.5.iii | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 18.8 Additional information:  There is international co-operation within the AEWA to develop an updated common management plan for Anser erythropus. During the last triennium there was a genetic study performed on the Swedish subpopulation of the Anser erythropus, resulting in that the management plan will be improved with new data. There are also other management plans for migrating species within the framework of the AEWA. | |

***Target 19.*** *Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced.*

*[Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 17]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.1 Has an assessment of national and local training needs for the implementation of the Convention been made? {4.1.4} KRAs 4.1.iv & 4.1.viii | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 19.1 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes? | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 19.2 Additional information: If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP13? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv  a) at Ramsar Sites  b) at other wetlands | 1. 0 2. 0 |
| E=# opportunities; F=Less than #; G= More than #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 19.3 Additional information (including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training):  There were some webinars, workshops etc when the large restoration programme started in 2018. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 19.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring): The national report is compiled from existing information concerning wetland conservation and wise use from many sources, and in this aspect used to monitor implementation of the Convention. Every trennium we use the old RNR combined with other data for checking what progress have been made the last three years. | |