Reporting on global SDG indicator 6.5.2

TEMPLATE of the second cycle for reporting

Content of the template

The template is divided into four parts:

- Section I  - Calculation of SDG indicator 6.5.2
- Section II - Information on each transboundary basin or group of basins
- Section III - General information on transboundary water management at the national level
- Section IV - Final questions

Country name: NORWAY
I. Calculation of Sustainable Development Goal indicator 6.5.2

Methodology

1. Using the information gathered in section II, the information gathered in this section allows for the calculation of Sustainable Development Goal global indicator 6.5.2, which is defined as the proportion of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation.

2. The step-by-step monitoring methodology for indicator 6.5.2, developed by UNECE and UNESCO in the framework of UN-Water, should be referred to for details on the necessary data, the definitions and the calculation.

3. The value of the indicator at the national level is derived by adding up the surface area in a country of those transboundary basins (river and lake basins and aquifers) that are covered by an operational arrangement and dividing the area obtained by the aggregate total area in a country of all transboundary basins (both river and lake basins, and aquifers).

4. Transboundary basins are basins of transboundary waters, that is, of any surface waters (notably rivers, lakes) or groundwaters which mark, cross or are located on boundaries between by two or more States. For the purpose of the calculation of this indicator, for a transboundary river or lake, the basin area is determined by the extent of its catchment. For groundwater, the area to be considered is the extent of the aquifer.

5. An “arrangement for water cooperation” is a bilateral or multilateral treaty, convention, agreement or other formal arrangement among riparian countries that provides a framework for cooperation on transboundary water management.

6. For an arrangement to be considered “operational” all the following criteria need to be in place in practice:

   (a) There is a joint body, joint mechanism or commission (e.g., a river basin organization) for transboundary cooperation (criterion 1);
   (b) There are regular (at least once per year) formal communications between riparian countries in form of meetings (either at the political or technical level) (criterion 2);
   (c) Joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan, or an action plan have been agreed upon by the riparian countries (criterion 3);
   (d) There is a regular (at least once per year) exchange of data and information (criterion 4).

Calculation of indicator 6.5.2

7. Please list in the tables below the transboundary basins (rivers and lakes and aquifers) in your country’s territory and provide the following information for each of them:

   (a) The country/ies with which the basin is shared;

---

(b) The surface area of the basin (the catchment of rivers or lakes and the aquifer in the case of groundwater) within the territory of your country (in square kilometres (km²));
(c) Whether a map and/or a geographical information system (GIS) shapefile of the basin has been provided;
(d) Whether there is an arrangement in force for the basin;
(e) The verification of each of the four criteria to assess operationality;
(f) The surface area of the basin within the territory of your country which is covered by a cooperation arrangement that is operational according to the above criteria.

8. In case an operational arrangement is in place only for a sub-basin or a portion of a basin, please list this sub-basin just after the transboundary basin it is part of. In case there is an operational arrangement for the whole basin, do not list sub-basins in the table below.

Table 1
Transboundary river or lake basin (please add rows as needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of transboundary river or lake basin/sub-basin</th>
<th>Is it a basin or a sub-basin? a</th>
<th>Countries shared with</th>
<th>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) within the territory of the country</th>
<th>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</th>
<th>Covered by an arrangement entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enningdalselva</td>
<td>NO5107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haldenvassdraget</td>
<td>NO5107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlommaVassdraget</td>
<td>NO5107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>41545</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>41545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NidelVassdraget</td>
<td>NO1107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stjordalsvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdalsvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1107</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vefsna</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3667</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b List sub-basins after the basin they belong to.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of transboundary river or lake basin/sub-basin</th>
<th>It is a basin or a sub-basin?</th>
<th>Countries shared with</th>
<th>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) within the territory of the country</th>
<th>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</th>
<th>Covered by an arrangement (entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rossåga</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjerka</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranavassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltjelvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulitjelvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagerbakkvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksåga</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorjordelva</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellemovassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storelv</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skjomavassdraget</td>
<td>NO1108</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salangselva</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Målselvvassdraget</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5772</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signaldalvella</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torneälven</td>
<td>NO1TO</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luleälven</td>
<td>NO1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piteälven</td>
<td>NO1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skellefteälven</td>
<td>NO1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeälven</td>
<td>NO1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of transboundary river or lake basin/sub-basin</td>
<td>It is a basin or a sub-basin?</td>
<td>Countries shared with</td>
<td>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) within the territory of the country</td>
<td>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</td>
<td>Covered by an arrangement (entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ångermanälven</td>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indalsälven</td>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljusnan</td>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalälven</td>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klarälven (Trysilehva)</td>
<td>NO5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5233</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norsälven</td>
<td>NO5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byälven</td>
<td>NO5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperudsälven</td>
<td>NO5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strömsån</td>
<td>NO5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skibotn</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisa</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2691</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>NO1109</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>7306</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>11234</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neiden</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkelva</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandneselva</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasvik</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemijoki</td>
<td>NOVHA5</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornionjoki</td>
<td>NOVHA6</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of transboundary river or lake basin/sub-basin</td>
<td>It is a basin or a sub-basin?</td>
<td>Countries shared with</td>
<td>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) within the territory of the country</td>
<td>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</td>
<td>Covered by an arrangement entirely, partly, no (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</td>
<td>Surface area of the basin/sub-basin (in km²) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasvikelva</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elv fra Svartaksivatnet</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpelva</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grense Jakobselv</td>
<td>NO1106</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Total surface area of transboundary basins/sub-basins of rivers and lakes covered by operational arrangements within the territory of the country (in km²) (do not double count sub-basins) 96316

(B) Total surface area of transboundary basins of rivers and lakes within the territory of the country (in km²) (do not double count sub-basins) 107664
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the transboundary aquifer</th>
<th>Countries shared with</th>
<th>Surface area of the aquifer(^a) (in km(^2)) within the territory of the country</th>
<th>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</th>
<th>Covered by an aquifer specific arrangement (entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Covered within an arrangement not specific to the aquifer(^d) (entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Surface area of the aquifer (in km(^2)) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Västerhavet</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>160,26</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>160,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottenviken</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottenhavet</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>54,57</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>54,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torneälv</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>230,68</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>230,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasvik</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>17,65</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasvik</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>62,43</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neiden</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>entirely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemijoki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torionjoen</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) For a transboundary aquifer, the extent is derived from the aquifer system delineation which is commonly done relying on information of the subsurface (notably the extent of geological formations). As a general rule, the delineation of aquifer systems is based on the delineation of the extent of the hydraulically connected water-bearing geological formations. Aquifer systems are three-dimensional objects and the aquifer area taken into account is the projection on the land surface of the system. Ideally, when different aquifer systems not hydraulically connected are vertically superposed, the different relevant projected areas are to be considered separately, unless the different aquifer systems are managed conjunctively.

\(^d\) In the text of the agreement or arrangement or in the practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the transboundary aquifer</th>
<th>Countries shared with</th>
<th>Surface area of the aquifer(^2) (in km(^2)) within the territory of the country</th>
<th>Map and/or GIS shapefile provided (yes/no)</th>
<th>Covered by an aquifer specific arrangement entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Covered within an arrangement not specific to the aquifer(^a) entirely, partly, no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 1 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 2 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 3 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Criterion 4 applied (yes/no) (Ref. to questions in sect. II)</th>
<th>Surface area of the aquifer (in km(^2)) covered by an operational arrangement within the territory of the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C) Sub-total: surface area of transboundary aquifers covered by operational arrangements (in km(^2))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Total surface area of transboundary aquifers (in km(^2))</td>
<td></td>
<td>534.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator value for the country**

**Surface waters:**
Percentage of surface area of transboundary basins of rivers and lakes covered by an operational arrangement:

\[ \frac{A}{B} \times 100 = 89.5\% \]

**Aquifers:**
Percentage of surface area of transboundary aquifers covered by an operational arrangement:

\[ \frac{C}{D} \times 100 = 88.3\% \]

**Sustainable Development Goal indicator 6.5.2:**
Percentage of surface area of transboundary basins covered by an operational arrangement:

\[ \left( \frac{A + C}{B + D} \right) \times 100 = 89.45\% \]

**Spatial information**
If a map (or maps) of the transboundary surface water catchments and transboundary aquifers (i.e., "transboundary basins") is available, please consider attaching them. Ideally, shapefiles of the basin and aquifer delineations that can be viewed in GIS should be sent.

**Additional information**
If the respondent has comments that clarify assumptions or interpretations made for the calculation, or the level of certainty of the spatial information, please write them here:
Does your country have transboundary agreements or arrangements for the protection and/or management of transboundary waters (i.e., rivers, lakes or groundwater), whether bilateral or multilateral?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, list the bilateral and multilateral agreements or arrangements (listing for each of the countries concerned):

**Agreements with Sweden:**


- Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive – WFD) from 2011. The strategy is presently undergoing revision following the meeting between the national and regional representatives from Norway and Sweden in January 2020. (Attachment 2)

- Norway-Sweden 2008: A Memorandum of Understanding, describing the implementation of the WFD by the countries. Norway is implementing the IWRM according to the WFD under the specific timetable agreed pursuant to the Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA). The strategy from 2011 is based on this MoU and the memorandum will therefore not be addressed in questions 2-3, as this will be covered by answers concerning the strategy.

- Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country, in force 05. January 1932.

- InterReg project Vänerlaksen to reintroduce local salmon populations to the Trysil and Femund rivers in Norway and Klarälven in Sweden [https://tvalanderenelv.eu/](https://tvalanderenelv.eu/)


**Agreements with Finland:**


- Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (in force 22. May 2014)


- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Waters Commission,

- Agreement on the diversion of the flow of water from lakes Garsjöen, Kjerringvatn and Förstevannene to the waterway of Gandvik instead of that of the River Näätamö (Neiden). Signed at Oslo on 25. April 1951

Agreements with Russia:
- Agreement between Norway and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Utilization of Water Power on the Pasvik River, Signed at Oslo on 18. December 1957
- Agreement regulating the Fishing and Conserving of the Fish Stocks in the Grense Jakobselv River (Voriema) and the Pasvik River (Paatsjoki) (1971), 7. December 1971

II. Questions for each transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin, or group of basins (river, lake or aquifer)

Please complete this second section for each transboundary basin (river or lake basin, or aquifer), sub-basin, part of a basin or a group of basins covered by the same agreement or arrangement where conditions are similar. In some instances, you may provide information on both a basin and one or more of its sub-basins or parts thereof, for example, where you have agreements or arrangements on both the basin and its sub-basin. You may coordinate your responses with other States with which your country shares transboundary waters, or even prepare a joint report. General information on transboundary water management at the national level should be provided in section III and not repeated here.

Please reproduce this whole section with its questions for each transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins for which you will provide a reply.

Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Västerhavet (NO5): Klaraälven, Norsälven, Byälven, Upperudsälven, Strømsån

List of the riparian States: Norway, Sweden

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

---

1 In principle, section II should be submitted for every transboundary basin, river, lake or aquifer, in the country, but States may decide to group basins in which their share is small or leave out basins in which their share is very minor, e.g., below 1 per cent.

2 In section II, “agreement” covers all kinds of treaties, conventions and agreements ensuring cooperation in the field of transboundary waters. Section II can also be completed for other types of arrangements, such as memorandums of understanding.
Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 30.39%

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   - One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force [X]
   - Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force [ ]
   - Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians [ ]

   Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s):

   * Norway–Sweden 2018: Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020 between the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (Sweden) and the Environment Directorate (Norway) on water management in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive. This agreement is to be extended, pending the scheduled meeting in September 2020.

   * Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive – WFD) from 2011. The strategy is presently undergoing revision following the meeting between the national and regional representatives from Norway and Sweden in January 2020.

   * Norway–Sweden 2008: A Memorandum of Understanding, describing the implementation of the WFD by the countries. Norway is implementing the IWRM according to the WFD under the specific timetable agreed pursuant to the Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA). The strategy from 2011 is based on this MoU and the memorandum will therefore not be addressed in questions 2-3, as this will be covered by answers concerning the strategy.

   * Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country (from 1929) https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929

   * InterReg project Vänerlaksen to reintroduce local salmon populations to the Trysil and Femund rivers in Norway and Klarälven in Sweden https://tvalanderenelv.eu/

   Agreement or arrangement is under development [ ]
   No agreement or arrangement [ ]

   If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]

   If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

   Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

   Norway – Sweden 2018 Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020
2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations?

The agreement names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälv

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☒

A single water use or sector ☐

Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry ☐

Agriculture ☐

Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐

Households ☐

Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐

Fisheries ☐

Tourism ☐

Nature protection ☐

Other (please list):

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
Consultation on planned measures
Mutual assistance

Topics of cooperation
Joint vision and management objectives
Joint significant water management issues
Navigation
Human health
Environmental protection (ecosystem)
Water quality
Water quantity or allocation
Cooperation in addressing floods
Cooperation in addressing droughts
Climate change adaptation

Monitoring and exchange
Joint assessments
Data collection and exchange
Joint monitoring
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

Joint planning and management
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
Lack of financial resources
Insufficient human capacity
Insufficient technical capacity
Tense diplomatic relations
Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
No significant difficulties

Other (please describe): Minor difficulties is usually addressed bilaterally on a regional or national level, within the structure of the agreement and the strategy, i.e. during meetings.

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The agreement provides a formal platform for the collaboration between Norway and Sweden on the subject of transboundary basins under EU’s Water Framework Directive (WFD).

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): See attached documents

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?
   Yes ☒/No ☐

   If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

Where there is a joint body or mechanism

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?
   Plenipotentiaries ☐
   Bilateral commission ☐
   Basin or similar commission ☐
   Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points ☒

Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the agreement.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   Yes ☒/No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?
   No cooperation ☐
   They have observer status ☒
Other *(please describe)*: [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features *(please tick the ones applicable)*?

- A secretariat
  - *If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]*
- A subsidiary body or bodies
  - *Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]*
- Other features *(please list)*:

(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?³

- Identification of pollution sources
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Setting emission limits
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Management and prevention of flood or drought risks
- Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures
- Surveillance and early warning of water related disease
- Water allocation and/or flow regulation
- Policy development
- Control of implementation
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations
- Settling of differences and conflicts
- Consultations on planned measures
- Exchange of information on best available technology
- Participation in transboundary EIA
- Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure

³ This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Addressing hydromorphological alterations ☒
Climate change adaptation ☐
Joint communication strategy ☐
Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans ☐
Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation ☐
Capacity-building ☐
Any other tasks (please list): [fill in]

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

Governance issues ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Unexpected planning delays ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of resources ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of mechanism for implementing measures ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of effective measures ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Unexpected extreme events ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of information and reliable forecasts ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): The cooperation between the countries is not suffering from any significant difficulties. The difference in water management cycles between Norway and Sweden is a challenge that is resolved within the agreement and the strategy.

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how frequently does it meet?

More than once per year ☒

Once per year ☐

Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?

The agreement describes biannual meetings as well as communication between meetings.
(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? There are no other relevant states for the agreement, as the transboundary water is shared between Norway and Sweden.

Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive)

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations?

The strategy names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☐/No ☐

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälv

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☒

A single water use or sector ☐

Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry ☐

Agriculture ☐

Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐

Households ☐
Energy: hydropower and other energy types
Fisheries
Tourism
Nature protection

Other (please list): The strategy concerns all water uses under EU’s water framework directive (WFD), as it is implemented in Norwegian law.

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
Consultation on planned measures
Mutual assistance

Topics of cooperation
Joint vision and management objectives
Joint significant water management issues
Navigation
Human health
Environmental protection (ecosystem)
Water quality
Water quantity or allocation
Cooperation in addressing floods
Cooperation in addressing droughts
Climate change adaptation

Monitoring and exchange
Joint assessments
Data collection and exchange
Joint monitoring
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

Joint planning and management
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
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Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Development of shared infrastructure ☐
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Lack of financial resources ☐
- Insufficient human capacity ☐
- Insufficient technical capacity ☐
- Tense diplomatic relations ☐
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
- No significant difficulties ☒
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success?

The strategy sets out agreed-upon methods for assessment of the water bodies, and how information can be shared across the borders, especially at the regional level. In addition it creates a mutual understanding and basis for cooperation regarding the making, implementation and supervision of the water management plans and the division of basins and their classification. Some of the success can be attributed to the level of operational cooperation (local and regional) in addition to the strategy being anchored and recognized on a national level.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): See attachment 2

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

Where there is a joint body or mechanism

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?

- Plenipotentiaries ☐
- Bilateral commission ☐
- Basin or similar commission ☐
- Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points ☐
- Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the Norwegian-Swedish
Strategy for transboundary river basins, in addition the representatives for the regional levels of water management in both countries.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?  
Yes ☒ No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?  
No cooperation ☐
They have observer status ☐
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

A secretariat ☐

If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

A subsidiary body or bodies ☐

Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

Other features (please list): The strategy is based on the requirements of the WFD and there are representatives from the local, regional and national level from both countries at meetings concerning the strategy itself.

(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?  
Identification of pollution sources ☒
Data collection and exchange ☒
Joint monitoring ☐
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
Setting emission limits ☐
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☒
Management and prevention of flood or drought risks ☐
Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
Surveillance and early warning of water related disease ☐

---

4 This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Water allocation and/or flow regulation ☒
Policy development ☐
Control of implementation ☐
Exchange of experience between riparian States ☒
Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations ☒
Settling of differences and conflicts ☐
Consultations on planned measures ☒
Exchange of information on best available technology ☐
Participation in transboundary EIA ☐
Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans ☐
Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Addressing hydromorphological alterations ☒
Climate change adaptation ☐
Joint communication strategy ☐
Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans ☐
Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation ☒
Capacity-building ☐

Any other tasks (please list): Cooperation on liming and management of certain transboundary fish species.

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

Governance issues ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Unexpected planning delays ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of resources ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of mechanism for implementing measures ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of effective measures ☐

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Unexpected extreme events ☐

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of information and reliable forecasts ☐
Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): There are no significant difficulties in the operation of the joint body

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how frequently does it meet?
- More than once per year ☐
- Once per year ☒
- Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?
Mutual agreement on reporting status of the transboundary basins within the EU's Water Framework Directive and to further establish cooperation between the countries on a regional level.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?
Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? [fill in]

Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? The convention between Norway and Sweden of 1929 encompass all transboundary basins in Norway and Sweden, concerning some aspects of the use of transboundary water that may affect the amount of water or the quality of the water in the neighbouring country.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]
(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses
- A single water use or sector
- Several water uses or sectors

*If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):*

**Water uses or sectors**

- Industry
- Agriculture
- Transport (e.g., navigation) ☒
- Households
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☒
- Fisheries ☒
- Tourism
- Nature protection
- Other *(please list)*:

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☒
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☒
- Consultation on planned measures ☒
- Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**

- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues ☒
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation ☒
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**

- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
Joint monitoring
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**

Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure

Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(e) **What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?**

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (*please describe*): [fill in]

(f) **What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success?**

The convention regulates the duty of each country to inform the other if actions are planned that will cause physical changes or in other ways impact the waterbody of the other country. It also establishes the rights of the countries to endorse such actions. The law was instituted during a period with high development of hydropower while watercourses were still needed for logging and other transports.

(g) **Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable):**

https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929

3. **Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?**
Yes ☑/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): The convention does not call for a joint body, but sets out procedures of notifications between the countries.

InterReg project Vänerlaksen to reintroduce local salmon populations to the Trysil and Femund rivers in Norway and Klaraälven in Sweden

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☑/No ☐

Additional explanations?
InterReg Project Vänerlaksen concerns the rivers Trysil and Femund.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☑/No ☐

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☐

A single water use or sector ☑

Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry ☐

Agriculture ☐

Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐

Households ☐

Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐

Fisheries ☐

Tourism ☐

Nature protection ☐
Other (please list): The project's goal is to reintroduce loal salmon populations in specific rivers in Norway and Sweden.

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures✓
- Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures✓

**Joint planning and management**
- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure
- Other (please list): [fill in]
(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The goal of the project is to reintroduce the local salmon, through cooperative measures on both sides of the border.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://tvalanderenelv.eu/

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☑/ No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): The project is run by representatives of the regional water management, County Governor of Innlandet and the County Administrative Board of Värmland.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑/ No ☐

If yes, please provide further details:

Both the convention from 1929, the agreement between Norway and Sweden (2018) and the Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water (2011) set joint objectives for all transboundary water.

The Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water lists the differences in assessment, waterbody delineation and characterization should be addressed for the transboundary waters in terms of the Water Framework Directive. The main conclusion is that the principles of the downstream country should be used. The national management plans for the international river basins can only be approved for the territory in the country that has written the plans, but the plans are available for public hearing in both countries.
5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use? As applied to the aforementioned agreements:

- Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction.
- Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality.
- Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals.
- Water-related species and habitats protection.

Other measures (please describe): Cooperation between the two countries is also visible in various projects concerning the reintroduction and protection of salmon populations (e.g. Vänerlaks InterReg project).

A wide number of measures for improving and protecting water quality and quantity are possible through the work that results from the implementation of the Water Framework Directive.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:
- More than once per year ☒
- Once per year ☐
- Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Formally twice a year between Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA) and Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SWAM), but more often on the regional and local level.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?
- Environmental conditions ☒
- Research activities and application of best available techniques ☒
- Emission monitoring data ☒
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts ☒
- Point source pollution sources ☒
- Diffuse pollution sources ☒
- Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☒
- Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☐
- Water abstractions ☒
- Climatological information ☐
Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development [ ]

Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?
Yes ☐ No ☑

(f) Is the database publicly available?
Yes ☑ No ☐

If yes, please provide the web address: The Norwegian database for the water framework directive: www.vann-nett.no. There is currently no connection with Swedish databases.

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?
Frequency of exchanges [ ]
Timing of exchanges [ ]
Comparability of data and information [ ]
Limited spatial coverage [ ]
Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) [ ]

Other (please describe): There is no common database or possibility for viewing data for transboundary waterbodies in the neighbouring country in our national database. However, there are no difficulties in exchanging data. There is good data exchange at the regional and local level.

Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): Data exchange permits better cooperation and ensures that an overall assessment of the ecological and chemical status of the waterbody is made on both sides of the border. This enables us to suggest appropriate measures and coordinate efforts in improving and protecting our transboundary waterbodies.

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☐ No ☑

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please describe [fill in]
Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected) | Hydrological | Ecological | Chemical
---|---|---|---
Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake | | | |

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint and agreed methodologies

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint sampling

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common monitoring network

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common agreed parameters

*Please describe: [fill in]*

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: Sweden and Norway meet regularly at the regional level to discuss water management in the terms of the Water Framework Directive. During the last planning process, January 2020 the environmental objectives were reviewed. Meetings at the regional level occur more frequently in order to exchange information.

National authorities exchanged data in 2017 on transboundary water courses in connection with reporting to WISE, the WFD database run by the European Environment Agency.

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been
applied? The water quality standards used in transboundary basins are in accordance with the WFD.

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

   Notification and communication ☒

   Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐

   Other (please list): The following European directives have been implemented into Norwegian legislation:
   - Directive 2003/105/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances
   - Directive 96/82/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances

   No measures ☐

   If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

   Notification and communication ☒

   Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods ☒

   Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts ☐

   Joint climate change adaptation strategy ☐

   Joint disaster risk reduction strategy ☐

   Other (please list): [fill in]

   No measures ☐

   If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?

   Yes ☒/No ☐

   If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   Yes ☒/No ☐

   If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)

   Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism (only for the Inter Reg project) ☒

   Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body (only for the Inter Reg project) ☒

   Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body ☐

   If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism:
Intergovernmental organizations
Private sectors organizations or associations
(only for the Inter Reg project)
Water user groups or associations
(only for the Inter Reg project)
Academic or research institutions
Other non-governmental organizations
General public
(only for the Inter Reg project)

Other (please specify): The InterReg projects for re-introduction of salmon to the upper parts of the rivers Klarälven/Trysilelva have a participation programme with engagement from stakeholders in hydropower companies, fishing organizations and local communities.

Availability of information to the public
Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans
Public involvement

Other (please specify): [fill in]

---

5 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Innlandet og Viken (NO5107): Enningdalselva, Haldenvassdraget, Glommavasdraget, Västerhavet (aquifer)

List of the riparian States: Norway, Sweden

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 97.76%

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

- One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force
- Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
- Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s):

*Norway-Sweden 2018: Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020 between the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (Sweden) and the Environment Directorate (Norway) on water management in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive. This agreement is to be extended, pending the scheduled meeting in September 2020. Attachment 1*  

*Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive – WFD) from 2011. The strategy is based on the MoU from 2008 and is presently undergoing revision following the meeting between the national and regional representatives from Norway and Sweden in January 2020. Attachment 2*

*Norway-Sweden 2008: A Memorandum of Understanding, describing the implementation of the WFD by the countries. Norway is implementing the IWRM according to the WFD under the specific timetable agreed pursuant to the Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA). The strategy from 2011 is based on this MoU and the memorandum will therefore not be addressed in questions 2-3, as this will be covered by answers concerning the strategy.*

*Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country (from 1929) https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929*

*Agreement between Norway and Sweden concerning management of salmon and trout in Svinesund, Iddefjorden and Enningdalselva (Innlandet og Viken) https://lovdata.no/dokument/TRAKTAT/traktat/2010-03-09-6?q=svinesund%20iddefjorden*
Agreement or arrangement is under development
No agreement or arrangement

*If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]*

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

**Norway – Sweden 2018 Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020**

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☒/No ☐
Additional explanations?

The agreement names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☐/No ☐
Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? *(Please list):* Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälv

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
All water uses ☒
A single water use or sector ☐
Several water uses or sectors ☐

*If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):*
Water uses or sectors

- Industry
- Agriculture
- Transport (e.g., navigation)
- Households
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Nature protection
- Other (please list):

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures
- Mutual assistance

Topics of cooperation

- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

Monitoring and exchange

- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

Joint planning and management
Development of joint regulations on specific topics ☐
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans ☐
Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Development of shared infrastructure ☐
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Lack of financial resources ☐
- Insufficient human capacity ☐
- Insufficient technical capacity ☐
- Tense diplomatic relations ☐
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
- No significant difficulties ☒

Other (please describe): Minor difficulties is usually addressed bilaterally on a regional or national level, within the structure of the agreement and the strategy, i.e. during meetings.

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success?
The agreement provides a formal platform for the collaboration between Norway and Sweden on the subject of transboundary basins under EU's Water Framework Directive (WFD).

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): See attachment 1

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

Where is there a joint body or mechanism
(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?

- Plenipotentiaries ☐
- Bilateral commission ☐
- Basin or similar commission ☐
Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points

Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the agreement.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑ No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?

No cooperation ☐

They have observer status ☐

Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

A secretariat ☐

If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

A subsidiary body or bodies ☐

Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

Other features (please list):

(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?

Identification of pollution sources ☐

Data collection and exchange ☑

Joint monitoring ☐

Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐

Setting emission limits ☐

Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☑

Management and prevention of flood or drought risks ☐

Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures ☐

Surveillance and early warning of water related disease ☐

---

6 This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water allocation and/or flow regulation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy development</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of implementation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of experience between riparian States</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settling of differences and conflicts</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on planned measures</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of information on best available technology</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in transboundary EIA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of shared infrastructure</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing hydromorphological alterations</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint communication strategy</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other tasks *(please list)*: [fill in]

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

**Governance issues**

*Please describe, if any*: [fill in]

**Unexpected planning delays**

*Please describe, if any*: [fill in]

**Lack of resources**

*Please describe, if true*: [fill in]

**Lack of mechanism for implementing measures**

*Please describe, if true*: [fill in]

**Lack of effective measures**

*Please describe, if true*: [fill in]

**Unexpected extreme events**

*Please describe, if any*: [fill in]

**Lack of information and reliable forecasts**

*Please describe, if any*: [fill in]
Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): The cooperation between the countries is not suffering from main difficulties. The difference in water management cycles between Norway and Sweden is a challenge that is resolved within the agreement and the strategy.

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how frequently does it meet?

More than once per year ☒

Once per year ☐

Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?

The agreement describes twice yearly meetings as well as communication between meetings.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?

Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? [fill in]

Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive)

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations?

The strategy names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälv
(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses
- A single water use or sector
- Several water uses or sectors

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

**Water uses or sectors**

- Industry
- Agriculture
- Transport (e.g., navigation)
- Households
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Nature protection

Other (please list): The strategy concerns all water uses under EU’s water framework directive (WFD), as it is implemented in Norwegian law.

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures
- Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**

- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**

- Joint assessments
Data collection and exchange ☒
Joint monitoring ☐
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☐
Common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
Exchange of experience between riparian States ☒
Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

**Joint planning and management**

Development of joint regulations on specific topics ☐
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans ☐
Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Development of shared infrastructure ☐
Other *(please list)*: [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

   - Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
   - Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
   - Lack of financial resources ☐
   - Insufficient human capacity ☐
   - Insufficient technical capacity ☐
   - Tense diplomatic relations ☐
   - Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
   - No significant difficulties ☒

   Other *(please describe)*: [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The arrangement provides common principles for the collaboration between Norway and Sweden on the subject of transboundary basins under EU's Water Framework Directive (WFD). In addition it creates a mutual understanding and basis for cooperation regarding the making, implementation and supervision of the water management plans and the division of basins and their classification. It provides a basis for the exchange of information regarding monitoring, data and proposed management of the basins. Some of the success can be attributed to the level of operational cooperation (local and regional) in addition to the strategy being anchored and recognized on a national level.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document *(please attach document or insert web address, if applicable)*: See attachment 2

43
3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☑/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

**Where there is a joint body or mechanism**

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?

- Plenipotentiaries ☐
- Bilateral commission ☐
- Basin or similar commission ☐
- Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points ☐

Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins, in addition the representatives for the regional levels of water management in both countries.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑/No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?

- No cooperation ☐
- They have observer status ☐
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

- A secretariat ☐

  If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

- A subsidiary body or bodies ☐

  Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

Other features (please list): The strategy is based on the requirements of the WFD and there are representatives from the local, regional and national level from both countries at meetings concerning the strategy itself.
(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?\(^7\)

- Identification of pollution sources
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Setting emission limits
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Management and prevention of flood or drought risks
- Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures
- Surveillance and early warning of water related disease
- Water allocation and/or flow regulation
- Policy development
- Control of implementation
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations
- Settling of differences and conflicts
- Consultations on planned measures
- Exchange of information on best available technology
- Participation in transboundary EIA
- Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Addressing hydromorphological alterations
- Climate change adaptation
- Joint communication strategy
- Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans
- Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation
- Capacity-building

Any other tasks *(please list)*: Cooperation on liming.

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

---

\(^7\) This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Governance issues

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Unexpected planning delays

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of resources

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of mechanism for implementing measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of effective measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Unexpected extreme events

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of information and reliable forecasts

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): There are no significant difficulties in the operation of the joint body

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, how frequently does it meet?

More than once per year ☐

Once per year ☑

Less than once per year [fill in]

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?
Mutual agreement on reporting status of the transboundary basins within the EU’s Water Framework Directive and to further establish cooperation between the countries on a regional level.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? [fill in]

Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Additional explanations? The convention between Norway and Sweden of 1929 encompass all transboundary basins in Norway and Sweden, concerning some aspects of the use of transboundary water that may affect the amount of water or the quality of the water in the neighbouring country.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒ / No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses ☐
- A single water use or sector ☐
- Several water uses or sectors ☒

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

- Industry ☐
- Agriculture ☐
- Transport (e.g., navigation) ☒
- Households ☐
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☒
- Fisheries ☒
- Tourism ☐
- Nature protection ☐
- Other (please list): ☐

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

- Procedural and institutional issues ☒
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☒
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☒
- Consultation on planned measures ☒
- Mutual assistance ☐

Topics of cooperation
| Joint vision and management objectives | ☑ |
| Joint significant water management issues | ☐ |
| Navigation | ☐ |
| Human health | ☐ |
| Environmental protection (ecosystem) | ☐ |
| Water quality | ☐ |
| Water quantity or allocation | ☐ |
| Cooperation in addressing floods | ☐ |
| Cooperation in addressing droughts | ☐ |
| Climate change adaptation | ☐ |

**Monitoring and exchange**

- Joint assessments | ☐
- Data collection and exchange | ☐
- Joint monitoring | ☐
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories | ☐
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives | ☐
- Common early warning and alarm procedures | ☐
- Exchange of experience between riparian States | ☐
- Exchange of information on planned measures | ☒

**Joint planning and management**

- Development of joint regulations on specific topics | ☐
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans | ☒
- Management of shared infrastructure | ☐
- Development of shared infrastructure | ☐
- Other *(please list)*: [fill in] | ☐

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes | ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes | ☐
- Lack of financial resources | ☐
- Insufficient human capacity | ☐
- Insufficient technical capacity | ☐
- Tense diplomatic relations | ☐
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement | ☐
No significant difficulties

Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The convention regulates the duty of each country to inform the other if actions are planned that will cause physical changes or other impact on the water of the other country. It also establishes the rights of the countries to endorse such actions. The law was instituted during a period with high development of hydropower while watercourses were still needed for logging and other transports.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

If no, why not? (please explain): The convention is implemented in Norwegian law and does not call for a joint body, but sets out procedures of notifications between the countries.

Agreement between Norway and Sweden concerning management of salmon and trout in Svinesund, Iddefjorden and Enningdalselva (Innlandet og Viken)

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒ / No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

Additional explanations? The agreement between Norway and Sweden concerning management of salmon and trout only covers the waterbodies Svinesund, Iddefjorden and Enningdalselva.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
All water uses □
A single water use or sector ✓
Several water uses or sectors □

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

**Water uses or sectors**
- Industry □
- Agriculture □
- Transport (e.g., navigation) □
- Households □
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types □
- Fisheries ✓
- Tourism □
- Nature protection □
- Other (please list): [fill in] □

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ✓
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) □
- Consultation on planned measures □
- Mutual assistance □

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives □
- Joint significant water management issues □
- Navigation □
- Human health □
- Environmental protection (ecosystem) □
- Water quality □
- Water quantity or allocation □
- Cooperation in addressing floods □
- Cooperation in addressing droughts □
- Climate change adaptation □

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments □
- Data collection and exchange □
- Joint monitoring □
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure

Other (*please list*): The agreement is implemented in Norwegian law and pertains to fishing of salmon and trout in the aforementioned waterbodies.

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties
- Other (*please describe*): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The agreement ensures a joint management of the stocks of salmon and trout in the transboundary waterbodies.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (*please attach document or insert web address, if applicable*): https://lovdata.no/dokument/TRAKTAT/traktat/2010-03-09-6?q=svinesund%20iddefjorden

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

   Yes [ ] No [x]

   *If no, why not? (please explain):* The agreement does not provide for the creation of joint bodies
4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please provide further details:
Both the convention from 1929, the agreement between Norway and Sweden (2018) and the Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water (2011) set joint objectives for all transboundary water.
The Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water lists the how differences in assessment, waterbody delineation and characterization should be addressed for the transboundary waters in terms of the Water Framework Directive. The main conclusion is that the principles of the down-stream country should be used. The national management plans for the international river basins can only be approved for the territory in the country that has written the plans, but the plans are available for public hearing in both countries.

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use? As applied to the aforementioned agreements:

Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction. ☐

Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality ☒

Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals ☒

Water-related species and habitats protection ☒

Other measures (please describe): Cooperation between the two countries is also visible in various projects concerning the reintroduction and protection of salmon populations (e.g. Vänerlaks InterReg project).

A wide number of measures for improving and protecting water quality and quantity are possible through the work that results from the implementation of the Water Framework Directive.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☑/No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

More than once per year ☒

Once per year ☐

Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Formally twice a year between Norwegian Environment
Agency (NEA) and Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SWAM), but more often on the regional and local level.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

- Environmental conditions
- Research activities and application of best available techniques
- Emission monitoring data
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts
- Point source pollution sources
- Diffuse pollution sources
- Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.)
- Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels)
- Water abstractions
- Climatological information
- Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development
- Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(f) Is the database publicly available?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide the web address: The Norwegian database for the water framework directive: www.vann-nett.no. There is currently no connection with Swedish databases.

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?

- Frequency of exchanges
- Timing of exchanges
- Comparability of data and information
- Limited spatial coverage
- Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial)

Other (please describe): There is no common database or possibility for viewing data for transboundary waterbodies in the neighbouring country in our national database. However, there are no difficulties in exchanging data. There is good data exchange at the regional and local level.

Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): Data exchange permits better cooperation and ensures that an overall assessment of the ecological and chemical status of the
waterbody is made on both sides of the border. This enables us to suggest appropriate measures and coordinate efforts in improving and protecting our transboundary waterbodies.

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please describe [fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations ☐

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint and agreed methodologies ☐

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint sampling ☐

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common monitoring network ☐

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common agreed parameters ☐

*Please describe: [fill in]*

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: Sweden and Norway meet regularly at the regional level to discuss water management in the terms of the Water Framework Directive. During the last planning process, January 2020 the environmental objectives were reviewed. Meetings at the regional level occur more frequently in order to exchange information.

National authorities exchanged data in 2017 on transboundary water courses in connection with reporting to WISE, the WFD database run by the European Environment Agency.

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? The water quality standards used in transboundary basins are in accordance with the WFD.

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

- Notification and communication ☑
- Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐
- Other (please list): The following European directives have been implemented into Norwegian legislation:
  - Directive 2003/105/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances
  - Directive 96/82/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances
- No measures ☐

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

- Notification and communication ☑
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods ☑
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts ☐
- Joint climate change adaptation strategy ☐
- Joint disaster risk reduction strategy ☐
- Other (please list): [fill in]
- No measures ☐

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?
Yes ☑️ No ☐

*If yes, please provide a brief summary:* [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑️ No ☐

*If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)*

- Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism
- Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body
- Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body

*If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism:* [fill in]

- Intergovernmental organizations
- Private sectors organizations or associations
- Water user groups or associations
- Academic or research institutions
- Other non-governmental organizations
- General public
- Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public ☐

Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans* ☒

Public involvement ☒

Other (please specify): [fill in]

---

*Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.*
Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins:
Bottenhavet (NO2): Ångermanelven, Indalselven, Ljusnan, Dalälven, Bottenhavet (aquifer)
Bottenviken (NO1): Luleelven, Piteelven, Skellefteälven, Umeälven, Bottenviken (aquifer)
Nordland og Jan Mayen (NO1108): Vefsna, Røssåga, Bjerka, Ranavassdraget, Saltdalsvassdraget, Sulitjelmavassdraget, Fagerbakkvassdraget, Laksåga, Sørkjordelva, Hellemovassdraget, Storelva, Skjomavassdraget
Torneälven (NO1TO), Torneälven (aquifer)
Troms og Finnmark (NO1109): Salangselva, Målselvvassdraget, Signdalelva
Trøndelag (NO1107): Nidelvvassdraget, Stjørdalsvassdraget, Verdalsvassdraget

List of the riparian States: Norway, Sweden

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:
- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake □
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water □
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water □
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water □
- Other □

Please describe: [fill in]
Unknown □

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins:
Bottenhavet 4,37%.
Bottenviken 1,27%.
Nordland og Jan Mayen 91,03%.
Torneälven 0,87%.
Troms og Finnmark 96,07%.
Trøndelag 93,27%.

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   - One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force □
   - Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force □
   - Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians □

   *Norway-Sweden 2018: Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020 between the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (Sweden) and the Environment Directorate (Norway) on water management in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive.*
This agreement is to be extended, pending the scheduled meeting in September 2020.

Attachment 1

* Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive – WFD) from 2011. The strategy is based on the MoU from 2008 and is presently undergoing revision following the meeting between the national and regional representatives from Norway and Sweden in January 2020.

Attachment 2

* Norway-Sweden 2008: A Memorandum of Understanding, describing the implementation of the WFD by the countries. Norway is not a member of the EU but is voluntarily implementing IWRM according to the WFD. The strategy from 2011 is based on this MoU and the memorandum will therefore not be addressed in questions 2-3, as this will be covered by answers concerning the strategy.

* Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in watercourses which affect watercourses in the neighbouring country (from 1929) https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929

Agreement or arrangement is under development [ ]

No agreement or arrangement [ ]

* If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

Norway – Sweden 2018 Agreement on cooperation 2018-2020

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes [ ]/No [ ]

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes [ ]/No [ ]

Additional explanations?

The agreement names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes [ ]/No [ ]

Additional explanations? [fill in]
Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? 
(Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers? 
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälv.

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement? 
☑ All water uses 
☐ A single water use or sector 
☐ Several water uses or sectors

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

☐ Industry 
☐ Agriculture 
☐ Transport (e.g., navigation) 
☐ Households 
☐ Energy: hydropower and other energy types 
☐ Fisheries 
☐ Tourism 
☐ Nature protection 
☐ Other (please list):

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues

☐ Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution 
☐ Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) 
☑ Consultation on planned measures 
☐ Mutual assistance

Topics of cooperation

☑ Joint vision and management objectives 
☑ Joint significant water management issues 
☐ Navigation 
☐ Human health 
☐ Environmental protection (ecosystem) 
☑ Water quality 
☐ Water quantity or allocation
Cooperation in addressing floods
Cooperation in addressing droughts
Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
Joint assessments
Data collection and exchange
Joint monitoring
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure
Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (*please describe*): Minor difficulties is usually addressed bilaterally on a regional or national level, within the structure of the agreement and the strategy, i.e. during meetings.

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The agreement provides a formal platform for the collaboration between Norway and Sweden on the subject of transboundary basins under EU's Water Framework Directive (WFD).
(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): See attachment 1

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

Where there is a joint body or mechanism

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?

- Plenipotentiaries ☐
- Bilateral commission ☐
- Basin or similar commission ☐
- Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points ☐

Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the agreement.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?

- No cooperation ☐
- They have observer status ☐
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

- A secretariat ☐

  If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

- A subsidiary body or bodies ☐

  Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

  Other features (please list):
(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?

- Identification of pollution sources
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Setting emission limits
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Management and prevention of flood or drought risks
- Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures
- Surveillance and early warning of water related disease
- Water allocation and/or flow regulation
- Policy development
- Control of implementation
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations
- Settling of differences and conflicts
- Consultations on planned measures
- Exchange of information on best available technology
- Participation in transboundary EIA
- Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Addressing hydromorphological alterations
- Climate change adaptation
- Joint communication strategy
- Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans
- Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation
- Capacity-building

Any other tasks (please list): [fill in]

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

---

9 This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Governance issues

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Unexpected planning delays

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of resources

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of mechanism for implementing measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of effective measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Unexpected extreme events

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of information and reliable forecasts

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): The cooperation between the countries is not suffering from any significant difficulties. The difference in water management cycles between Norway and Sweden is a challenge that is resolved within the agreement and the strategy.

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how frequently does it meet?

More than once per year ☒

Once per year ☐

Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?
The agreement describes biannual meetings as well as communication between meetings.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?

Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? There are no other relevant states for the agreement, as the transboundary water is shared between Norway and Sweden.

Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins (Water Framework Directive)

2.
(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☒/No ☐
Additional explanations?

The strategy names and covers all of the transboundary river basins between Norway and Sweden.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☒/No ☐
Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Västerhavet, Bottenviken, Bottenhavet and Torneälvs.

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
All water uses ☒
A single water use or sector ☐
Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors
Industry ☐
Agriculture ☐
Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐
Households ☐
Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐
Fisheries ☐
Tourism ☐
Nature protection ☐

Other (please list): The strategy concerns all water uses under EU’s water framework directive (WFD), as it is implemented in Norwegian law.

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☐
Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☐
Consultation on planned measures ☒
Mutual assistance ☐

**Topics of cooperation**

- Joint vision and management objectives ☒
- Joint significant water management issues ☒
- Navigation ☐
- Human health ☐
- Environmental protection (ecosystem) ☒
- Water quality ☒
- Water quantity or allocation ☒
- Cooperation in addressing floods ☐
- Cooperation in addressing droughts ☐
- Climate change adaptation ☐

**Monitoring and exchange**

- Joint assessments ☐
- Data collection and exchange ☒
- Joint monitoring ☐
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☐
- Common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
- Exchange of experience between riparian States ☒
- Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

**Joint planning and management**

- Development of joint regulations on specific topics ☐
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans ☐
- Management of shared infrastructure ☐
- Development of shared infrastructure ☐
- Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Lack of financial resources ☐
Insufficient human capacity ☐
Insufficient technical capacity ☐
Tense diplomatic relations ☐
Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
No significant difficulties ☒
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The arrangement provides common principles for the collaboration between Norway and Sweden on the subject of transboundary basins under EU’s Water Framework Directive (WFD). In addition it creates a mutual understanding and basis for cooperation regarding the making, implementation and supervision of the water management plans and the division of basins and their classification. It provides a basis for the exchange of information regarding monitoring, data and proposed management of the basins. Some of the success can be attributed to the level of operational cooperation (local and regional) in addition to the strategy being anchored and recognized on a national level.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): See attachment 2

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): [fill in]

Where there is a joint body or mechanism

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (please tick one)?

Plenipotentiaries ☐
Bilateral commission ☐
Basin or similar commission ☐
Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points ☐

Other (please describe): The Norwegian Environment Agency and the Swedish Agency for the Marine and Water Management constitutes the joint body for the Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary river basins, in addition the representatives for the regional levels of water management in both countries.

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway and Sweden

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): No
(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?

No cooperation
They have observer status
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

A secretariat

If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

A subsidiary body or bodies

Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

Other features (please list): The strategy is based on the requirements of the WFD and there are representatives from the local, regional and national level from both countries at meetings concerning the strategy itself.

(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?10

Identification of pollution sources ☒
Data collection and exchange ☒
Joint monitoring ☐
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
Setting emission limits ☐
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☒
Management and prevention of flood or drought risks ☐
Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
Surveillance and early warning of water related disease ☐
Water allocation and/or flow regulation ☒
Policy development ☐
Control of implementation ☐
Exchange of experience between riparian States ☒
Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations ☒
Settling of differences and conflicts ☐
Consultations on planned measures ☒

---

10 This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Exchange of information on best available technology
Participation in transboundary EIA
Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Addressing hydromorphological alterations
Climate change adaptation
Joint communication strategy
Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans
Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation
Capacity-building

Any other tasks (please list): Cooperation on liming and management of certain transboundary fish species.

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

- Governance issues
- Unexpected planning delays
- Lack of resources
- Lack of mechanism for implementing measures
- Lack of effective measures
- Unexpected extreme events
- Lack of information and reliable forecasts
- Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): There are no significant difficulties in the operation of the joint body.

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, how frequently does it meet?

More than once per year [ ]
Once per year ☒
Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism? Mutual agreement on reporting status of the transboundary basins within the EU’s Water Framework Directive and to further establish cooperation between the countries on a regional level.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?
Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? [fill in]

Convention between Sweden and Norway pertaining to certain issues concerning activities in water courses which affect water courses in the neighbouring country

2.

(a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? The convention between Norway and Sweden of 1929 encompass all transboundary basins in Norway and Sweden, concerning some aspects of the use of transboundary water that may affect the amount of water or the quality of the water in the neighbouring country.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Sweden

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☐
A single water use or sector ☐
Several water uses or sectors ☒

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry ☐
Agriculture ☐
Transport (e.g., navigation) ☒
Households ☐
Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☒
Fisheries ☒
Tourism ☐
Nature protection ☐
Other (please list):

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☒
Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☒
Consultation on planned measures ☒
Mutual assistance ☐

Topics of cooperation
Joint vision and management objectives ☐
Joint significant water management issues ☒
Navigation ☐
Human health ☐
Environmental protection (ecosystem) ☐
Water quality ☐
Water quantity or allocation ☒
Cooperation in addressing floods ☐
Cooperation in addressing droughts ☐
Climate change adaptation ☐

Monitoring and exchange
Joint assessments ☐
Data collection and exchange ☐
Joint monitoring ☐
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☐
Common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
Exchange of experience between riparian States ☐
Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

Joint planning and management
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (please list): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The convention regulates the duty of each country to inform the other of actions planned that will cause physical changes or other impact on the water of the other country. It also establishes the rights of the countries to endorse such actions. The law was instituted during a period with high development of hydropower while watercourses were still needed for logging and other transports.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1931-06-12-1?q=norge%20sverige%201929

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☒ No ☐

*If no, why not? (please explain):* The convention does not call for a joint body, but sets out procedures of notifications between the countries.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒ No ☐

*If yes, please provide further details:*
Both the convention from 1929, the agreement between Norway and Sweden (2018) and the Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water (2011) set joint objectives for all transboundary water.

The Norwegian-Swedish Strategy for transboundary water lists the how differences in assessment, waterbody delineation and characterization should be addressed for the transboundary waters in terms of the Water Framework Directive. The main conclusion is that the principles of the downstream country should be used. The national management plans for the international river basins can only be approved for the territory in the country that has written the plans, but the plans are available for public hearing in both countries.

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use? *As applied to the aforementioned agreements*

Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction. ☐

Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality ☒

Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals ☒

Water-related species and habitats protection ☒

Other measures (*please describe*): Cooperation between the two countries is also visible in various projects concerning the reintroduction and protection of salmon populations (e.g. Vänerlaks InterReg project).

A wide number of measures for improving and protecting water quality and quantity are possible through the work that results from the implementation of the Water Framework Directive.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/ No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

More than once per year ☒

Once per year ☐

Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Formally twice a year between Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA) and Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SWAM), but more often on the regional and local level.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

Environmental conditions ☒

Research activities and application of best available techniques ☒

Emission monitoring data ☒
Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts

Point source pollution sources

Diffuse pollution sources

Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.)

Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels)

Water abstractions

Climatological information

Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development

Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

Yes ☒/No ☐

Is there a shared database or information platform?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Is the database publicly available?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide the web address: The Norwegian database for the water framework directive: www.vann-nett.no. There is currently no connection with Swedish databases.

What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?

Frequency of exchanges

Timing of exchanges

Comparability of data and information

Limited spatial coverage

Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial)

Other (please describe): There is no common database or possibility to consult data for transboundary waterbodies in the neighbouring country in our national database. However, there are no difficulties in exchanging data. There is good data exchange at the regional and local level.

Additional comments: [fill in]

What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): Data exchange permits better cooperation and ensures that an overall assessment of the ecological and chemical status of the waterbody is made on both sides of the border. This enables us to suggest appropriate measures and coordinate efforts in improving and protecting our transboundary waterbodies.

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

Yes ☒/No ☐
Border surface waters
Surface waters in the entire basin
Surface waters on the main watercourse
Surface waters in part of the basin
please describe [fill in]
Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)
Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?
National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations
Please describe: [fill in]
Joint and agreed methodologies
Please describe: [fill in]
Joint sampling
Please describe: [fill in]
Common monitoring network
Please describe: [fill in]
Common agreed parameters
Please describe: [fill in]

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: Sweden and Norway meet regularly at the regional level to discuss water management in the terms of the Water Framework Directive. During the last planning process, January 2020 the environmental objectives were reviewed. Meetings at the regional level occur more frequently in order to exchange information.

National authorities exchanged data in 2017 on transboundary water courses in connection with reporting to WISE, the WFD database run by the European Environment Agency
9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☒ No ☐

*If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied?* The water quality standards used in transboundary basins are in accordance with the WFD.

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

- Notification and communication ☒
- Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐
- Other *(please list)*: The following European directives have been implemented into Norwegian legislation:
  - Directive 2003/105/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances
  - Directive 96/82/EC on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances

No measures ☐

*If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?:* [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

- Notification and communication ☒
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods ☒
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts ☐
- Joint climate change adaptation strategy ☐
- Joint disaster risk reduction strategy ☐
- Other *(please list)*: [fill in]

No measures ☐

*If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?:* [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, please provide a brief summary:* [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒ No ☐

*If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)*

- Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism ☐
Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body

Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body

If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism:

- Intergovernmental organizations
- Private sectors organizations or associations
- Water user groups or associations
- Academic or research institutions
- Other non-governmental organizations
- General public
- Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public

Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans

Public involvement

Other (please specify): [fill in]

Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Tana (Teno) Basin

List of the riparian States: Norway, Finland

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 68.6%

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

---

11 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force
Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s)
- Agreement between Finland and Norway on the Fisheries in the Tana Watercourse (2017)
- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District, (2014)
- Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)

Agreement or arrangement is under development
No agreement or arrangement

If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

Agreement between Finland and Norway on the Fisheries in the Tana Watercourse:

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
   Yes ☒/No ☐

   If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
   Yes ☐/No ☒

   Additional explanations? The bilateral agreement covers the border section of the main stem. Tributaries are managed domestically, as well as the lower part and terminus which is solely on Norwegian territory and managed through a separate regulation.

   Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
   Yes ☐/No ☐

   Additional explanations? [fill in]

   Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement?
   (Please list): Norway, Finland
(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses ☐
- A single water use or sector ☒
- Several water uses or sectors ☐

*If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):*

**Water uses or sectors**

- Industry ☐
- Agriculture ☐
- Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐
- Households ☐
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐
- Fisheries ☒
- Tourism ☐
- Nature protection ☐
- Other (please list): [fill in] ☐

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☒
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☐
- Consultation on planned measures ☐
- Mutual assistance ☐

**Topics of cooperation**

- Joint vision and management objectives ☒
- Joint significant water management issues ☐
- Navigation ☐
- Human health ☐
- Environmental protection (ecosystem) ☐
- Water quality ☐
- Water quantity or allocation ☐
- Cooperation in addressing floods ☐
- Cooperation in addressing droughts ☐
Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**

- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**

- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure

Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The agreement limits the number of fishing licences that can be sold in the border section and allocates each State an equal share of these cards. This gives a much better balance in the access to fish from each State, in comparison to earlier agreements. The agreements also restricts the fishing season, both for local fishers and tourists, which hopefully will contribute to re-establishing and strengthen the more than 30 salmon stocks in the watercourse.
3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes □/No ☒

If no, why not? (please explain): Such joint body has not been created. An informal bilateral working group on management exists, but so far the group has not been recognised in the agreement or given a specific mandate.

Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District:

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No □

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes □/No ☒

Additional explanations? The Agreement covers four transboundary river basins including Tana River basin. One of these (Pasvik) also covers Russian territory, but Russia is not party to the Agreement

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes □/No □

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Finland

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No □

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Tana, Pasvik, Neiden

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☒

A single water use or sector □

Several water uses or sectors □

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry □

Agriculture □

Transport (e.g., navigation) □
Households

Energy: hydropower and other energy types

Fisheries

Tourism

Nature protection

Other (please list): [fill in]

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures
- Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin
management or action plans ☑️
Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Development of shared infrastructure ☐
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Lack of financial resources ☐
- Insufficient human capacity ☐
- Insufficient technical capacity ☐
- Tense diplomatic relations ☐
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
- No significant difficulties ☑️
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success?

Management of these basins are coordinated in each State, and in line with the requirements in the EU Water Framework Directive.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable):


3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☑️/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): The Agreement does not provide for the creation of a joint body

Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District:

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☑️/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☑️/No ☐

Additional explanations? See the comment for the Agreement on the Finnish-Nowegian River Basin District above.
Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☐/No ☒
Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement?
(Please list): Norway, Finland

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☐/No ☒
If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
   - All water uses ☐
   - A single water use or sector ☒
   - Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

**Water uses or sectors**
- Industry ☐
- Agriculture ☐
- Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐
- Households ☐
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐
- Fisheries ☐
- Tourism ☐
- Nature protection ☐
- Other (please list): Cooperative issues ☒

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☐
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☒
- Consultation on planned measures ☐
- Mutual assistance ☐

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives ☐
- Joint significant water management issues ☐
- Navigation ☐
Human health
Environmental protection (ecosystem)
Water quality
Water quantity or allocation
Cooperation in addressing floods
Cooperation in addressing droughts
Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure

Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(c) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (*please describe*): [fill in]
(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The memorandum clarifies procedural aspects of the cooperation over the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://www.vannportalen.no/globalassets/vannregioner/norsk-finsk/norsk-finsk---dokumenter/memorandum-of-understanding.pdf

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☐/No ☒

If no, why not? (please explain): The memorandum does not provide for the creation of joint bodies

**Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Water Commission:**

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? **Tana River basin is covered.** The drainage basin of Pasvik (Paatsjoki) also covers Russian territory, but Russia is only an invited observer to the commission.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? *(Please list):** Norway, Finland

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: Tana, Pasvik, Neiden

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses ☐
- A single water use or sector ☐
- Several water uses or sectors ☒

*If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):*

**Water uses or sectors**
Industry  ☒
Agriculture  ☒
Transport (e.g., navigation)  ☒
Households  ☐
Energy: hydropower and other energy types  ☒
Fisheries  ☒
Tourism  ☒
Nature protection  ☒

Other (please list): The Agreement covers all topics relating to the transboundary waters  ☒

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution  ☐
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)  ☒
- Consultation on planned measures  ☐
- Mutual assistance  ☐

Topics of cooperation

- Joint vision and management objectives  ☐
- Joint significant water management issues  ☒
- Navigation  ☐
- Human health  ☐
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)  ☒
- Water quality  ☒
- Water quantity or allocation  ☒
- Cooperation in addressing floods  ☐
- Cooperation in addressing droughts  ☐
- Climate change adaptation  ☐

Monitoring and exchange

- Joint assessments  ☐
- Data collection and exchange  ☒
- Joint monitoring  ☐
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories  ☐
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives  ☐
- Common early warning and alarm procedures  ☐
- Exchange of experience between riparian States  ☒
Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

**Joint planning and management**

- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure
- Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties ☒
- Other (*please describe*): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The commission informs the two governments about conditions in the area, and gives advise on necessary action. The commission is also a forum for communication and exchange of information between the regional governments in each State.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (*please attach document or insert web address, if applicable*): See attachment 4 (not in English)

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☒ No ☐

*If no, why not? (please explain)*: [fill in]

**Where there is a joint body or mechanism**

(a) If there is a joint body or mechanism, which kind of joint body or mechanism (*please tick one)*?

- Plenipotentiaries
- Bilateral commission ☒
- Basin or similar commission
- Expert group meeting or meeting of national focal points
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(b) Does the joint body or mechanism cover the entire transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑ No ☐

(c) Which States (including your own) are members of the joint body or mechanism? (Please list): Norway, Finland

(d) Are there any riparian States that are not members of the joint body or mechanism? (please list): Russia

(e) If not all riparian States are members of the joint body or mechanism how does the joint body or mechanism cooperate with them?

- No cooperation ☐
- They have observer status ☑
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) Does the joint body or mechanism have any of the following features (please tick the ones applicable)?

- A secretariat ☐

If the secretariat is a permanent one, is it a joint secretariat or does each country host its own secretariat? (Please describe): [fill in]

- A subsidiary body or bodies ☐

Please list (e.g., working groups on specific topics): [fill in]

- Other features (please list): [fill in]

(g) What are the tasks and activities of this joint body or mechanism?12

- Identification of pollution sources ☑
- Data collection and exchange ☑
- Joint monitoring ☑
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
- Setting emission limits ☐
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives ☐
- Management and prevention of flood or drought risks ☐
- Preparedness for extreme events, e.g., common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
- Surveillance and early warning of water related disease ☑
- Water allocation and/or flow regulation ☐
- Policy development ☐
- Control of implementation ☐

---

12 This may include tasks according to the agreement or tasks added by the joint body, or its subsidiaries. Both tasks which joint bodies coordinate and tasks which they implement should be included.
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on existing and planned uses of water and related installations
Settling of differences and conflicts
Consultations on planned measures
Exchange of information on best available technology
Participation in transboundary EIA
Development of river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Addressing hydromorphological alterations
Climate change adaptation
Joint communication strategy
Basin-wide or joint public participation and consultation of, for example, basin management plans
Joint resources to support transboundary cooperation
Capacity-building
Any other tasks (please list): [fill in]

(h) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the operation of the joint body or mechanism, if any?

Governance issues

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Unexpected planning delays

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of resources

Please describe, if true: The financing of the commission by the two governments does not cover its activities, and the commission also depends on financial support from the EU (Interreg, Kolarctic etc.)

Lack of mechanism for implementing measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Lack of effective measures

Please describe, if true: [fill in]

Unexpected extreme events

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Lack of information and reliable forecasts

Please describe, if any: [fill in]

Others (please list and describe, as appropriate): There is some disagreement between Norway and Finland regarding the interpretation of certain provisions in the Water
Framework Directive. This can sometimes affect the discussions in the commission. Moreover, the commission has not been granted any formal management tasks, and therefore has few of the difficulties described in the questions above.

(i) Does the joint body or mechanism, or its subsidiary bodies meet regularly?
   Yes ☑/No ☐
   If yes, how frequently does it meet?
   - More than once per year ☐
   - Once per year ☑
   - Less than once per year ☐

(j) What are the main achievements with regards to the joint body or mechanism?
The commission ensures good dialogue and cooperation between the regional governments in the area, and contributes to the solid cooperation between Finland and Norway.

(k) Did the joint body or mechanism ever invite a non-riparian coastal State to cooperate?
   Yes ☐/No ☑
   If yes, please give details. If no, why not, e.g. are the relevant coastal States also riparian States and therefore already members of the joint body or mechanism? [fill in]

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   Yes ☑/No ☐
   If yes, please provide further details: [fill in] A joint management plan has recently been drafted by the informal working group on management, but has not yet been implemented. A joint management plan has also been adopted for the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District in line with the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive, this plan also covers Tana.

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basins or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?
   Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction. ☑
   Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality ☑
   Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals ☑
   Water-related species and habitats protection ☑
   Other measures (please describe): The Tana Basin and the Tana fjord where it terminates, are protected under the National Salmon River/Fjords protection programme. This programme restricts any activity or project that can pose a risk to its stocks of wild salmon. Moreover, the basin has been protected from large hydropower development since 1980.
6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

- More than once per year ☒
- Once per year ☐
- Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): The watercourse is monitored by a bilateral research- and monitoring group. The group shares information with both states regularly, and produces a yearly status report on the development of each tributary and salmon stock. Joint monitoring is also conducted in the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

- Environmental conditions ☒
- Research activities and application of best available techniques ☒
- Emission monitoring data ☒
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts ☒
- Point source pollution sources ☒
- Diffuse pollution sources ☒
- Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☐
- Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☒
- Water abstractions ☒
- Climatological information ☒
- Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development ☐
- Other subjects (please list): surveillance of salmon stocks

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?

Yes ☐/No ☒

(f) Is the database publicly available?

Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please provide the web address:

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?

Frequency of exchanges ☐

Timing of exchanges ☐
Comparability of data and information ✗
Limited spatial coverage ☐
Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
Other (please describe): [fill in]

Additional comments:

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): This information is guiding for the yearly assessment of the bilateral fishing rules, and has also been central to the drafting of the common management plan. Data exchange also ensures that an overall assessment of the ecological and chemical status of the watercourse is made on both sides of the border.

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ✗ No ☐

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations ☒

Please describe: The bilateral research and monitoring group has established monitoring stations in the border section and in the lower Norwegian part of the watercourse.

Joint and agreed methodologies ☒

Please describe: The bilateral research and monitoring group has agreed on a joint methodology for their work.

Joint sampling ☐

Please describe: [fill in]
Common monitoring network ☒
Please describe: Data from national monitoring stations are gathered by the bilateral research and monitoring group, and form the basis for the group's work. The data is also supplied by traditional and local knowledge and observations from the local population on each side of the border.

Common agreed parameters ✗

Please describe: The bilateral research and monitoring group has set parameters for their work and also for the development of the salmon stocks. These parameters form the basis for the agreement's provisions on pre-agreed measures.

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: The bilateral research group provides data about the salmon stocks that are central to the fisheries management. Joint monitoring gives 'neutral' data and assessments that are essential for developing joint strategies and management plans.

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring:

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ✗/No ☐

If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: The parties conduct a joint assessment of the bilateral fishing rules and makes adjustments in the protocol and in domestic regulations. The last assessment was done through the Protocol of 23. March 2020. Assessments are also made in accordance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Moreover, the Transboundary Waters Commission meets yearly and assesses the cooperation and management of the four watercourses it covers. The last such meeting was in June 2019.

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?
Yes ✗/No ☐

If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? The standards of the Water Framework Directive

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

Notification and communication ☑

Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐

Other (please list): [fill in]

No measures ☐

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?:

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

Notification and communication ☑

Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods ☑
Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts
Joint climate change adaptation strategy
Joint disaster risk reduction strategy
Other (please list): [fill in]
No measures
If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?
   Yes ☐/No ☒
   If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   Yes ☒/No ☐
   If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)
   Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism ☐
   Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body ☒
   Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body ☐
   If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism:
      Intergovernmental organizations ☐
      Private sectors organizations or associations ☐
      Water user groups or associations ☐
      Academic or research institutions ☐
      Other non-governmental organizations ☐
      General public ☐
      Other (please specify): [fill in]
      Availability of information to the public ☒
      Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans13 ☒
      Public involvement ☒

   Other (please specify): The organisation of local fishing right-holders is in charge of managing the fishing and sale of fishing licenses in the basin, in dialogue with the Finnish right-holder organisations. This organisation participates in the common (informal) working group on management and in the yearly assessment and adjustment of the fishing rules. The right-holder organisation and the Sami Parliament also participate in the ongoing negotiation about changes in the common fishing rules.

13 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Neiden (Näätämö) Basin

List of the riparian States: Finland, Norway

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 21%

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

- One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force ☒
- Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
- Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s)

- Agreement on the diversion of the flow of water from lakes Garsjöen, Kjerringvatn and Förstevannene to the waterway of Gandvik instead of that of the River Näätämö (Neiden). Signed at Oslo on 25 April 1951
- Agreement concerning fishing in the Näätämö (Neiden) fishing area (with related fishing regulations). Signed at Helsinki 14 December 1977
- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Waters Commission (1980)
- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)
- Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)

Agreement or arrangement is under development

No agreement or arrangement

If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.
Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

**Agreement on the diversion of the flow of water from lakes Garsjöen, Kjerringvatn and Förstevannene to the waterway of Gandvik instead of that of the River Näätämö (Neiden). Signed at Oslo 25 April 1951:**

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

   Yes ☑/No ☐

   If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

   Yes ☐/No ☑

   Additional explanations? The Agreement concerns diversion of water from three tributaries of the Neiden Basin into a different basin to accommodate a hydroelectric plant. The entire Neiden basin is not covered by the Agreement, only the relevant tributaries.

   Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

   Yes ☐/No ☑

   Additional explanations? [fill in]

   Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? *(Please list): Norway, Finland*

   (b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

   Yes ☐/No ☑

   If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

   (c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

   All water uses ☐

   A single water use or sector ☑

   Several water uses or sectors ☐

   *If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):*

   **Water uses or sectors**

   Industry ☐

   Agriculture ☐

   Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐

   Households ☐

   Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☑

   Fisheries ☐

   Tourism ☐

   Nature protection ☐

   Other *(please list):* [fill in]
(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures
- Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure

Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with
national laws, policies and programmes
Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
Lack of financial resources
Insufficient human capacity
Insufficient technical capacity
Tense diplomatic relations
Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
No significant difficulties
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? In addition to securing the necessary flow for the hydroelectric plant, the Agreement provides for the construction of a fish ladder that secures the ascent of salmon in the river.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume1257/volume1257-I-20621-English.pdf

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?
Yes ☐/No ☑

If no, why not? (please explain): The Agreement does not provide for the creation of joint bodies

**Agreement concerning fishing in the Näätämö (Neiden) fishing area (with related fishing regulations). Signed at Helsinki 14 December 1977:**

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☑/No ☐

Additional explanations? The Agreement is limited to the fishing area of the Neiden basin, which stretches as far as salmon can ascend.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☑/No ☐

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Finland

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☑️/No ☐
If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]
(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
   All water uses ☐
   A single water use or sector ☑️
   Several water uses or sectors ☐
If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors
   Industry ☐
   Agriculture ☐
   Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐
   Households ☐
   Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☐
   Fisheries ☑️
   Tourism ☐
   Nature protection ☐
   Other (please list): [fill in]
(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

   Procedural and institutional issues
   Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☐
   Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☐
   Consultation on planned measures ☐
   Mutual assistance ☐
   Topics of cooperation
   Joint vision and management objectives ☐
   Joint significant water management issues ☐
   Navigation ☐
   Human health ☐
   Environmental protection (ecosystem) ☐
   Water quality ☐
   Water quantity or allocation ☐
   Cooperation in addressing floods ☐
   Cooperation in addressing droughts ☐
   Climate change adaptation ☐
   Monitoring and exchange
Joint assessments □
Data collection and exchange □
Joint monitoring □
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories □
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives □
Common early warning and alarm procedures □
Exchange of experience between riparian States □
Exchange of information on planned measures □

**Joint planning and management**

Development of joint regulations on specific topics □
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans □
Management of shared infrastructure □
Development of shared infrastructure □
Other *(please list)*: [fill in] □

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes □
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes □
- Lack of financial resources □
- Insufficient human capacity □
- Insufficient technical capacity □
- Tense diplomatic relations □
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement □
- No significant difficulties □
- Other *(please describe)*: [fill in] □

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The Agreement establishes common fishing rules between Finland and Norway that ensures a sustainable fishery in the basin and an equitable apportionment of fish for the two states.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document *(please attach document or insert web address, if applicable)*: https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201215/Volume-1215-I-19588-English.pdf

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes □/No □
If no, why not? (please explain): The Agreement does not provide for the creation of joint bodies.

**Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Waters Commission:**

Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District; Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District – these agreements were reported above under the Tana Basin and will not be repeated here. These agreements cover the entire Neiden basin. The Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Waters Commission is the joint body, among other, for the Neiden basin.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑/No ☐

If yes, please provide further details: A joint management plan has been adopted for the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District in line with the requirements under the EU Water Framework Directive. This plan also covers Neiden.

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

- Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction.
- Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality
- Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals
- Water-related species and habitats protection

Other measures (please describe): The Neiden Basin and the Neiden fjord where it terminates, are protected under the National Salmon Rivers and Salmon Fjords protection programme. This programme restricts any activity or project that can pose a risk to its stocks of wild salmon.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑/No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

- More than once per year ☑
- Once per year ☐
- Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Finland and Norway conduct joint monitoring of the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District, this information is exchanged and updated regularly.
(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

- Environmental conditions ☑
- Research activities and application of best available techniques ☑
- Emission monitoring data ☑
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts ☑
- Point source pollution sources ☑
- Diffuse pollution sources ☑
- Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☑
- Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☑
- Water abstractions ☑
- Climatological information ☑
- Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development ☑
- Other subjects (please list): [fill in]
- Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?

Yes ☑ No ☑

(f) Is the database publicly available?

Yes ☑ No ☑

*If yes, please provide the web address:*

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?

- Frequency of exchanges ☐
- Timing of exchanges ☐
- Comparability of data and information ☑
- Limited spatial coverage ☐
- Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
- Other (please describe): [fill in]
- Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): To have a shared understanding of the risks and challenges in the basin, which inform the management of the watercourse through the River Basin District.

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑ No ☑

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?
Hydrological  Ecological  Chemical

Border surface waters

Surface waters in the entire basin

Surface waters on the main watercourse

Surface waters in part of the basin

Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)

Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations

Please describe: All monitoring in the basin is conducted in line with the requirements and practices of the EU Water Framework Directive, and data and samples are exchanged regularly based on agreed methodologies and parameters

Joint and agreed methodologies

Please describe: [fill in]

Joint sampling

Please describe: [fill in]

Common monitoring network

Please describe: [fill in]

Common agreed parameters

Please describe: [fill in]

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only; pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: The Transboundary Water Commission makes yearly assessments of the cooperation and management of the four watercourses it covers. The last such assessment was in June 2019.

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☒/No ☐
If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? The standards set by the EU Water Framework Directive

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

   Notification and communication [x]
   Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution [ ]
   Other (please list): [fill in]
   No measures [ ]

   If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

   Notification and communication [x]
   Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods [x]
   Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts [ ]
   Joint climate change adaptation strategy [ ]
   Joint disaster risk reduction strategy [ ]
   Other (please list): [fill in]
   No measures [ ]

   If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?

   Yes [x] No [ ]

   If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   Yes [x] No [ ]

   If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)
   Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism [ ]
   Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body [x]
   Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body [ ]

   If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism: [fill in]
   Intergovernmental organizations [ ]
   Private sectors organizations or associations [ ]
   Water user groups or associations [ ]
   Academic or research institutions [ ]
Other non-governmental organizations
General public
Other (please specify): [fill in]
Availability of information to the public
Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans
Public involvement
Other (please specify): The organisation of fishing right-holders on the Norwegian side of the basin are managing the fishing and sale of fishing licenses, in dialogue with the Finnish right-holders organisation.

Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Pasvik (Paatsjoki) Basin
List of the riparian States: Finland, Russia, Norway
In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:
Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
Confined aquifer connected to surface water
Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
Other
Please describe: [fill in]
Unknown
Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 6.8 %
1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force
Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians
Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s)
- Agreement between Norway and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Utilization of Water Power on the Pasvik River (1957)
- Agreement Regulating the Fishing and Conserving the Fish Stocks in the Grense Jacob River (Voriema) and Pasvik River (Paatsjoki) (1971)
- Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning Water Abstraction
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by Norway from the Upper Reservoir of the Borisglebsk Hydropower Plant at the Transboundary River Pasvik (1976)
- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Water Commission (1980); Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)
- Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)

Agreement or arrangement is under development □

No agreement or arrangement □

*If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation.*

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.

**Agreement between Norway and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Utilization of Water Power on the Pasvik River (1957):**

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? It only covers the area from the river mouth and up to the point 70.32 m above sea level where the river intersects the border. Finland is also a riparian to the Pasvik river, but not party to the Agreement.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes ☐/No ☒

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? *(Please list): Norway, Russia*

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses ☐

A single water use or sector ☒
Several water uses or sectors

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors
- Industry
- Agriculture
- Transport (e.g., navigation)
- Households
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Nature protection
- Other (please list): [fill in]

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies)
- Consultation on planned measures
- Mutual assistance

Topics of cooperation
- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

Monitoring and exchange
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures ☐
Exchange of experience between riparian States ☐
Exchange of information on planned measures ☒

**Joint planning and management**
Development of joint regulations on specific topics ☐
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans ☐
Management of shared infrastructure ☐
Development of shared infrastructure ☐
Other (*please list*): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes ☐
- Lack of financial resources ☐
- Insufficient human capacity ☐
- Insufficient technical capacity ☐
- Tense diplomatic relations ☐
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement ☐
- No significant difficulties ☒
- Other (*please describe*): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The Agreement provides both states with a possibility to make use of the hydropower potential of the watercourse's border section.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (*please attach document or insert web address, if applicable*): [insert web address]

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

*If no, why not? (please explain)*: The Agreement does not address the issue of joint management or joint bodies.

**Agreement regulating the Fishing and Conserving the Fish Stocks in the Grense Jacob River (Voriema) and Pasvik River (Paatsjoki) (1971):**
2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?

Yes √/No □

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?

Yes √/No □

Additional explanations? The Agreement covers the lower part of the Pasvik River, and most of the Jacobs River. Finland is a riparian to the Pasvik River, but not party to the Agreement.

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?

Yes □/No √

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Russia

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes □/No √

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

All water uses □

A single water use or sector √

Several water uses or sectors □

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors

Industry □

Agriculture □

Transport (e.g., navigation) □

Households □

Energy: hydropower and other energy types □

Fisheries √

Tourism □

Nature protection □

Other (please list): [fill in]

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues

Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution □

Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) □

Consultation on planned measures □
Mutual assistance

**Topics of cooperation**
- Joint vision and management objectives
- Joint significant water management issues
- Navigation
- Human health
- Environmental protection (ecosystem)
- Water quality
- Water quantity or allocation
- Cooperation in addressing floods
- Cooperation in addressing droughts
- Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
- Joint assessments
- Data collection and exchange
- Joint monitoring
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
- Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
- Common early warning and alarm procedures
- Exchange of experience between riparian States
- Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
- Development of joint regulations on specific topics
- Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
- Management of shared infrastructure
- Development of shared infrastructure
- Other *(please list)*: [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
Tense diplomatic relations □
Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement □
No significant difficulties ☒
Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The Agreement provides common fishing rules than ensures sustainable fisheries and an equitable access for each State to fish.

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document (please attach document or insert web address, if applicable): https://www.nb.no/items/URN:NBN:no-nb_digibok_2016061748044?page=1029 (page 1026)

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If no, why not? (please explain): The Agreement does not provide for the creation of joint bodies

**Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of the union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning Watr Abstraction by Norway from the Upper Reservoir of the Borisglebsk Hydropower Plant at the Transboundary River Pasvik (1976):**

2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States?
Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? The Agreement only covers a small area of the watercourse

Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes ☒/No ☐

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): Norway, Russia

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?
Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?
All water uses ☒
A single water use or sector ☑
Several water uses or sectors ☐

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

Water uses or sectors
- Industry ☐
- Agriculture ☐
- Transport (e.g., navigation) ☐
- Households ☐
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types ☑
- Fisheries ☐
- Tourism ☐
- Nature protection ☐
- Other (please list): [fill in] ☐

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

Procedural and institutional issues
- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution ☐
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) ☐
- Consultation on planned measures ☐
- Mutual assistance ☐

Topics of cooperation
- Joint vision and management objectives ☐
- Joint significant water management issues ☐
- Navigation ☐
- Human health ☐
- Environmental protection (ecosystem) ☐
- Water quality ☐
- Water quantity or allocation ☑
- Cooperation in addressing floods ☐
- Cooperation in addressing droughts ☐
- Climate change adaptation ☐

Monitoring and exchange
- Joint assessments ☐
- Data collection and exchange ☐
- Joint monitoring ☐
- Maintenance of joint pollution inventories ☐
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure
Other *(please list)*: [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?
   - Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
   - Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
   - Lack of financial resources
   - Insufficient human capacity
   - Insufficient technical capacity
   - Tense diplomatic relations
   - Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
   - No significant difficulties
   - Other *(please describe)*: [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The Agreement ensures that both States can make use of the hydropower potential in the watercourse

(g) Please attach a copy of the agreement or arrangement or provide the web address of the document *(please attach document or insert web address, if applicable)*: https://www.nb.no/items/URN:NBN:no-nb_digibok_2016061748044?page=1963 (page 1960)

3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If no, why not? (please explain)*: The Agreement does not provide for the creation of joint bodies

**Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Water Commission; Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District; Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin**
District: see reporting under the Tana basin (above). These agreements cover part of the Pasvik basin and the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin Commission is the joint body for bilateral cooperation of Norway and Finland on the Pasvik basin, among other basins.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   Yes ☑/No ☐

   If yes, please provide further details: Joint management plans have been created for the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District, in line with the requirements in the EU Water Framework Directive

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

   Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction.
   Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality
   Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals
   Water-related species and habitats protection
   Other measures (please describe): [fill in]

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   Yes ☑/No ☐

   (b) If yes, how often:

      More than once per year ☐
      Once per year ☐
      Less than once per year ☐

   (c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Information is exchanged with Finland through the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District cooperation.

   (d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

      Environmental conditions ☑
      Research activities and application of best available techniques ☑
      Emission monitoring data ☑
      Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts ☑
      Point source pollution sources ☑
      Diffuse pollution sources ☑
      Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☑
Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☒
Water abstractions ☒
Climatological information ☒
Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development ☒
Other subjects (please list): [fill in]
Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?
Yes ☐ No ☒
(f) Is the database publicly available?
Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, please provide the web address: [fill in]*

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?
Frequency of exchanges ☐
Timing of exchanges ☐
Comparability of data and information ☒
Limited spatial coverage ☐
Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
Other (please describe): [fill in]
Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): [fill in]

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☒ No ☐

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please describe [fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations

*Please describe:* All monitoring in the basin is conducted in line with the requirements and practices of the EU Water Framework Directive, and data and samples are exchanged regularly based on agreed methodologies and parameters

Joint and agreed methodologies

*Please describe:* [fill in]

Joint sampling

*Please describe:* [fill in]

Common monitoring network

*Please describe:* [fill in]

Common agreed parameters

*Please describe:* [fill in]

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒ / No ☐

*If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: The Transboundary Water Commission makes an assessment of the cooperation and management of the four watercourses it covers, at its yearly meeting. The last such meeting was in June 2019.*

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☒ / No ☐

*If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? The standards of the Water Framework Directive*

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

Notification and communication

Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution

Other (please list): [fill in]
11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

- Notification and communication
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts
- Joint climate change adaptation strategy
- Joint disaster risk reduction strategy
- Other (please list): [fill in]

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?

Yes ☑ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑ No ☐

If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)

- Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism
- Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body ☑
- Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body

If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism: [fill in]

- Intergovernmental organizations
- Private sectors organizations or associations
- Water user groups or associations
- Academic or research institutions
- Other non-governmental organizations
- General public
- Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public ☑
Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans

^15 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Public involvement

Other (please specify): [fill in]

Name of the transboundary basin,-sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Munkelva (Uutanjoki) Basin

List of the riparian States: Finland, Norway

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake

Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water

Confined aquifer connected to surface water

Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water

Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 42.8 %

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force

Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force

Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s)

- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian Transboundary Waters Commission (1980)
- Agreement concerning the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)
- Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the Agreement on the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District (2014)

Agreement or arrangement is under development

No agreement or arrangement

If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]

If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.

All agreements are reported under the Tana Basin section (above). These agreements cover the entire Munkelva basin. The Finnish-Norwegian River Basin Commission is the joint body for this basin, among other basins.
4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide further details: A joint management plan has been created for the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District, in line with the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive.

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

- Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction.
- Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality
- Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals
- Water-related species and habitats protection
- Other measures (please describe): [fill in]

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

- More than once per year ☒
- Once per year ☐
- Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Information is exchanged through the cooperation over the Finnish-Norwegian River Basin District.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

- Environmental conditions ☒
- Research activities and application of best available techniques ☐
- Emission monitoring data ☒
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts ☒
- Point source pollution sources ☒
- Diffuse pollution sources ☒
- Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☒
- Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☒
- Water abstractions ☒
- Climatological information ☒
Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development

Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?

Yes ☐ No ☒

(f) Is the database publicly available?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, please provide the web address: [fill in]*

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?

- Frequency of exchanges ☐
- Timing of exchanges ☐
- Comparability of data and information ☒
- Limited spatial coverage ☐
- Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): Data exchange allows for better management and coordinated efforts to protect and preserve the watercourse

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒ No ☐

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please describe [fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations

Please describe: All monitoring in the basin is conducted in line with the requirements and practices of the EU Water Framework Directive, and data and samples are exchanged regularly based on agreed methodologies and parameters

Joint and agreed methodologies

Please describe: [fill in]

Joint sampling

Please describe: [fill in]

Common monitoring network

Please describe: [fill in]

Common agreed parameters

Please describe: [fill in]

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☑ No ☐

If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: The Transboundary Water Commission makes yearly assessments of the four watercourses it covers. The last such assessment was in June 2019.

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☑ No ☐

If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? The Standards of the Water Framework Directive

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

Notification and communication ☑

Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐

Other (please list): [fill in]

No measures ☐

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?
Notification and communication
Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods ✗
Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts
Joint climate change adaptation strategy
Joint disaster risk reduction strategy
Other (please list): [fill in]
No measures

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?
Yes ☐ No ✗
If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ✗ No ☐
If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)
Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism ☐
Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body ✗
Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body ☐
If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism: [fill in]

Intergovernmental organizations ☐
Private sectors organizations or associations ☐
Water user groups or associations ☐
Academic or research institutions ☐
Other non-governmental organizations ☐
General public ☐
Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public ✓
Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans16 ✓
Public involvement ✓
Other (please specify): [fill in]

16 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Grense Jakobselv (Voriema) Basin (also sometimes referred to as Jakobselva)  
List of the riparian States: Norway, Russia  
In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin: 
- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake  
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water  
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water  
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water  
- Other  
Please describe: [fill in]  
Unknown  
Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 3.73%  
Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? 
- One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force  
- Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force  
- Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians  
Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s) - Agreement Regulating the Fishing and Conserving the Fish Stocks in the Grense Jakob River (Voriema) and Pasvik River (Paatsjoki) (1971)  
Agreement or arrangement is under development  
No agreement or arrangement  
If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: [fill in]  
If there is no agreement or arrangement and no joint body or mechanism for the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins then jump to question 4; if there is no agreement or arrangement, but a joint body or mechanism then go to question 3.  
Questions 2 and 3 to be completed for each bilateral or multilateral agreement or arrangement in force in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins.  
2. (a) Does this agreement or arrangement specify the area subject to cooperation? 
- Yes ☒/No ☐  
If yes, does it cover the entire basin or group of basins and all riparian States? 
- Yes ☒/No ☐  
Additional explanations?  
Or, if the agreement or arrangement relates to a sub-basin, does it cover the entire sub-basin?
Yes □/No □

Additional explanations? [fill in]

Which States (including your own) are bound by the agreement or arrangement? (Please list): **Norway, Russia**

(b) If the agreement or arrangement relates to a river or lake basin or sub-basin, does it also cover aquifers?

Yes □/No ☒

If yes, please list the aquifers covered by the agreement or arrangement: [fill in]

(c) What is the sectoral scope of the agreement or arrangement?

- All water uses □
- A single water use or sector ☒
- Several water uses or sectors □

If one or several water uses or sectors, please list (check as appropriate):

**Water uses or sectors**

- Industry □
- Agriculture □
- Transport (e.g., navigation) □
- Households □
- Energy: hydropower and other energy types □
- Fisheries ☒
- Tourism □
- Nature protection □
- Other (please list): [fill in] □

(d) What topics or subjects of cooperation are included in the agreement or arrangement?

**Procedural and institutional issues**

- Dispute and conflict prevention and resolution □
- Institutional cooperation (joint bodies) □
- Consultation on planned measures □
- Mutual assistance □

**Topics of cooperation**

- Joint vision and management objectives □
- Joint significant water management issues □
- Navigation □
- Human health □
- Environmental protection (ecosystem) □
- Water quality □
Water quantity or allocation
Cooperation in addressing floods
Cooperation in addressing droughts
Climate change adaptation

**Monitoring and exchange**
Joint assessments
Data collection and exchange
Joint monitoring
Maintenance of joint pollution inventories
Elaboration of joint water quality objectives
Common early warning and alarm procedures
Exchange of experience between riparian States
Exchange of information on planned measures

**Joint planning and management**
Development of joint regulations on specific topics
Development of international or joint river, lake or aquifer basin management or action plans
Management of shared infrastructure
Development of shared infrastructure
Other (please list): [fill in]

(e) What are the main difficulties and challenges that your country faces with the agreement or arrangement and its implementation, if any?

- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with national laws, policies and programmes
- Aligning implementation of agreement or arrangement with regional laws, policies and programmes
- Lack of financial resources
- Insufficient human capacity
- Insufficient technical capacity
- Tense diplomatic relations
- Non-participation of certain riparian countries in the agreement
- No significant difficulties

Other (please describe): [fill in]

(f) What are the main achievements in implementing the agreement or arrangement and what were the keys to achieving such success? The Agreement sets joint fishing rules on both sides of the border, which ensures equitable and sustainable fishery.
3. Is your country a member of any joint body or mechanism for this agreement or arrangement?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

*If no, why not? (please explain):* The Agreement does not provide for the creation of such joint bodies.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☐ / No ☒

*If yes, please provide further details: [fill in]*

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

- Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction. ☐
- Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality ☐
- Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals ☒
- Water-related species and habitats protection ☒

*Other measures (please describe):* The basin is protected under Norwegian environmental legislation.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒ / No ☐

(b) If yes, how often:

- More than once per year ☐
- Once per year ☒
- Less than once per year ☐

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Information is exchanged through various regional projects.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

- Environmental conditions ☒
- Research activities and application of best available techniques ☐
- Emission monitoring data ☐
- Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce ☐
transboundary impacts ☒
Point source pollution sources ☐
Diffuse pollution sources ☐
Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) ☐
Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) ☐
Water abstractions ☐
Climatological information ☐
Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development ☒

Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?
Yes ☐ No ☒

(f) Is the database publicly available?
Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please provide the web address: [fill in]

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?
Frequency of exchanges ☐
Timing of exchanges ☐
Comparability of data and information ☐
Limited spatial coverage ☐
Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
Other (please describe):
Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): [fill in]

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☐ No ☒

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrological</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
<td>[fill in]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

- National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations
  
  *Please describe: [fill in]*

- Joint and agreed methodologies
  
  *Please describe: [fill in]*

- Joint sampling
  
  *Please describe: [fill in]*

- Common monitoring network
  
  *Please describe: [fill in]*

- Common agreed parameters
  
  *Please describe: [fill in]*

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: [fill in]*

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? [fill in]*

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

  - Notification and communication ☐
  - Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution ☐
11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?

- Notification and communication
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods
- Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts
- Joint climate change adaptation strategy
- Joint disaster risk reduction strategy
- Other (please list): [fill in]

If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)

- Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism
- Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body
- Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body

If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism: [fill in]

- Intergovernmental organizations
- Private sectors organizations or associations
- Water user groups or associations
- Academic or research institutions
- Other non-governmental organizations
- General public
- Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public ☒

Consultation on planned measures or river basin
Management plans\(^{17}\)  
Public involvement  
Other (please specify): [fill in]

Name of the transboundary basin-, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: Torneelva/Torne älv/Tornionjoki

List of the riparian States: Finland, Sweden, Norway

In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: 1.98%

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

- One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force
- Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
- Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s)

- Agreement or arrangement is under development
- No agreement or arrangement

If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: There is no agreement that covers Norway's small part of the Tornionjoki's drainage basin. In Finland and Sweden, the basin is covered by the 'Agreement between Finland and Sweden concerning Transboundary River and 'Fishing Rule for the Tornionjoki Fishing District'

Since Norway is not party to the agreements in the Tornionjoki basin or participant in the frontier rivers commission, questions 2 and 3 will not be addressed.

\(^{17}\) Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Questions 4-13 will be answered from Norway's perspective, although this may differ from the Finnish and Swedish responses to the same questions.

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, please provide further details: [fill in]

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction. [ ]

Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality [ ]

Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms, heavy metals [ ]

Water-related species and habitats protection [ ]

Other measures (please describe): The small Norwegian part of the basin is protected by the general environmental legislation in Norway.

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, how often:

More than once per year [ ]

Once per year [ ]

Less than once per year [ ]

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): Information is exchanged in connection with regular meetings on water cooperation.

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?

Environmental conditions [ ]

Research activities and application of best available techniques [ ]

Emission monitoring data [ ]

Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts [ ]

Point source pollution sources [ ]

Diffuse pollution sources [ ]

Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.) [ ]

Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels) [ ]

Water abstractions [ ]
Climatological information

Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development

Other subjects (please list): [fill in]

Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?
Yes ☐/No ☒

(f) Is the database publicly available?
Yes ☐/No ☒

If yes, please provide the web address: [fill in]

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?
- Frequency of exchanges ☐
- Timing of exchanges ☐
- Comparability of data and information ☐
- Limited spatial coverage ☐
- Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial) ☐
- Other (please describe): [fill in]

Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): [fill in]

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☐/No ☒

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please describe [fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint and agreed methodologies

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Joint sampling

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common monitoring network

*Please describe: [fill in]*

Common agreed parameters

*Please describe: [fill in]*

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]

(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwater only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: [fill in]*

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?

Yes ☐ No ☒

*If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? All three riparians are bound by the standards imposed by the Water Framework Directive.*

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?

Notification and communication

Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution

Other (please list): [fill in]

No measures ☒

*If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: Such measures follow from national legislation, but as Norway is not part of the cooperation in the Ternionjoki basin, it has not implemented any common measures with the other riparian States.*

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?
Notification and communication  □
Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods  □
Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts  □
Joint climate change adaptation strategy  □
Joint disaster risk reduction strategy  □
Other (please list): [fill in]
No measures  ☒
If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?
   Yes ☐ No ☒
   If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)
   Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body or mechanism  □
   Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body  □
   Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body  □
   If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism: [fill in]
   Intergovernmental organizations  □
   Private sectors organizations or associations  □
   Water user groups or associations  □
   Academic or research institutions  □
   Other non-governmental organizations  □
   General public  □
   Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public  ☒
Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans18  ☒
Public involvement  ☒
Other (please specify): [fill in]

---

18 Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
Name of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins: **Basins in the region Troms og Finnmark**

List of the riparian States: Norway and Finland

**In the case of an aquifer, what is the nature of the aquifer and its relation with the river or lake basin:**

- Unconfined aquifer connected to a river or lake
- Unconfined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Confined aquifer connected to surface water
- Confined aquifer with no or limited relation with surface water
- Other

Please describe: [fill in]

Unknown

**Percentage of your country’s territory within the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins:**

- Skibotn basin: 91.1% (693 km² of 760 km²)
- Reisa basin: 99.5% (2,690 km² of 2,703 km²)
- Alta basin: 99% (7,312 km² of 7,384 km²)

1. Is there one or more transboundary (bilateral or multilateral) agreement(s) or arrangement(s) on this basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   - One or more agreements or arrangements exist and are in force
   - Agreement or arrangement developed but not in force
   - Agreement or arrangement developed, but not in force for all riparians

   Please insert the name of the agreement(s) or arrangement(s) [fill in]

   - Agreement or arrangement is under development
   - No agreement or arrangement

   *If there is no agreement or arrangement or it is not in force, please explain briefly why not and provide information on any plans to address the situation: The Finnish shares of these basins are so small that it has not been necessary to regulate any Finnish use of the waters in a bilateral agreement.*

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

   - Yes
   - No

   *If yes, please provide further details: [fill in]*

5. How is the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins protected, including the protection of ecosystems, in the context of sustainable and rational water use?

   - Regulation of urbanization, deforestation, and sand and gravel extraction.
   - Environmental flow norms, including consideration of levels and seasonality
   - Water quality protection, e.g. nitrates, pesticides, faecal coliforms,
heavy metals
Water-related species and habitats protection
Other measures (please describe): The basins are protected under general Norwegian environmental law

6. (a) Does your country regularly exchange information and data with other riparian States in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
Yes ☐ No ☑

(b) If yes, how often:
   - More than once per year
   - Once per year
   - Less than once per year

(c) Please describe how information is exchanged (e.g. in connection with meetings of joint bodies): [fill in]

(d) If yes, on what subjects are information and data exchanged?
   - Environmental conditions
   - Research activities and application of best available techniques
   - Emission monitoring data
   - Planned measures taken to prevent, control or reduce transboundary impacts
   - Point source pollution sources
   - Diffuse pollution sources
   - Existing hydromorphological alterations (dams, etc.)
   - Flows or water levels (including groundwater levels)
   - Water abstractions
   - Climatological information
   - Future planned measures with transboundary impacts, such as infrastructure development
   - Other subjects (please list): [fill in]
   - Other comments, e.g. spatial coverage of data and information exchange: [fill in]

(e) Is there a shared database or information platform?
Yes ☐ No ☑

(f) Is the database publicly available?
Yes ☐ No ☑

If yes, please provide the web address: [fill in]

(g) What are the main difficulties and challenges to data exchange, if applicable?
   - Frequency of exchanges
   - Timing of exchanges
Comparability of data and information

Limited spatial coverage

Inadequate resources (technical and/or financial)

Other (please describe): [fill in]

Additional comments: [fill in]

(h) What are the main benefits of data exchange on the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? (please describe): [fill in]

7. Do the riparian States carry out joint monitoring in the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?

Yes ☐ No ☒

(a) If yes, what does the joint monitoring cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrological</th>
<th>Ecological</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border surface waters</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in the entire basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters on the main watercourse</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface waters in part of the basin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

please describe [fill in]

Transboundary aquifer(s) (connected or unconnected) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Aquifer(s) in the territory of one riparian hydraulically connected to a transboundary river or lake | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

(b) If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?

National monitoring stations connected through a network or common stations | ☐ |

Please describe: [fill in]

Joint and agreed methodologies | ☐ |

Please describe: [fill in]

Joint sampling | ☐ |

Please describe: [fill in]

Common monitoring network | ☐ |

Please describe: [fill in]

Common agreed parameters | ☐ |

Please describe: [fill in]

(c) Please describe the main achievements regarding joint monitoring, if any: [fill in]
(d) Please describe any difficulties experienced with joint monitoring: [fill in]

8. Do the riparian States carry out joint assessment of the transboundary basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
   Yes □ No ☒
   If yes, please provide the date of the last or only assessment, the frequency and scope (e.g., surface waters or groundwaters only, pollution sources, etc.) of the assessment, and assessment methodology applied: [fill in]

9. Have the riparian States agreed to use joint water quality standards?
   Yes □ No ☒
   If yes, what standards have been applied, e.g. international or regional standards (please specify which), or have national standards of the riparian States been applied? [fill in]

10. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of accidental pollution?
    Notification and communication □
    Coordinated or joint early warning or alarm system for accidental water pollution □
    Other (please list): [fill in]
    No measures ☒
    If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

11. What are the measures implemented to prevent or limit the transboundary impact of extreme weather events and climate change?
    Notification and communication □
    Coordinated or joint alarm system for floods □
    Coordinated or joint alarm system for droughts □
    Joint climate change adaptation strategy □
    Joint disaster risk reduction strategy □
    Other (please list): [fill in]
    No measures ☒
    If not, why not? What difficulties does your country face in putting in place such measures?: [fill in]

12. Are procedures in place for mutual assistance in case of a critical situation?
    Yes □ No ☒
    If yes, please provide a brief summary: [fill in]

13. Are the public or relevant stakeholders involved in transboundary water management in the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins?
    Yes ☒ No □
    If yes, how? (please tick all applicable)
    Stakeholders have observer status in a joint body
or mechanism

Stakeholders have an advisory role in the joint body

Stakeholders have a decision-making role in the joint body

*If yes, please specify the stakeholders for the joint body or mechanism:* 
[fill in]

- Intergovernmental organizations
- Private sectors organizations or associations
- Water user groups or associations
- Academic or research institutions
- Other non-governmental organizations
- General public
- Other (please specify): [fill in]

Availability of information to the public

Consultation on planned measures or river basin management plans\(^{19}\)

Public involvement

Other *(please specify)*: [fill in]

---

\(^{19}\) Or, where applicable, aquifer management plans.
III. Water management at the national level

In this section, you are requested to provide general information on water management at the national level as it relates to transboundary waters. Information on specific transboundary basins, sub-basins, part of basins and groups of basins, should be presented in section II and not repeated here.

1. (a) Does your country’s national legislation, policies, action plans and strategies refer to measures to prevent, control and reduce any transboundary impact?

   Yes ☒ / No □

   If yes, please briefly describe the main national laws, policies, action plans and strategies:
   - The 1981 Pollution Control Act
     (https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/pollution-control-act/id171893/)
   - The 2000 Water Resources Act
   - The 2009 Nature Diversity Act
     (https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/nature-diversity-act/id570549/)
   - The 2008 Planning and Building Act
     (https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/planning-building-act/id570450/)

(b) Does your country’s legislation provide for the following principles?

   - Precautionary principle  Yes ☒ / No □
   - Polluter pays principle  Yes ☒ / No □
   - Sustainable development  Yes ☒ / No □
   - User pays principle  Yes ☒ / No □

   If yes, please briefly describe how these principles are implemented at the national level: The principles are incorporated in the Nature Diversity Act as principles for official decision making. The principles are applied as guidelines and the application of these principles are to be included in each decision.

(c) Does your country have a national licensing or permitting system for wastewater discharges and other point source pollution? (e.g., in industry, mining, energy, municipal, wastewater management or other sectors)?

   Yes ☒ / No □
If yes, for which sectors?

- Industry
- Mining
- Energy
- Municipal
- Livestock raising
- Aquaculture
- Other (please list): Wastewater

Please briefly describe the licensing or permitting system, indicating whether the system provides for setting emission limits based on best available technology?

The licensing system sets emission limits based on best available technology.

If yes, for which sectors? (please list):

Applicable to all sectors with a licensing system

If not, please explain why not (giving the most important reasons) or provide information if there are plans to introduce a licensing or permitting system: [fill in]

Are the authorized discharges monitored and controlled?

Yes ☒/No ☐

If yes, how? (Please tick the ones applicable):

- Monitoring of discharges
- Monitoring of physical and chemical impacts on water
- Monitoring of ecological impacts on water
- Conditions on permits
- Inspectorate
- Other means (please list): [fill in]

If your country does not have a discharge monitoring system, please explain why not or provide information if there are plans to introduce a discharge monitoring system: [fill in]

What are the main measures which your country takes to reduce diffuse sources of water pollution on transboundary waters (e.g., from agriculture, transport, forestry or aquaculture)? The measures listed below relate to agriculture, but other sectors may be more significant. Please be sure to include these under “others”:

Legislative measures

- Norm for uses of fertilizers
- Norms for uses of manure
- Permitting system
Bans on or norms for use of pesticides
Others (please list): [fill in]

Economic and financial measures
Monetary incentives
Environmental taxes (such as fertilizer taxes)
Others (please list): [fill in]

Agricultural extension services

Technical measures
Source control measures
Crop rotation
Tillage control
Winter cover crops
Others (please list): [fill in]

Other measures
Buffer/filter strips
Wetland reconstruction
Sedimentation traps
Chemical measures
Others (please list): [fill in]

Other types of measures

If yes, please list: [fill in]

(f) What are the main measures which your country takes to enhance water resources allocation and use efficiency?

Please tick as appropriate (not all might be relevant)
A regulatory system regarding water abstraction
Monitoring and control of abstractions
Water rights are defined
Water allocation priorities are listed
Water-saving technologies
Advanced irrigation techniques
Demand management activities
Other means (please list)

(g) Does your country apply the ecosystems approach?
Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please describe how:

• The Nature Diversity Act's aim is to protect the function, structure and productivity of ecosystems, within reason.

• There is a Norwegian Action Plan for Biodiversity (2015), which seeks to maintain well-functioning ecosystem services in order to address issues such as climate change mitigation, protection of endangered species, and improve knowledge.

(h) Does your country take specific measures to prevent the pollution of groundwaters?

Yes ☒/No ☐

*If yes, please briefly describe the most important measures:*

• Emissions to groundwater is strictly controlled and regulated, and there are few cases where emissions to groundwater are permitted.

2. Do your national laws require transboundary environmental impact assessment (EIA)?

Yes ☒/No ☐

*If yes, please briefly describe the legislative basis, and any related implementing procedures.*

• The following directives have been implemented in Norwegian legislation:
  o Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA)
  o Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment

*If not, do other measures provide for transboundary EIA? [fill in]*

IV. Final questions

1. What are the main challenges your country faces in cooperating on transboundary waters?

   Differences between national administrative and legal frameworks ☒
   Lack of relevant data and information ☐
   Difficulties in data and information exchange ☐
   Sectoral fragmentation at the national level ☐
   Language barrier ☐
   Resource constraints ☐
   Environmental pressures, e.g. extreme events ☐
Sovereignty concerns

Please list other challenges and/or provide further details: Some transboundary basins lack institutionalised cooperation, which means that no formal procedures for information exchange etc. are in place. Yet, we do have very good relations to our neighbour States, and a close dialogue on issues concerning our transboundary watercourses. We would therefore underline that transboundary water cooperation is taking place, although it may not always fulfil the formal requirements highlighted through this questionnaire.

2. What have been the main achievements in-cooperating on transboundary waters?

- Improved water management
- Enhanced regional integration, i.e. beyond water
- Adoption of cooperative arrangements
- Adoption of joint plans and programmes
- Long-lasting and sustained cooperation
- Financial support for joint activities
- Stronger political will for transboundary water cooperation
- Better knowledge and understanding
- Dispute avoidance
- Stakeholder engagement

Please list other achievements, keys to achieving success, and/or provide concrete examples: [fill in]

3. Please indicate which institutions were consulted during the completion of the questionnaire

- Joint body or mechanism
- Other riparian or aquifer countries
- National water management authority
- Environment agency/authority
- Basin authority (national)
- Local or provincial government
- Geological survey (national)
- Non-water specific ministries, e.g. foreign affairs, finance, forestry and energy
- Civil society organizations
- Water user associations
- Private sector

Other (please list): [fill in]

Please briefly describe the process by which the questionnaire was completed: The questionnaire has been completed in cooperation between the Norwegian Environment Agency and the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment. We’ve had consultations with Finnish and Swedish colleagues, and gathered information from regional authorities and cooperation bodies.
4. If you have any other comments please add them here *(insert comments)*: [fill in]

5. Name and contact details of the person(s) who filled out the questionnaire *(please insert)*:

   Julie Gjørtz Howden, Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment
   (julie-gjortz.howden@kld.dep.no) – Part II: Finnish-Norwegian and Norwegian-Russian basins, Part IV.

   Sunniva Hartmann, Norwegian Environment Agency,
   (Sunniva.hartmann@miljodir.no) – Part II: Norwegian-Swedish basins, Part III.

   Dag Rosland, Norwegian Environment Agency
   (dag.rosland@miljodir.no) – Part I.

Date: Oslo, 14. December 2020 Signature: Julie Gjørtz Howden
Avtale om samarbeid i 2018-2020 mellom Havs- og vattenmyndigheten (Sverige) og Miljødirektoratet (Norge) om vannforvaltning etter EUs rammedirektiv for vann.

0. Bakgrunn

Både Norge og Sverige gjennomfører EUs rammedirektiv for vann. De to landene har liknende naturtyper og arter, samt påvirkninger og utfordringer. Landene har derfor samme behov for kunnskapsgrunnlag og forvaltningsverktøy for å sikre en god og effektiv vannforvaltning. Gjennom samarbeid kan man få tilgang til mer ressurser, mer omfattende kunnskapsgrunnlag og erfaringer, samt bredere ekspertise, slik at landene kan utnytte hverandres styrker.

På et møte mellom direktørene for de to institusjonene 12. september 2017, gikk man igjennom potensielle samarbeidsområder som kan gi synergier for å oppnå bedre resultater og mer effektiv ressursbruk for begge land. Hensikten med samarbeidet er å skape felles forutsetninger og prinsipper, gjensidig forståelse og utnytte synergier i de to myndighetenes arbeid.

Samarbeidet må baseres på aktiv kontakt slik at ressurser kan utnyttes effektivt, det må skapes arenaer for felles utvikling av metoder, verktøy og veiledning, samt muligheter for å dele ressurser, modeller, referansestasjoner og data. I arbeidet med utvikling av metoder og verktøy kan det være hensiktsmessig å nitiere fellesfinansierede FoU-prosjekter der relevante svenske og norske forskere samarbeider. Det norsk-svenske samarbeidet må sees i sammenheng med det europeiske CIS-arbeidet der begge land deltar.

Møtet konkluderte med at samarbeidet i 2018 - 2020 skal fokusere på følgende områder:

1. Bærekraftig vannkraft og hydromorfologi

Målet er å sammen utvikle en felles forståelsen av bærekraftig vannkraft basert på god praksis, herunder å få en så felles tolkning og forvaltningspraksis som mulig av Sterkt Modifiserte Vannforekomster, Godt Økologisk Potensial og Mindre Streng Milljømål, samt å utvikle god praksis for tiltak i regulerte vassdrag innenfor våre myndighetsområder.

Begge land har betydelig vannkraftproduksjon, og vannkraftbransjen opererer på tvers av landegrensen. Arbeidet må sees i sammenheng med en forståelse av vannkraftens betydning og samfunnsnytte i det enkelte land og i det felles elektrisitetsmarkedet, og respektere forskjellen mellom regelverk og forvaltning i Norge og Sverige. Avgrensning mot andre myndigheters ansvarsområder i det enkelte land må hensyntas.

Tema som prioriteres i 2018:

- Erfaringsutveksling om vurdering av økologiske konsekvenser av vassdragsregulering og effekter av annen hydromorfologisk påvirkning i elver, innsjøer og kystvann.
- Erfaringsutveksling om god og innovativ praksis med tiltak for å forhindre, restaurere eller avbøte negative miljøeffekter av vannkraft og andre vassdragsinngrep.
Mulige tema fremover:

- Samarbeide om effektiv miljøovervåking og kartlegging, særlig bruk av nye metoder (fjernmåling etc).
- Erfaringsutveksling knyttet til sektorsamarbeid, gjennomføring og veiledning.
- Videre samarbeid om forskning og utvikling knyttet til sammenhengen mellom økologi og hydromorfologi for elver, innsjøer og kystvann.
- Felles veiledning og prinsipper for gode tiltak for bærekraftig vassdragsregulering, med regelmessige norsk-svenske fagsamlinger for å dele erfaringer og gode eksempler.

2. Miljøovervåking og kartlegging

Målet er å få en så harmonisert gjennomføring av vanndirektivet som mulig, og en effektiv utnyttelse av ressurser i form av referansestasjoner, data og ekspertise.

Det er en stor oppgave å utvikle gode overvåkingsmetoder, klassifiseringssystemer og tilhørende verktøy. Landene har mange I ke vann typer, som gir mulighet for å utnytte et større felles data- og referansegrunnlag.

Tema som prioriteres i 2018:

- Harmonisering av prinsipper for inndeling av vannforekomster (inkludert grensekryssende nedbørfelt).
- Utvikle etterprøvbare prinsipper for gruppering av vannforekomster for representativ overvåking.
- Videre harmonisering av klassegrenser for fysisk-kjemiske kvalitetselementer.
- Felles videre utvikling av klassifiseringssystemer (supplerende interkalibrering), særlig for ferskvannsfisk.

Mulige tema fremover:

- Felles utvikling av effektiv miljøovervåking og karakterisering, særlig bruk av nye metoder (fjernmåling, ekkolodd etc.) og modeller.
- Bedre samordning av referanseovervåking, særlig knyttet til klimaendringer og allestedsnærvarende stoffer.
- Bedre samordning av overvåking og tilstandsvurdering i grensekryssende nedbørfelt.

3. Annet løpende samarbeide

Pågående samarbeid skal videreføres det hvor dette er til nytte i form av bedre resultater og mer effektiv ressursbruk:

- Grensekryssende nedbørfelt: oppfylle vanndirektivets krav til mest mulig samløs forvaltning av internasjonale vannregioner.
- Forsuring og kalking: felles konferanser, og utvikling av erfaringer med nedtrapping av kalking
- Europeisk arbeid: samordning av posisjoner der vi har felles interesser, særlig knyttet til vurdering og revisjon av direktivet.
- Overvåking: store innsjøer.
- Havmiljøforvaltning: dialog og erfaringsutveksling knyttet til OSPAR, EUs havdirektiv og norske forvaltningsplaner for havområdene.
- Marint søppel: dialog og erfaringsutveksling knyttet til kunnskap og forvaltning.
- Vannforvaltning i internasjonal bistand: kontakt for å vurdere synergier og unngå dobbeltarbeid.
4. Gjennomføring, rapportering og styring

For de prioriterte samarbeidsområdene avholdes 1-2 møter årlig, med sirkulerende vertskap, med løpende kontakt på e-post og Skype imellom.

Dersom det etableres fellesfinansierte FoU-prosjekter, skal HaV og Miljødirektoratet styre slike prosjekter gjennom felles styringsgrupper.

Ved behov kan også andre relevante myndigheter og ekspertenter inviteres inn. Det må også vurderes om andre relevante land bør inviteres inn på enkelte tema.

Resultater og framdrift i samarbeidet rapporteres til direktørene i et årlig møte, med sirkulerende vertskap. I møtet vurderer direktørene behov for å justere hensikt, mål og ressursinnsats i samarbeidet for kommende år, og oppdaterer prioriteringer for kommende år. Samarbeidet avsluttes når partene er enige om at det ikke lenger er behov for det.

Dato

13/3-18

Underskrift

Ellen Hambro, Direktør

Datum

19/3 2018

Underskrift

Jakob Granit, Generaldirektør
Gränsvatten

Norge och Sverige

Strategi för internationellt samarbete
Bakgrund

Det finns sju vattendistrikt/vannregioner med vattenförekomster som korsar riksgrens mellan Norge och Sverige (Figuur 1). Situationen mellan Norge och Sverige är att riksgrens mellan de flesta riken följer toppen av fjällkedjan, och därmed vattendelaren. De flesta gränsöverskridande vattenområdena har 93 % eller mer av sin areal i det land som ligger nedströms gränsen. Denna situation är olik den som finns i många stora vattendistrikt på kontinenten, där stora delar av olika länder kan ligga inom samma vattendistrikt. Syftet med den är att lägga grunden för en samordnad vattenförvaltning för de avrinningsområden som korsar gränsen mellan Norge och Sverige och som därför utgör internationella avrinningsområden.

33 avrinningsområden korsar riksgrens mellan Norge och Sverige. Av dessa rinner 14 från Norge till Sverige, med största ytan och andelen inom huvudavrinningsområdena Vänern och Göta älv, med över 8000 km² (16 %) i Norge, och Indalsälven med över 2000 km² (8 %) i Norge. 19 avrinningsområden rinner från Sverige till Norge, varav de största områdena ingår i huvudavrinningsområdena Halden vattendrag med 570 km² (23 %) i Sverige och Vefsna med 560 km² (23 %) i Sverige. Merparten av de 33 gränsöverskridande avrinningsområdena har dock mindre än 7 % av sin areal i det uppströms belägna landet. De flesta av områdena har obetydlig antropogen påverkan och kan därför antas ha god eller hög vattenstatus. Övervakning och åtgärdsprogram kommer därför inte att vara aktuellt för en stor del av de gränsöverskridande avrinningsområdena.


Ett nytt möte om gränsvatten mellan Sverige och Norge hölls på Selbusjöen i Norge 2008 med representanter från tre nivåer i Sverige (Miljödepartementet, Naturvårdsverket, och vattenvårdsdirektörer) och motsvarande representanter från Norge. Vid mötet konstaterades att det är olika reglering av gränsvattenförekomster i de båda länderna, enligt respektive nationell lagstiftning. Mötesdeltagarna ansåg att det var önskvärt att enas om kartläggning, statusklassning m.m., men att det var bättre att fokusera det operativa samarbetet på enskilda gränsöverskridande avrinningsområden och inte ha gemensamma planer m.m. för hela de internationella vattendistriken. EU-kommissionen blev informellt informerad om detta av de svenska och norska vattendirektörerna på det europeiska vattendirektörsmötet i Slovenien i juni 2008.

Vid två arbetsmöten i Stockholm den 7 september och 22 november 2011 har ett nytt förslag till arbetssätt diskuterats, vilket ligger till grund för detta PM. Mötena i Stockholm byggde delvis vidare på de diskussioner och principer som har tagits upp och dokumenterats vid de två tidigare mötena om gränsvatten. Ett första moment i utförare av praktiskt och tekniskt samarbete var en gemensam workshop för berörda vattenmyndigheter och vannregionmyndigheter, länsstyrelser, fylkesmän och andra i Oslo den 26 mars 2012.

Figur 1: Översiktskarta över vattendistrikt/vannregioner och vattendelare vid riksgrenen mellan Norge och Sverige.
Indelning av vattenförekomster

De grundläggande skillnaderna mellan vattenförekomstindelningen i Sverige och Norge beskrivs nedan. Norges metod innebär att i princip alla sjöar och vattendrag som är påverkade är egna vattenförekomster och att alla övriga vattendrag ingår i det hydrologiska nätverket och grupperas som vattenförekomster.

Sveriges vattenförekomstindelning
- Skala 1:250 000
- Homogenitet avseende kategori, typ, status och påverkan
- Sjöar > 1 km² är VF
- Vattendrag > 10 km² tillrinningsområde är VF
- Hydrologiskt samband, men inget krav (övrigt vatten fyller ut vattenförekomster)
- Skyddade områden
- Påverkade VF enligt indikativa modellen (verifierat)

Norges vattenförekomstindelning
- Skala 1:50 000
- Alla sjöar > 0,5 km² är VF
- Alla påverkade sjöar är VF
- Alla sjöar < 0,5 km² räknas som vattendrag
- Alla vattendrag ingår i nätverket
- Inget övrigt vatten finns
- Man grupperar flera mindre vattendrag till en VF

Förslag till strategi

Förslaget till en ny strategi för gränsvattenförekomster kan sammanfattas i följande steg:

- Huvudprincipen är att arbetet med vattenförvaltning i Sverige och Norge så långt som möjligt organiseras efter gränserna för avrinningsområden istället för längs med rikssgrensen.
- Avgränsningar mellan de båda ländernas förvaltningsroller kommer att göras efter huvudavrinningsområde, delavrinningsområde eller riksgrensen, beroende på vilken del av vattenförvaltningen som berörs.
- En utgångspunkt för rollfordelningen bör vara att det så långt som möjligt är det nedströms liggande landets principer för kartläggning och analys som tillämpas, dvs. principerna från det landet som de gränsöverskridande vattenförekomsterna rinner till.

Respektive lands behöriga myndigheter kan bara besluta om förvaltningsplaner, åtgärdsprogram, övervakningsprogram samt miljöutgåvan normer (i Norge: miljömål) inom det egna landets gränser. Det betyder att formella beslut som rör de delar av distriksen som ligger i det andra landet, behöver fattas av det landets myndigheter. I dessa delar krävs det alltså en nära samverkan mellan de behöriga myndigheterna i respektive vattendistrikt/vannregion.

I detta sammanhang bör det påpekas att de svenska bestämmelserna om vattendistriktens avgränsning idag inte stämmer överens med bestämmelserna i direktiv 2000/60/EG (vattendirektivet) om att vattendistriken ska avgränsas efter avrinningsområdens gränser.
Distriktsgrensarna överensstämmer inte heller med hur de norska vannregionerna har avgränsats. Vid gränsen mot Norge har de svenska vattendistriken istället avgränsats längs med riksgrensen. En förutsättning för att den strategi som föreslås i detta dokument ska kunna genomföras, är att de svenska bestämmelserna ändras i denna del, så att de svenska vattendistriken får avgränsningar som svarar mot de norska vannregionerna. Detta är också nödvändigt för att den svenska lagstiftningen ska stämma överens med de principer för distriktssnittling som framgår av vattendirektivet. Denna fråga behandlas i ett separat PM.

Nedan lämnas förslag på hur de olika arbetsuppgifterna i förvaltningscykeln bör fördelas mellan länderna, utifrån dessa utgångspunkter. Förslagen delas in i två avsnitt, där det första handlar om det praktiska utförandet av olika vattenförvaltningsmoment, såsom typning, karaktärisering, statusklassificering, riskbedömning och övervakning av vattenförekomster. Det andra avsnittet berör utarbetande och utformning av de administrativa verkygen inom vattenförvaltningen, närmare bestämt arbetsprogram, översikt av väsentliga frågor, förvaltningsplan, åtgärdsprogram, miljökvalitetsnormer och övervakningsprogram.

Praktiskt och operativt arbete

Indelning och typning av vattenförekomster

Den långsiktiga målsättningen med gränsvattensamarbetet i gränsöverskridande avrinningsområden är att det nedströms liggande landets principer för vattenförekomstindelning och typning tillämpas i hela avrinningsområdet. Det övergripande kravet är att vattenförekomster på båda sidor om gränsen jämfas ihop så att det inte förekommer några sjöar, vattendrag eller grundvattenförekomster som ”upphör” vid gränsen.


Sjöar och vattendrag i avrinningsområdena som ligger i ett land och rinner till det andra, men som inte delas av riksgrensen, kommer att visas i båda ländernas kartsystem, förvaltningsplan och åtgärdsprogram. Sjöar och vattendrag visas i respektive lands vattenkarta enligt det landets egna principer för vattenförekomstindelning och typindelning, i ett första steg mot det långsiktiga målet som beskrivs ovan. Vattenförekomster och övrigt vatten kommer alltså att visas både i VISS och Vann-Net i hela huvudavrinningsområdena som delas av riksgrensen. Det påverkar dock inte hur t.ex. vattenförekomstindelning, åtgärder och miljökvalitetsnormer regleras i respektive land.

Övrig karaktärisering, statusklassificering och riskbedömning av vattenförekomster

Den långsiktiga målsättningen är att karaktärisering, statusklassificering och riskbedömning ska synkroniseras i de gränsöverskridande vattenförekomsterna och avrinningsområdena enligt nedströmslandets principer och bedömningsgrunder. Det behöver dock finnas en flexibilitet i systemet, mot bakgrund av de olikheter som finns mellan länderna. Behöriga myndigheter i respektive land bör kunna utnyttja de metoder från respektive lands
bedömningsgrunder som är bäst anpassade till förhållanden och förutsättningar i respektive avrinningsområde. Avsteg från principen att nedströmslandets metoder tillämpas måste redovisas och motiveras tydligt i respektive lands databas för bedömningar (VISS/Vann-Nett).

I ett första steg så ska sjöar och vattendrag som delas av riksgrensen statusklassificeras och riskbedömas enligt nedströmslandets principer, så långt det är möjligt enligt respektive lands regler för detta (t.ex. genom expertbedömning eller motsvarande).

Sjöar och vattendrag i avrinningsområden som ligger i Norge men rinner till Sverige eller vice versa men som inte delas av riksgrensen kan i ett första steg status- och riskbedömas enligt det lands bedömningsgrunder som bedöms fungera bäst för aktuellt miljöproblem, påverkanskälla m.m. Detta kan ske med utgångspunkt från resultat från olika projekt, t.ex. i Enningsdalsälven. I ett andra steg bör även sjöar och vattendrag som inte delas av riksgrensen omfattas av nedströmslands principer så långt som möjligt.

Det måste tydligt anges i VISS/Vann-Nett vilket lands bedömningsgrunder eller andra metoder som används för respektive kvalitetsfaktor och en motivering till detta. Det är då mycket viktigt med ett tätt samarbete mellan respektive myndigheter i båda länder och också mellan de olika distrikten så att det blir en någorlunda enhetlig bedömning i gränsavrinningsområdena. Särskilt viktigt är det att få till stånd ett nära samarbete om hur dessa principer ska tillämpas i de mer befolkade avrinningsområdena som Trysilälven och Enningsdalsälven.

Hänsyn måste även tas till fylkenas och kommunernas kunskap, redan gjorda bedömningar och befintlig miljöövervakning, så att det inte uppstår konflikter i samordningen mellan länderna. Resultaten av samarbetet mellan regionala/lokala myndigheter och kommuner måste slutligen godkännas av den behöriga vattenmyndigheten/vannregionmyndigheten för den aktuella delen av vattendistriktet och av dess motsvarighet i det andra landet.

Digital rapportering till WISE (Water Information System Europe) av karaktärisering, statusklassificering och riskbedömning

 Alla gränsöverskridande vattenförekomster ska ha en gemensam ID-sättning, så att det finns ett gemensamt EU-ID för varje sådan vattenförekomst i sin helhet. Dessa vattenförekomster kommer därför att ha två olika nationella ID-nummer, på respektive sida om gränsen. Vid digital rapportering till WISE rapporterar varje land typning, övrig karaktärisering, statusklassificering och riskbedömning av sin del av vattenförekomster som korsar gränsen. De gränsöverskridande vattenförekomsterna rapporteras med sitt gemensamma EU-ID, så att det framgår att det är samma vattenförekomster på båda sidor om gränsen.

Övervakning av vattenförekomster i avrinningsområden som korsar gränsen sker enligt motsvarande huvudprinciper som har angetts ovan, dvs. enligt det nedströms liggande landets principer vad gäller övervakning. Avvikelser från denna huvudprincip kan dock göras efter överenskommelse mellan regionala och/eller lokala myndigheter eller kommuner. Sådana avvikelser behöver godkännas av de berörda vattenmyndigheterna/vannregionmyndigheterna i båda länderna. Beslut om verkställande av övervakningsprogram fattas dock av respektive lands myndigheter inom det egna landets gränser.
Figur 2: En illustration av förslaget med principen att karaktärisering, klassning och riskbedömning följer avrinningsområdet istället för landsgränsen.

**Administrativ process**

**Förvaltningsplaner för de gränsöverskridande avrinningsområdena** mellan Norge och Sverige fastställs enligt följande principer: Varje internationellt distrikts förvaltningsplan har två delar, en del som omfattar de delar av distriktet som ligger i det egna landet (beslutas) och en andra del som omfattar de internationella delarna av distriktet (för information, beslutas av det andra landets myndigheter). Hela förvaltningsplanen skickas på remiss för samråd i båda länderna, och det säkerställs därigenom i båda länderna att samtliga berörda myndigheter, kommuner, organisationer och allmänheten får information om vattenförvaltningen både inom det egna landets gränser och i de delar av vattendistriktet som ligger i det andra landet.

**Förslag till text i inledningen på förvaltningsplan:**

Vattendistriktet XX är internationellt, på så sätt att delar av vattendistriktet ligger i Sverige. För att säkerställa en integrerad och samordnad vattenförvaltning har man samarbetat tätt mellan de två länderna om indelning, typning, karaktärisering, riskbedömning och klassificering av vattenförekomster. Det har också varit en tätt dialog med syfte att samordna miljökvalitetsnormer, åtgärdsprogram och övervakningsprogram, på så sätt att åtgärdsprogram och förvaltningsplan ska framstå som enhetliga på båda sidor om riksgrensen.

Det ska uppmärksammas att norska myndigheter bara kan besluta om de delar av dokumentet som rör områden inom Norge. De delar av dokumentet som beskriver områden i Sverige skall beslutas av svenska myndigheter, men finns med här som information för att kunna presentera ett samlat dokument för hela det internationella vattendistriktet.
Åtgärdsprogrammen, som är rättsliga styrdokument i respektive land, bör hanteras med ett liknande arbetsätt som för förvaltningsplanerna. Varje land kan bara besluta om åtgärdsprogram för myndigheter, kommuner m.fl. inom sitt eget respektive territorium. Det innebär att ett åtgärdsprogram för ett vattendistrikt/vannregion med internationella avrinningsområden behöver omfatta de delar som ligger i det egna landet, medan det i en bilaga ska finnas information om de åtgärder i det internationella avrinningsområdet som beslutats av det andra landets behöriga myndighet. Det får utredas närmare om sådana beslut för internationella delar av ett annat lands vattendistrikt ska ingå i det egna landets åtgärdsprogram, eller om det ska fattas separat beslut om åtgärder i dessa områden.

Med andra ord får utarbetandet av och beslut om åtgärdsprogram genomföras av den behöriga myndigheten i det land som har jurisdiktion över respektive avrinningsområde, oavsett vilket vattendistrikt det hör till. Norska myndigheter ansvarar för alla delar av internationella avrinningsområden som ligger inom Norges gränser, och svenska myndigheter på motsvarande sätt för de svenska delarna av internationella avrinningsområden. För att det ändå ska finnas ett åtgärdsprogram som beskriver åtgärdsbehov och åtgärdsarbete i hela vattendistriken/vannregionerna, är det lämpligt att det till varje distriktets åtgärdsprogram finns bilagor som beskriver de delar av åtgärdsprogrammen som berör det egna distriktet men som har beslutats av det andra landets vattenmyndighet/vannregionmyndighet.

Detta är den formella delen av processen, men i praktiken bör det naturligtvis ske en nära samverkan mellan de ansvariga vattenmyndigheterna i respektive land så att det råder enighet om vilka åtgärder som behöver utföras i avrinningsområdet, av vem eller vilka och hur prioriteringar och avvägningar ska göras. Samråd och samverkan med allmänhet, kommuner, verksamhetsutövare och organisationer m.fl. bör också så långt som möjligt ske i ett avrinningsområdesperspektiv, dvs. även i de delar av det andra landet som kan påverkas av förslagen i ett åtgärdsprogram.

Åtgärdsprogrammen i Sverige är än så länge ganska övergripande, vilket kan vara ett problem vid utarbetande av och samråd kring åtgärdsprogram för internationella avrinningsområden. De norska åtgärdsprogram som har utarbetats hittills är mer specifika och mindre övergripande. Här kan det behövas en diskussion och i vissa delar en harmonisering av utformningen av åtgärdsprogrammen. I Sverige sker det för närvarande en översyn av utformningen av åtgärdsprogram och kopplingen till konkreta åtgärder, vilket möjligen kommer att leda till åtgärdsprogram på en mer detaljerad nivå, och i Norge finns det överväganden om samma inriktning. En nära samverkan mellan de behöriga myndigheterna i båda länderna kring denna fråga skulle skapa bra förutsättningar för en god och ändamålsenlig samordning av arbetet med åtgärdsprogram i de gränssöverskridande avrinningsområdena.

Miljökvalitetsnormer (motsvarar i Norge av miljømål) beslutas för alla vattenförekomster i Sverige av vattenmyndigheten för respektive vattendistrikt. Alla myndigheter och kommuner i Sverige ansvarar för att miljökvalitetsnormerna följs, t.ex. vid tillämpning av miljölagstiftning, planlagstiftning m.m. Det innebär att normerna är sådana rättsliga styremedel som bara kan beslutas för vattenförekomster inom Sveriges gränser. Med andra ord kommer de svenska vattenmyndigheterna inte kunna besluta om miljökvalitetsnormer i hela vattendistriken, eftersom vissa delar ligger utanför svenskt territorium. En intressant frågeställning, som behöver utredas ytterligare, är om det finns några hinder för de svenska vattenmyndigheterna att besluta om miljökvalitetsnormer för de delar av internationella avrinningsområden som ligger i Sverige men ingår i norska vattendistrikt. Dessa vattenförekomster ingår ju inte i de svenska distrikten. Samtidigt kommer rimligen de svenska
Övervakningsprogram för respektive vattendistrikt behöver också fastställas och verkställas av behörig myndighet inom sitt lands gränser. Med andra ord kommer samma principer som för förvaltningsplaner och åtgärdsprogram att tillämpas för övervakningsprogrammen i de gränsöverskridande huvuddrivaområdena. Eftersom den praktiska övervakningen ska samordnas enligt de huvudprinciper som har angetts ovan, blir det mycket viktigt med ett nära samarbete mellan de behöriga vattenmyndigheterna/vannregionmyndigheterna när det gäller utarbetandet av övervakningsprogram för internationella vattendistrikt. Övervakningen i de internationella avrinningsområdena bör samordnas så långt som möjligt mellan länderna.


Skyddade områden

Register över skyddade områden ska också rapporteras och kopplas till respektive vattenförekomst. Med hänsyn till att vattenförvaltning i Sverige och Norge delvis omfattar olika typer av skyddade områden, bör frågor om hur sådana register förtecknas och rapporteras hanteras från fall till fall i samverkan mellan de berörda myndigheterna i båda länderna.

Särskilda frågor

Informationsutbyte

En indelning som utgår från avrinningsområden ställer krav på datautbyte/kartutbyte mellan länderna. Det behöver göras jämförbara avgränsningar av vannområden/huvuddrivaområden/delområden (eller motsvarande) i respektive land, och dessa avgränsningar behöver tydliggöras för det andra landets myndigheter och kommuner. Det ger kommuner och övriga aktörer goda förutsättningar att medverka vid olika åtgärder i det andra landet.

Det har i tidigare sammanhang diskuterats om ett data-/kartutbyte mellan länderna kan omfattas av den norsk-svenska vattenrättskonventionen från 1929. Den konventionen omfattar dock bara ”anläggning, arbete eller annan åtgärd i vattendrag i det ena riket” som kan vålla ”märkbart förändring i vattendrag i det andra riket” avseende djup, lage, riktning, vattenstånd eller vattenmängd, eller medför skada för fisket i det andra landet. Mot den bakgrunden är det uppenbart att utbyte av geografisk och naturvetenskaplig information om sjöar, vattendrag och grundvattenförekomster mellan länderna inte kan grundas på bestämmelserna i denna konvention. Det behöver därför finnas annan, nationell lagstiftning i de båda länderna som möjliggör det informationsutbyte som behövs för att genomföra den strategi och det arbete som föreslås i detta dokument. Det bör möjligen också utredas om det finns behov av kompletterande internationella överenskommelser mellan länderna. Ett exempel är Finland
som under våren 2012 har öppnat upp för att alla offentlig data ska vara tillgängligt för allmänheten.

I Sverige framgår det av 8 kap 3 § vattenförvaltningsförordningen att vattenmyndigheten ska lämna de upplysningar som de behöriga myndigheterna i Norge behöver för att fullgöra uppgifter i enlighet med vattendirektivet (2000/60/EG) samt bistå dessa myndigheter vid samråd i Sverige som följer av samma direktiv. Denna bestämelse bör kunna användas som stöd för de svenska vattenmyndigheterna att dela med sig av nödvändigt data- och kartmaterial till sina norska motsvarigheter. Det kan dock behöva utredas ytterligare om det finns behov av att utveckla/förändra den svenska lagstiftningen för att möjliggöra ett fullständigt och öppet informationsutbyte mellan länderna.

För norsk del finns motsvarande bestämelse (som nämnts ovan) i § 31 Forskrift om rammer för vannförvaltningen (FOR 2006-12-15 nr 1446). Även den bestämmelsens utformning bör ge tillräckligt stöd för norska vannregionmyndigheter att dela med sig av den information som behövs. Detta bör dock bekräftas och förankras hos norska ansvariga myndigheter.


Enligt överenskommelsen vid mötet på Selbusjøen i Norge 2008 ska de regionala vattenmyndigheterna leverera samma upplysningar som motsvarande myndigheter i det andra landet för att fullgöra sina uppgifter. Underlag för tyning, miljöövervakningsdata, kartunderlag, olika register, expertutvärderingar, vattenförekomstindelning etc. är exempel på information som måste utbytas mellan ansvariga vattenmyndigheter i respektive länder. För svensk del möjliggörs förhoppningsvis detta av den ovan nämnda bestämmelsen i den nationella lagstiftningen.

**Statusklassning**

Ett Interregprojekt som pågår i Enningsdalsälven i Glomma vannregion visar att svenska och norska bedömningsgrunder innehåller många olikheter i metoder för tyning, datainsamling och klassning. Projektet visar att mycket arbete återstår innan en gemensam grund kan åstadkommas för att jämna samman båda länderns bedömningsgrunder. Det behövs fler gränsöverskridande projekt liknande arbetena kring Enningsdalsälven och Torneälven för att lösa detta. Att låta respektive lands system gälla i tillrinnande avrinningsområden löser problemet med olika bedömningsgrunder i denna förvaltningssykel. Långsiktigt så bör erfarenheter från projekt Enningsdalsälven och liknande projekt användas t.ex. i det svenska arbetet med översyn av bedömningsgrunder för ekologiska kvalitetsfaktorer i ytvatten (Waters) och för en grund till harmonisering av bedömningsgrunder mellan Norge och Sverige.

**Samråd**

Innan regionala vattenmyndigheter beslutar om miljömål, förvaltningsplaner och åtgärdsprogram för de internationella avrinningsområdena ska samråd hållas med myndigheter, kommuner, allmänhet och andra berörda från båda länderna. Samrådet ska säkra att man för de gränsöverskridande vattenområdena kommer fram till en förvaltning som fungerar friktionsfritt som en helhet och en samsyn om att respektive lands system någorlunda överensstämmer med varandra.

Det är också lämpligt att de regionala vattenmyndigheterna bjuder in motsvarande myndigheter och andra berörda från det andra landet som medverkande vid möten rörande vattenförvaltningen i de internationella avrinningsområdena.

**Kustzon**

Idefjorden består idag av tre svenska och fyra norska vattenförekomster. Kustvattenförekomster bör kunna slås ihop till hela bassänger över landsgränsen (Figur 3). På så sätt följs vattendirektivets principer även i dessa områden. Dessa bassänger borde bli tre eller eventuellt fyra kustvattenförekomster (Figur 4).

Sverige har använt en kustzonmodell för Idefjorden vilket kan underlätta statusklassningen. Dock saknar SMHI bra djupuppgifter för var klackarna är. Det finns också ett behov av att få använda norska utsläppsdatal till modellen eftersom de största punktkällorna ligger i Halden och är de enskilt största påverkanskällorna för Idefjorden.
Figur 3: Karta över Idefjorden och dagens indelning
Figur 4: Karta över nytt förslag till indelning av Idefjorden
Grundvatten

Grundvattenförekomster ska som huvudregel hanteras enligt samma principer som för ytvatten. Eftersom inte alla grundvattenförekomster följer huvudavrinningsområdesgränserna, kan det dock behövas speciella lösningar i vissa fall. Dessa fall får hanteras i samverkan mellan de berörda myndigheterna i båda länderna. Endast ett fåtal grundvattenförekomster korsar riksgränsen. Ett exempel är Görälven-Stöten i Dalarna (Figur 5).

Figur 5: Den vänstra bilden är från Vann-net, blå markerade områden är en grundvattenförekomst som tillhör Bottenhavets vattendistrikt i Sverige men tillhör Hedmarks fylke och Vannregionmyndigheten i Ostfold FK. Den högra bilden är från VISS, lila områden är grundvattenförekomster i sand och grus och rosa områden är grundvattenförekomster i sedimentär berggrund.
Tidplan för arbetet

**Administrativ process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Översikt av väsentliga frågor</th>
<th>Jurisdiktion/avgränsning</th>
<th>Norge (år-månad)</th>
<th>Sverige (år-månad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationell (med bilagor)</td>
<td>Underlag: 2012-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ev. internationellt)</td>
<td>Samråd: 2012-07 → 2012-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underlag: 2012-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samråd: 2012-12 → 2013-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Övervakningsprogram</td>
<td>Nationell (med bilagor)</td>
<td>Förslag: 2013-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samråd: 2014-07</td>
<td>Förslag: 2012-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beslut: 2012-12</td>
<td>Beslut: 2012-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åtgärdsprogram</td>
<td>Nationell (ev. med bilagor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samråd: 2014-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beslut: 2015-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Förvaltningsplan</td>
<td>Nationell (med bilagor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationell delförvaltningsplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samråd: 2014-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beslut: 2015-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapportering</td>
<td>Nationell (med bilagor)</td>
<td>2016-03</td>
<td>2016-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tekniskt och praktiskt samarbete**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indelning av vattenförekomster</th>
<th>Ansvar/utförare</th>
<th>Norge (år-månad)</th>
<th>Sverige (år-månad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distrikt/regionalt</td>
<td>2012-02</td>
<td>2012-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nationell förankring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typtning och riskbedömning</td>
<td>Distrikt/regionalt</td>
<td>2012-06 till</td>
<td>2013-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statusklassificering</td>
<td>Distrikt/regionalt</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2013-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kort beskrivning av några väsentliga frågor i genomförandet av det tekniska och praktiska samarbetet:

1. Primär indelning av delavrinningsområden/vattenförekomster som korsar gränsen: SMHI (Ylva Westman) och NVE (Lars Stalsberg) (VRM/FM) + VM/lst (Henrik Lindblom) samverkar och utarbetar förslag. Förankring:
   a. Norge MD (Anders Iversen, DN).
   b. Sverige HaV, MDEP, Lantmäteriet, (Joakim Kruse, VMBH).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svensk</th>
<th>Norsk</th>
<th>Engelsk</th>
<th>Kommentar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vattenmyndighet</td>
<td>Vannregionmyndighet</td>
<td>River Basin District Authority</td>
<td>(Competent Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattendeligation</td>
<td>Vannregionutvalg</td>
<td>River Basin District Water Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Länsstyrelse</td>
<td>Fylkesmannen</td>
<td>County Govenors Office</td>
<td>(County administrative board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landstingsstyrelse</td>
<td>Fylkestrying</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommun</td>
<td>Kommune</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattendistrikt</td>
<td>Vannregion</td>
<td>River Basin District (RBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delområde</td>
<td>Vannområde</td>
<td>Sub-District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avrinningsområde (också huvud- eller del-)</td>
<td>Nedbørfelt</td>
<td>River Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattenråd</td>
<td>Vannområdeutvalg</td>
<td>Sub-District Water Board</td>
<td>(Här skiljer det sig i beslutsmandat mellan länderna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattenförekomst</td>
<td>Vannforekomst</td>
<td>Waterbody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åtgärd – åtgärdsprogram</td>
<td>Tiltak – tiltaksprogram</td>
<td>Measure – Program of Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG:s ramdirektiv för vatten</td>
<td>EUs vanndirektiv</td>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väsentliga frågor</td>
<td>Vesentlige spörsniel</td>
<td>Significant Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedömningsgrunder</td>
<td>Klassifiserings-system</td>
<td>Classification system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miljöklassifikationsnormer</td>
<td>Miljömål</td>
<td>Environmental Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samråd/Remiss</td>
<td>Höring</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Översvämning</td>
<td>Flom</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exempel 1

Gränsvattenförekomster
Denna insjö rinner till Glomma avrinningsområde. Förslaget är att sjön karaktäriseras, typindelas och klassificeras enligt norska principer, det samma gäller vattendragen inom avrinningsområdet. Samma vattenförekomst EUID används för respektive vattenförekomst på båda sidor av gränsen.
Exempel 3

Denna insjö har avrinning till Sverige. Förslaget är att hela sjön då karaktäriseras och klassificeras efter svenska principer. Detsamma gäller vattendragen inom avrinningsområdet. Samma vattenförekomst EUID används för respektive vattenförekomst på båda sidor av gränsen.
Bilaga 1

Beslut Myndighet NO-1
Forvaltningsplan RBD NO-1:
• Del I (beslut) NO-1
• Del II (til informasjon) SENO-1 (a, b, c)
Tiltaksprogram RBD NO-1:
• Hovuddokument (beslut) NO-1
• Bilaga SENO-1 (a, b, c)
Forvaltningsplan/Åtgärdsprogram RBD SE-3:
• Separat beslut NOSE-3
Forvaltningsplan/Åtgärdsprogram RBD SE-2:
• Separat beslut NOSE-2

Rapportering Myndighet NO-1
Papirplaner (1 IRBD):
• Forvaltningsplan NO-1 – Del I og II
• Tiltaksprogram NO-1 – Hovuddokument og bilaga
WISE (3 IRBD):
• Karaktärisering m.m. – NO-1 og NOSE-2 og NOSE-3
• Elektronisk forvaltningsplan – NO-1, NOSE-2 og NOSE-3

NO-1
SENO-1 (a)
SENO-1 (b)
SENO-1 (c)
NOSE-3
SE-3
SE-2
SENO-2
NOSE-2

Beslut Myndighet SE-3
Forvaltningsplan RBD SE-3:
• Del I (beslut) SE-3
• Del II (for information) NOSE-3
Åtgärdsprogram RBD SE-3:
• Hovuddokument (beslut) SE-3
• Bilaga NOSE-3
Forvaltningsplan RBD NO-1:
• Separat beslut SENO-1 (a)
Tiltaksprogram RBD NO-1:
• Separat beslut SENO-1 (a)

Rapportering Myndighet SE-3
Dokument (1 IRBD):
• Forvaltningsplan RBD SE-3 – Del I og II
• Åtgärdsprogram RBD SE-3 – Hovuddokument og bilaga
WISE (2 IRBD):
• Karaktärisering m.m. – SE-3 og SENO-1a
• Elektronisk (plan) Dokument – SE-3 og SENO-1(a)

Rapportering Myndighet SE-2
Dokument (1 IRBD):
• Forvaltningsplan RBD SE-2 – Del I og II
• Åtgärdsprogram RBD SE-2 – Hovuddokument og bilaga
WISE (2 IRBD):
• Karaktärisering m.m. – SE-2 och SENO-1b och SENO-1c
• Elektronisk (plan) Dokument – SE-2 och SENO-1b och SENO-1c

Hele papirplaner for hver IRBD sendes kommisjonen. Det vises i planen til hvilke del som gjelder norsk og svensk jurisdiksjon.
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Avtale mellom Norge og Finland om fisket i Tanavassdraget

Kongeriket Norges regjering og Republikken Finlands regjering, heretter partene, som

onsker å erstatte Overenskomst mellom Kongeriket Norge og Republikken Finland om felles forskrifter om fisket i Tanaelvas fiskeområde av 1. mars 1989 samt tilhørende forskrifter med en ny avtale,

understreker sitt ansvar i henhold til internasjonale konvensjoner og behovet for å verne og sikre fiskebestandene i Tanavassdraget gjennom formålstjenlig regulering av fisket basert på føre-var-prinsippet,

erkjenner betydningen av naturmangfoldet og av bærekraftig utnyttelse av naturressursene,

erkjenner samenes urfolksrettigheter og lokalbefolkningens rettigheter, og betydningen naturressursene har for samene som urfolk i bevaring av deres kultur, samt andre fiskerettshavere rettigheter,

understreker betydningen av informasjonsutveksling og samarbeid om bruk og forvaltning av felles naturressurser, og bred medvirkning fra lokale fiskerettshavere og andre lokale interesser i denne forvaltningen,


har inngått følgende avtale:

Kapittel 1
Formål og virkeområde

Artikkel 1
Formål

1. Avtalens formål er å bidra til at fiskebestandene i Tanavassdraget forvaltes på en økologisk, økonomisk og sosialt bærekraftig måte basert på beste tilgjengelige kunnskap, inkludert tradisjonell kunnskap, slik at vassdragets kapasitet for lakseproduksjon utnyttes og mangfoldet i fiskebestandene sikres.

2. Ved vern, forvaltning og bruk av fiskebestandene skal det tas hensyn til alle berørte fiskeinteresser, og særlig til fiske basert på lokale kulturtradisjoner.


4. Reguleringene skal gjennomføres slik at forvaltningsmålene for de enkelte laksebestandene oppnås og opprettholdes over tid i samsvar med forvaltningsplanen.

Artikkel 2
Geografisk virkeområde

1. Avtalens og Vedlegg 2 om fiskeregler gjelder på riksgrensestrekningene mellom Norge og Finland i Tanaelva, Anárjohka og Skiehččanjohka (grenseelvstrekningene).


3. Områdene som er omtalt under artikkelen punkt 1 og 2 er avmerket på kartene i Vedlegg 1.
Artikkel 3

Sidevassdrag, nedre norske del av vassdraget og sjøområder i Finnmark fylke


2. Forslag til endringer i reguleringene av sjølaksefisket i Finnmark skal sendes ansvarlig myndighet i Finland til uttalelse før vedtak treffes.

Kapittel 2

Reguleringer i fisket

Artikkel 4

Forvaltningsplan

1. Partene skal i fellesskap utarbeide en forvaltningsplan for laksebestandene i Tanaelva for å sikre biologisk mangfold og bærekraftig utnytting av bestandene.

2. Planen skal være fleksibel, kunnskapsbasert og rettet inn mot de enkelte laksebestandene, og vil være utgangspunkt for utarbeidelse av eventuelle avtalte bestemmelser om å fravike felles fiskereglere. Fiskerettshavere skal medvirke i utarbeidelse av planen.

3. Planen skal inneholde:
   i) informasjon om tilstanden til fiskebestandene og deres livsmiljø;
   ii) informasjon om fisket;
   iii) forvaltningsmål for de enkelte laksebestandene;
   iv) forslag til forvaltningstiltak for fiskebestandene;
   v) forslag til nødvendige gjenoppbyggingstiltak for de bestandene som ikke oppnår forvaltningsmålene.

4. Dersom en eller flere laksebestander er på et nivå som ligger under forvaltningsmålet, skal planer for gjenoppbygging av disse bestandene inkluderes i forvaltningsplanen.


Artikkel 5

Felles fiskeregler

1. Partene skal ha felles regler om fisket på grenseelvstrekningen. Fiskereglene er vedlagt avtalen som Vedlegg 2, og er en integrert del av avtalen.

2. Fiskereglene gjelder i fem år fra avtalens ikrafttredelse. Fiskereglene gjelder deretter i perioder på sju år, med mindre en av partene tidligere anmoder om endringer. Anmodning om endring av fiskereglene skal legges fram senest to år før utløpet av fiskereglenes gyldighetsperiode.

3. Fiskereglene skal inkludere forhåndsavtalte reguleringstiltak som trer i kraft i samsvar med nasjonal lovgivning når forutsetninger defineret i fiskereglene er oppfylt. Vurderingen av om forutsetningene for anvendelse av forhåndsavtalte tiltak er tilstede, gjøres årlig i forbindelse med vurderingen omtalt under artikkel 7 punkt 2. Vurderingen føres inn i protokollen omtalt under artikkel 7 punkt 4.

Artikkel 6

Adgang til å fravike fiskereglene

1. Dersom det er nødvendig for å sikre fiskebestandenes levedyktighet, for å verne eller gjenoppbygge
fiskebestander som er svekket eller står i fare for å bli svekket, eller dersom fiskebestandenes tilstand tillater det, kan regjeringene eller de av disse utpekt e myndigheter, innen rammene av hver parts nasjonale lovgivning, avtale bestemmelser som fraviker fiskereglen e, for å oppnå formålet i artikkel 1 i denne avtale.

2. Bestemmelser om å fravike fiskereglen e kan gjelde:
   1) forbud mot eller begrensninger i fisket med visse fangstredskaper eller fiskemetoder;
   2) forbud mot eller begrensninger i fisket på visse tidspunkter eller i visse områder;
   3) begrensninger i antall fiskeredskaper som brukes;
   4) kvoter for fangst;
   5) antall fiskekort;
   6) indeling av grenseelvstrekningen i fiskesoner;
   7) forbud mot å ta fisk av et bestemt kjønn eller i en viss størrelsesklasse;
   8) fangstredskapenes utforming; eller
   9) andre reguleringstiltak som er sammenlignbare med punktene 1-8 ovenfor og knyttet til implementering av fiskereglene.

3. Bestemmelser om å fravike fiskereglen e kan begrens e til å gjelde for en del av avtaleområdet, for angitt fiskesesonger eller for den enkelte fiskemetode. Bestemmelsene skal være tidsbegrenset og kan ikke gjelde for mer enn tre fiskesesonger om gangen.

Artikkel 7
Evaluering av effektene av fiskereglen e og prosedyrer for bestemmelser om fravik

1. Effekten av fiskereglen e og eventuelle bestemmelser om fravik skal vurderes årlig av en felles overvåkings- og forskningsgruppe og ansvarlige myndigheter på grunnlag av den beste tilgjengelige kunnskapen om laksebestandenes tilstand og utviklingstendenser. Fiskerettshaverne trekk es inn i vurderingene.

2. Regjeringene eller de av regjeringene utpekte myndigheter v urderer hvert år behovet for å avtale bestemmelser om å fravike fiskereglen e i henhold til artikkel 6.

3. Vurderingen av behovet for bestemmelser om å fravike fiskereglen e skal gjøres på et slikt tidspunkt at forskere og relevante lokale interessegrupper kan medvirke, og slik at nasjonale regler kan tre i kraft senest 1. april det år bestemmelsene skal gjelde fra.

4. Avtale mellom regjeringene eller av regjeringene utpekte myndigheter om bestemmelser om å fravike fiskereglen e skal nedfelles i en særskilt protokoll.

Kapittel 3
Organisering av fisket

Artikkel 8
Fiskeravgift

Plikten til å betale fiskeravgift ved fiske på grenseelvstrekningen følger lovgivningen i det landet fiskekort etter artikkel 10 blir løst i.

Artikkel 9
Indeling av grenseelvstrekningen i fiskesoner


Artikkel 10
Fiskekort
1. Maksimalt antall fiskekort for tilreisende fiskere skal fastsettes i fiskereglene. Antallet fordeles likt mellom partene.
3. For fiske fra strand må kort løses i den stat hvor fisket skal foregå. Kort for fiske fra båt gir adgang til fiske i angitt sone i begge partenes områder.

Artikkel 11
Fiskeoppsyn
1. Partene skal sørge for tilstrekkelig oppsyn med fisket. De myndigheter og oppsynsbetjenter som i henhold til partenes nasjonale lovgivning er ansvarlige for fiskeoppsyn, skal ha oppsyn med at forskriftene om fisket overholdes.
2. I tillegg kan det gjennomføres oppsyn ved felles norsk-finske oppsynspatruljer. Ved slikt oppsyn har den andre parts oppsynsbetjenter observatørstatus.
3. Partene kan avtale en felles plan for fiskeoppsyn.
4. Dersom en av partene har grunn til mistanke om at det foregår eller har foregått fiske på den andre parts område i strid med gjeldende forskrifter, skal de ansvarlige for fiskeoppsynet underrette den andre parts ansvarlige myndigheter umiddelbart.

Kapittel 4
Overvåking, forskning, fangstrapportering og fangststatistikk

Artikkel 12
Overvåking og forskning
1. Partene skal samarbeide om overvåking av og forskning på fiskebestandene i Tanavassdraget, særlig som grunnlag for utarbeidelse og evaluering av forvaltningsplanen etter artikkel 4 og vurdering av fiskereglene etter artikkel 7.

Artikkel 13
Fangstregistering og fangstrapportering
1. Partene skal ha et felles elektronisk fangstregister. Fiskeren plikter å rapportere opplysninger om fiskeinnsats og fangster til registeret i samsvar med bestemmelsene i fiskereglene.
2. Opplysninger lagret i registeret benyttes til fangststatistikk, planlegging av forvaltningstiltak, oppsyn og fiskeundersøkelser, samt forskning på fiskebestandene og fiskeutøvelsen.

Kapittel 5
Beskyttelse av fiskebestandene

Avtale mellom Norge og Finland om fisket i Tanavassdraget
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Artikkel 14
Inngrep og forurensning
1. Partene skal i henhold til relevant lovgivning påse at plassering og bygging av anlegg, bygninger eller konstruksjoner, eller annen tilsvarende virksomhet eller utnyttelse av vannressursene ikke medfører skade eller risiko for skade på fiskebestandene eller fiskeutøvelsen.
2. Partene skal hver for seg og i samarbeid iverksette tiltak for å overvåke, oppretholde og om nødvendig forbedre vannkvaliteten i vassdraget.

Artikkel 15
Biologisk påvirkning
1. Partene skal iverksette nødvendige tiltak for å beskytte fiskebestandene mot smittsomme fiskesykdommer og introdusjon av fremmede arter eller bestander.
2. Partene skal redusere risikoen fra pågående aktiviteter og forhindre ny risikoaktivitet innenfor vassdragets nedbørfelt og i nærliggende land- og sjøområder, herunder risiko for skadevirkninger og sykdomsoverføring fra fiskeoppdrett samt påvirkning fra rømt eller utsatt fisk.
3. Fiskeoppdrett og kultivering av anadrome laksefisk skal ikke finne sted i Tanavassdragets nedbørfelt. Det skal ikke settes ut fisk i Tanavassdragets nedbørfelt fra område utenfor nedbørfeltet.
4. Det skal ikke flyttes levende fisk eller gameter (melke og rogn) fra andre vassdrag til Tanavassdragets nedbørfelt.
5. Introduksjon av akvakulturdyr og deres gameter skal skje i henhold til den Europeiske unions regelverk om fiskehelse.

Artikkel 16
Tiltak i særskilte situasjoner
1. Dersom fiskebestandene er truet av forurensning eller andre miljøpåvirkninger, skal de ansvarlige myndigheter hver for seg eller i samarbeid iverksette tiltak som anses nødvendig for å forebygge, begrense eller hindre skade.

Kapittel 6
Avsluttende bestemmelser

Avtale mellom Norge og Finland om fisket i Tanavassdraget
Side 7
Artikkel 17
Samarbeid, oppfølging av avtalen og endringer
1. Partenes ansvarlige myndigheter skalamarbeide om alle spørsmål som berører fiskebestandene og
vannmiljøet i Tanavassdraget.
2. Partene skal møtes ved behov for å evaluere anvendelsen av avtalen. Møter skal arrangeres senest innen to
måneder etter at en av partene har bedt om dette.
3. Denne avtale med vedlegg kan endres ved overenskomst mellom partene. Endringer trer i kraft som
fastsatt i artikkel 22.

Artikkel 18
Tvisteløsning
1. Tvister som oppstår om tolkningen eller anvendelse av denne avtalen skal løses i minnelighet og så snart
som mulig gjennom forhandling mellom ansvarlige myndigheter.
2. Forhandlingene skal innledes senest to måneder etter at den ene parten har anmodet om det gjennom
diplomatiske kanaler.
3. Dersom man ikke i løpet av tre måneder kommer frem til en løsning, skal tvisten henvises til en ad hoc
grenseelvkommisjon for Tanavassdraget. Hver part oppnevner tre medlemmer og tre varamedlemmer til
kommisjonen. Begge partene stiller i tillegg en sekretær og nødvendige sakkyndige til rådighet for
kommisjonen. Kommisjonen skal søke å finne en løsning som er akseptabel for begge parter.
4. Dersom saken ikke kan løses av kommisjonen i løpet av fem måneder, skal tvisten løses gjennom
diplomatiske kanaler.

Artikkel 19
Oppsigelse
Denne avtalen kan sies opp av hver part ved skriftlig meddelelse til den andre parten. Oppsigelsen av avtalen
trer i kraft etter tolv måneder fra sluttendet kalenderåret meddelelse om oppsigelse er mottatt.

Artikkel 20
Straffereaksjoner
For straff, beslag, inndragning og andre strafferettsslike følger, gjelder nasjonal lovgivning.

Artikkel 21
Opphevelse av någjeldende overenskomst
Ved ikrafttredelse av denne avtalen oppheves Overenskomsten mellom Kongeriket Norge og Republikken
Finland om felles forskrifter om fisket i Tanaelvas fiskeområde av 1. mars 1989 med tilhørende forskrifter om
fisket.

Artikkel 22
Ikrafttreden
Denne avtalen trer i kraft den første dagen i den andre måneden etter at partene har meddelt hverandre
 gjennom diplomatiske kanaler at kravene som i henhold til statsforfatningen stilles for at avtalen kan tre i kraft
 er oppfølt.

Til bekreftelse av foranstående har de undertegnende, som er gitt behørig fullmakt til dette, undertegnet
denne avtalen.

Utferdiget i to eksemplarer i Helsingfors den 30. september 2016 på norsk og finsk. Begge tekster har lik
gyldighet.
Vedlegg 2
Fiskeregler for Tanavassdraget

Kapittel 1
Generelle bestemmelser

§ 1.
Virkeområde

Fiskereglene er en integrert del av avtalen mellom Norge og Finland om fisket i Tanavassdraget.

Bestemmelsene i fiskereglene gjelder på grenseelvstrekningen jf. avtalens artikkel 2 punkt 1. Kapittel 6 om beskyttelse mot biologisk påvirkning gjelder i hele nedbørfeltet til Tanavassdraget.

§ 2.
Grupper av fiskere på grenseelvstrekningen

I Norge deles personer som er berettiget til å kjøpe fiskekort i følgende grupper:
1) Fiskerettshavere med rett til å fiske med alle redskaper etter § 4 i lov om fiskeretten i Tanavassdraget (Tanaloven);
2) Fiskerettshavere med rett til å fiske med stang og håndsnøre etter § 5 i lov om fiskeretten i Tanavassdraget;
3) Person som ikke er fiskerettshaver etter lov om fiskeretten i Tanavassdraget, og ikke er fast bosatt i Tanavassdragets elvedaler.

I Finland deles personer som er berettiget til å kjøpe fiskekort i følgende grupper:
1) Fiskerettshaver etter lov om fiske (379/2015) § 4, første ledd, punkt 10, som er fast bosatt i Tanavassdragets elvedaler;
2) Fiskerettshaver etter lov om fiske § 4, første ledd, punkt 10, som ikke er fast bosatt i Tanavassdragets elvedaler;
3) Person som er fast bosatt i Tanavassdragets elvedaler;
4) Person som ikke er fiskerettshaver etter lov om fiske § 4, første ledd, punkt 10, og ikke er fast bosatt i Tanavassdragets elvedaler.

Kapittel 2
Fiskeravgift og fiskekort

§ 3.
Fiskeravgift

Plikten til å betale fiskeravgift ved fiske på grenseelvstrekningen følger lovgivningen i det landet hvor fiskekortet blir løst.

§ 4.
Kategorier av fiskekort

Fiskekort for fiske på grenseelvstrekningen, jf. avtalens artikkel 10, inndelers i følgende kategorier:
1) Generelt fiskekort for lokale fiskere gir rett til å fiske med alle fiskemåter som er nevnt i disse reglene, med de begrensninger som nevnes senere, og i det omfang som fiskeretten nasjonalt bestemmer. Rett til å kjøpe generelt fiskekort for lokale fiskere har i Norge de personer som er nevnt i § 2, første ledd punkt 1, og i Finland de personer som er nevnt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 1. Generelt fiskekort for lokale fiskere gjelder for en fiskesesong.
2) Stangfiskekort for lokale fiskere gir rett til å fiske med stang fra strand og båt med de begrensninger som
nevnes senere. Rett til å kjøpe stangfiskekort for lokale fiskere har i Norge de personer som er nevnt i § 2, første ledd punkt 2, og i Finland de personer som er nevnt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 3. Stangfiskekort for lokale fiskere gjelder for en fiskesesong.

3) **Fiskekort for fiske fra båt (båtfiskekort)** gir rett til å fiske med stang og håndsnøre fra båt, med senere nevnte betingelser og begrensninger.

4) **Fiskekort for fiske fra strand (strandfiskekort)** gir rett til å fiske med stang og håndsnøre fra strand, med senere nevnte betingelser og begrensninger.

### § 5.
**Fordeling av antall fiskekort til ulike soner**

Det maksimale antallet båtfiskekort, per fiskesesong er 11.000 fiskedøgn, som fordeles likt mellom Norge og Finland. Antall fiskekort for fiske fra båt fordeles på følgende måte for fiskesoner i grenseelvstrekningen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidsrom</th>
<th>Nuorgam</th>
<th>Veahčajohka</th>
<th>Utsjoki</th>
<th>Outakoski og Anárjohka</th>
<th>Til sammen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6-16.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6-23.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6-30.6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-7.7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7-14.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7-21.7</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7-28.7</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7-4.8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8-10.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totalt</strong></td>
<td>980</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>3576</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>11000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Det maksimale antallet strandfiskekort per fiskesesong er 11.000 fiskedøgn, som fordeles likt mellom Norge og Finland. Antall fiskekort for fiske fra strand fordeles på følgende måte mellom strandfiskesonene i grenseelvstrekningen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidsrom</th>
<th>Nuorgam</th>
<th>Veahčajohka</th>
<th>Utsjoki</th>
<th>Outakoski hovedlopet</th>
<th>Anárjohka</th>
<th>Til sammen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6-16.6</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6-23.6</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6-30.6</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-7.7</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7-14.7</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7-21.7</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7-28.7</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7-4.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8-10.8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totalt</strong></td>
<td>3527</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>4114</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>11000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grensen for fiskesonene følger av kartvedlegg 1 til fiskereglene. Sonene skal merkes i terrenget.

En kvote på høyst en tredjedel av dagfiskekortene som selges i Finland kan reserveres for fiskeretthavere fast bosatt andre steder enn i Tanavassdragets elvedaler som angitt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 2. Kvoten skal fordeles likt på stangfiskekort og båtfiskekort.
Kapittel 3
Fiskeredskaper, fiskesesong og fisketider

§ 6.
Tillatte fiskeredskaper

Tillatte redskap for fiske av laks, sjøørret og sjørøye er:
1) stengsel med krokgarn (joddu) og ruse (meardi)
2) settsgarn
3) drivgarn
4) stang og håndsnøre.

Tillatte redskap for fiske av andre fiskearter enn nevnt i første ledd, er:
1) settsgarn
2) stang og håndsnøre
3) teine
4) lakekrok ved fiske på isen
5) kastenot i innsjøer i Anárjohka ovenfor Matinköngäs.

Andre redskaper og fiskemetoder enn de som er nevnt foran i 1 og 2 ledd, herunder oter, er forbudt.

De som har generelt fiskekort, jf. § 4 punkt 1, kan bruke redskap nevnt foran i første og andre ledd. Andre fiskere kan bare bruke stang og håndsnøre.

§ 7.
Generell ukefredning

I fiskesesongen er alt fiske forbudt fra søndag kl. 18 (19) til mandag kl. 18 (19). Unntatt fra dette er fiske i innsjøer etter andre fiskearter enn laks, sjøørret og sjørøye når fisket foregår mer enn 200 meter fra utløps- eller innløpsos.

§ 8.
Fiskesesong for stang og håndsnøre

For personer fast bosatt i Tanadalen, med fiskekort angitt i § 4, punkt 1 og 2, er fiske med stang og håndsnøre (stangfiske) tillatt fra 1. juni til 20. august.

For personer med fiskekort angitt i § 4, punkt 3 og 4 er stangfiske tillatt fra 10. juni til 10. august.

For personer nevnt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 2, med fiskekort fra kvoten nevnt i § 5 fjerde ledd, er stangfiske tillatt fra 1. juni til 10. august. Fiskekort for å fiske i perioden 1.- 9. juni kan løses fra kvoten reservert for den første perioden ifølge tabell under § 5.

§ 9.
Båtfiskekort og strandfiskekort

Båtfiskekort og strandfiskekort er personlig.

Strandfiskekort gir rett til å bruke én stang. Fiskekortet gjelder i en nærmere angitt fiskesone i den staten hvor strandfiskekortet er kjøpt. Fiskekortet gjelder i ett fiskedøgn som begynner kl. 22 (23) og slutter dagen etter kl. 15 (16). Strandfiskekort fra kvoten reservert etter § 5, fjerde ledd for personer som er nevnt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 2, gjelder for fiskedøgn som begynner kl. 22 (23) og slutter dagen etter kl. 22 (23).


Ved fiske fra båt mellom kl. 18 (19) og 06 (07) skal det i båten være med en roer som bor fast i Tanadalen (lokal roer). De båtfiskekort som er reservert etter § 5, fjerde ledd for personer nevnt i § 2, andre ledd punkt 2,
er unntatt fra denne regelen. I Storfossen-området mellom Boratbokča og Bildanguoika skal det alltid være en lokal roer i båten.

§ 10.  
Tillatt agn ved fiske med båtfiskekort og strandfiskekort

Personer med båtfiskekort kan fiske med en sluk eller en flue.

Personer med strandfiskekort kan fiske med flue uten dupp eller søkke. I følgende områder kan de også fiske med sluk og flue med dupp eller søkke:
1) i Storfossen, Ailesstrykene og Matinköngäs i henhold til skilt oppsatt i terrenget, samt
2) i Anarjohka oppstrøms fra Matinköngäs og Skiehččanjohka.

Barn opp til 16 år med strandfiskekort kan fiske med flue og dupp.

§ 11.  
Generelle bestemmelser om agn og krokredskap ved stangfiske

Det er forbudt å bruke reker, fisk og mark som agn.

Det er forbudt å bruke krokredskaper på en slik måte og under slike forhold at fisken kan krøkes. Det er tillatt å bruke klepp, fiskeøks og håv som hjelpemiddel for å løfte en fisk som har satt seg fast i redskap, opp i båt eller på land.

Lakekrok er kun tillatt ved isfiske etter lake. Som unntak fra regelen i første ledd, er det tillatt å bruke død fisk fra Tanavassdraget som agn ved fiske med lakekrok.

§ 12.  
Forbudsområder for stangfiske

Stangfiske er forbudt:
1) innenfor ledegarn i stengsel og innenfor et område nærmere enn 50 meter nedenfor stengsel eller 10 meter til siden
2) nærmere enn 10 meter fra settegarn
3) fra bro
4) fra båt og fra strand nærmere enn 200 meter fra nærmeste elvebredd i lakseførende sideelvs munning, unntatt ved Akujoki, Laksjohka og Leavvajohka der grensen er 300 meter.

§ 13.  
Fisketid for drivgarn

Fiske med drivgarn er tillatt i perioden 1. juni til 15. juni, fra mandag kl. 18 (19) til onsdag kl. 18 (19).

§ 14.  
Fisketid for settegarn


I fiskesesongen mellom den 1. juni og 15. juli samt mellom 1. og 12. august er fiske med settegarn tillatt fra mandag kl. 18 (19) til onsdag kl. 18 (19).

I fiskesesongen mellom den 16. og 31. juli er fiske med settegarn tillatt fra mandag kl. 18 (19) til torsdag kl. 18 (19).

§ 15.  
Fisketid for stengsel

Når det ikke er tillatt å fiske skal garnene i stenglets tverrstengsel (doares), ledestengsel (cuollo) og ledegarn (vuojahat) være heist over vannoverflaten eller bragt på land. Alle andre bundne deler av fangstredskapet, inklusive stenglets krokgarn (joddu) og ruse (meardi), skal oppbevares på land.

§ 16.
Antallsbegrensning for garnredskaper

Ved fiske etter laks, sjøørret og sjørøye med drivgarn, settegarn eller stengsel, kan det bare brukes ett redskap om gangen per fiskerettshaver i Norge og per eiendom med rett til slikt fiske i Finland.

§ 17.
Fisketid for andre arter


§ 18.
Fiske fra båt

Det er forbudt å fiske, inkludert utsetting av redskap, fra båt med motoren i gang, og fra båt som er ankret opp.

§ 19.
Ulovlige tiltak

Tiltak som ikke har annen hensikt enn å skremme fisken eller hindre fiskens frie gang er forbudt.

Kapittel 4
Tekniske bestemmelser om fiskeredskap

§ 20.
Merking av redskap

Settegarn og stengsler som er satt ut i elva, skal merkes slik at andre som ferdes i vassdraget, lett kan få øye på dem. Fangstredskapene skal merkes med en flottør som stikker minst 15 cm over vannoverflaten eller med et flagg festet på en stang som stikker minst 40 cm over vannoverflaten. Kortsiden av flagget skal være minimum 15 cm lang.


§ 21.
Maskevidde og trådtype

Ved fiske på laks, sjøørret eller sjørøye er minste tillatte maskevidde i settegarn, drivgarn og krokgarn i stengsel 58 mm, målt fra knutes midtpunkt til knutes midtpunkt når redskapet er vått.

I garn nevnt i første ledd er det bare tillatt å bruke tråd av hamp, bomull, nylonbindetråd eller spunnet nylon (nylon, perlon, terylene). Det er ikke tillatt å bruke gjennomsiktig materiale, som monofilament nylon.

Det er forbudt å bruke metalltråd, wire eller tilsvarende materiale i fangstredskap.

§ 22.
Stengsel

Stengsel skal ha tverrstengsel (doaris), eventuelt ledestengsel (cuollo) og ledegarn (vuojahat) av slik konstruksjon at disse deler av redskapet ikke fanger fisk. I tverrstengsel og ledegarn skal det være trebukker eller stolper med avstand på 3 meter eller mindre.
I tverrstengsel, ledestengsel og ledegarn kan det ellers bare brukes ris, garn, eller grinder med ris eller garn. Når det brukes garn i slike ledeanordninger, skal maskevidden være enten maksimalt 40 mm eller minst 150 mm. Det er forbudt å bruke garn av et gjennomsiktig materiale som monofilament nylon.


Sammen med krokgarnet kan det stå et inntil 15 meter langt ledegarn og ett ledestengsel slik figur 1 viser. Funksjonen til ledegarnet og ledestengselet er å lede laksen til fangstdelen.

Krokgarn nr. 1 skal være festet i den ytterste posestolpen som vist på figur 1.

Krokgarn nr. 2 og 3 skal være festet på følgende måte:
A) i spissen av krokgarnet (se figur 2, krokgarn nr. 3)
B) i ledegarnet (se figur 2, krokgarn nr. 2)
C) i ledestengselet (se figur 1, krokgarn nr. 2), eller
D) i tverrstengselet (se figur 1, krokgarn nr. 3).

Ledestengselet skal stå nedenfor hvert krokgarn/ruse, og være festet på følgende måte:
A) i krokgarnet (se figur 1, ledestengsel nr. 2), eller
B) i ledergarnet (se figur 1, ledestengsel nr. 1)

Dersom det er flere krokgarn ved siden av hverandre fra tverrstengselet (se figur 1, krokgarn nr. 1 og 3), er det bare tillatt å ha ledestengsel fra det ytterste krokgarnet.

Samlet lengde av krokgarn og ledestengsel kan være inntil 80 meter, målt nedstrøms fra ytterste posestolpe som vist på figur 2.

§ 23.  
Settegarn for fiske etter laks, sjøørret og sjørøye

Settegarn for fiske etter laks, sjøørret eller sjørøye er et enkelt, rett garn med flottør i begge ender. Garnet skal ikke festes med stolper eller andre festeanordninger på andre steder enn i endene. Festeanordningen skal bare bestå av et enkelt søkk eller en enkelt stokk. Det er ikke tillatt å lage krok på settegarn.

Settegarn for fiske etter laks, sjøørret eller sjørøye kan være inntil 30 meter lang. To eller flere garn kan ikke lenkes sammen, hvis de sammen blir lengre enn 30 meter.

Ved fiske med settegarn er det forbudt å bruke kunstig strømbryster eller ledestengsel.

§ 24.  
Drivgarn

Drivgarn er et enkelt, rett garn uten pose. Drivgarn kan være inntil 45 meter langt. Ved drivgarnsfiske skal avstanden mellom to drivgarn være minst 200 meter.

Drivingen kan foregå inntil 500 meter om gangen. Under drivingen kan det bare brukes én båt.

§ 25.  
Garnredskaper til fiske etter andre fiskearter

Settegarn til fangst av andre fiskearter enn laks, sjøørret og sjørøye kan være et inntil 2 meter dypt bunngarn, som består av garn med én line, uten pose, laget av monofilamenttråd av inntil 0,17 mm tykkelse.

Ved fiske med settegarn er det ikke lov å bruke kunstig strømbryster eller ledestengel.

Maskevidden i settegarn og kastenot skal være minst 29 mm og høyest 35 mm, målt fra knutes midtpunkt til knutes midtpunkt når redskapet er vått. Det er bare tråd av hamp, bomull, nylonbindetråd eller spunnet nylon som er lov å bruke i kastenoten.

Kastenot må ikke brukes nærmere enn 200 meter fra elvers utløpsos, innløpsos, foss eller stryk.

§ 26.  
Djupål og avstand mellom redskap

Ingen del av stengsel eller settegarn må stå over djupålen i hovedløpet eller sideløp. Den ytterste delen av redskap skal ikke på noe punkt strekke seg nærmere enn 10 meter fra motsatt elvebredd. Med motsatt bredd menes også øyer, holmer og klipper som har egne løp mellom seg.

Ingen del av stengsler må være nærmere enn 120 meter fra annet stengsel.

Ingen del av settegarn og stengsel eller to settegarn må være nærmere enn 60 meter fra hverandre.

§ 27.  
Forbudsområder for garnfiske

Ved sideelv hvor laks går opp, må det i hovedelv på sideelvas side av djupålen, ikke brukes settegarn, drivgarn eller stengsel nedstrøms fra sideelva nærmere enn 200 meter fra samløpet av sideelv og hovedelv.
I de områdene i Storfossen og Ailestrykene som er avmerket i kartvedlegg 2, er fiske med garn eller stengsel bare tillatt for fiskere som har fisket i disse områdene i fiskesesongene 2013-2015.

§ 28.
Opptak av redskap

Fangstredskap skal tas på land straks etter at fiskesesongen for redskapet er avsluttet. Utstyr brukt til å merke og sette opp redskap skal tas på land innen to uker etter avsluttet fiskesesong.

Kapittel 5
Bestemmelser om fangst

§ 29.
Minstemål og gjenutsetting

Laks, sjøørret og sjørøye som er mindre enn 30 cm skal settes ut igjen.

Lengden på fisk måles fra snutespissen til enden av halefinnen.

Det er forbudt å fange vinterstøing og fisk som er mindre enn minstemålet.

Fisk skal alltid gjenutsettes i vannet, hvis den er fanget:
1) utenom lovlige fisketider
2) med forbudt redskap eller fiskemåte.

§ 30.
Fangstoppgave til registret

Fisker er pliktig til å fore fangstdagbok (elektronisk eller på papir) og rapportere følgende opplysninger om hver enkelt fanget fisk av laks, sjøørret, sjørøye, pukkellaks og regnbueørret til et elektronisk fangstregister for Tanavassdraget:
1) område hvor fisket har foregått
2) dato for fisket
3) kjønn, lengde og vekt
4) antall fisk som er gjenutsatt
5) fiskeredskap (stang/håndsnøre, drivgarn, settegarn, stengsel).

Ved gjenutsetting er det ikke påkrevd å opplyse om kjønn, lengde og vekt.

Den som har fisket uten å få fisk skal gi opplysninger om punkt 1, 2 og 5.

Fangstoppgave skal leveres innen første mandag etter at fisket foregikk.

Fisker skal rapportere alle sine fangster av laks, sjøørret og sjørøye før nytt fiskekort kan kjøpes.

Fangst av andre fiskearter kan rapporteres sammen med fangsten av laks, sjøørret og sjørøye eller etter endt fiskesesong. Rapporteringen for disse artene skal inkludere totalvekt for hver art.

Kapittel 6
Beskyttelse mot biologisk påvirkning

§ 31.
Fremmede arter

Pukkellaks, regnbueørret og eventuelle andre fremmede arter som fanges, skal avlives straks.
§ 32.
Fisk som agn og rensing av fisk
Det er forbudt å ta med agnfisk fra andre vassdragsområder til Tanavassdraget.
Det er forbudt å bruke fisk som agn ved stangfiske i Tanavassdragets nedbørfelt.
Innenfor vassdragets nedbørfelt er det i umiddelbar nærhet av naturlige vann ikke tillatt å rense fisk fra annet vassdrag.

§ 33.
Tørking og desinfisering av fiskeredskap og båter
Fiskeredskap og annet fiskeutstyr, samt båter og andre transportmidler som har vært benyttet i annet vassdrag skal være tørt eller desinfisert før det kan benyttes i nedbørfeltet.
Hvert land kan ha utfyllende regler om desinfisering av fiskeredskap og båter.

Kapittel 7
Forhåndsavtalte tiltak

§ 34.
Forutsetninger for anvendelse av forhåndsavtalte tiltak
Ukentlige fisketider i henhold til §§ 8, 13, 14 og 15 reduseres med ett døgn i en del av eller på hele grenseelvstrekningen hvis det blir fastslått følgende avvik i laksebestandenes tilstand sammenliknet med forvaltningsplanen for laksebestandene i Tanavassdraget omtalt i avtalens artikkel 4:
1. Fiskedødelighet i en laksebestand hvor forvaltningsmålene er oppnådd er betydelig høyere enn forutsatt bærekraftig fiskedødelighet.
2. Fiskedødelighet i en laksebestand under gjenoppbygging er betydelig høyere enn forutsatt i gjenoppbyggingsplanen for vedkommende bestand.

Forhåndsavtalte tiltak iverksettes ved overskridelse av følgende bestandsvises terskelverdier:
1. Konstatert fiskedødelighet i en bestand er over 5 % mer enn forutsatt.
2. Konstatert fiskedødelighet i en bestand er over 10 % mer enn forutsatt.

Hvis fiskedødeligheten i en bestand er mer enn 20 % over det som er forutsatt, eller hvis andre omstendigheter krever tiltak, skal ytterligere reduksjon i fisket foretas i samsvar med avtalens artikler 6 og 7.

Det kan innføres mindre restriktive reguleringer av fisket hvis fiskebestandenes tilstand tilsier det, jf. avtalens artiklene 6 og 7.

Vurderingen av om forutsetningene for anvendelse av forhåndsavtalte tiltak er tilstede, gjøres slik det følger av avtalens artikkel 5 tredje punkt og i samsvar med prosedyrer fastsatt i avtalens artikkel 7.

§ 35.
Forhåndsavtalte tiltak rettet mot de enkelte laksebestandene
Fiske er ikke tillatt mellom mandag klokka 18 (19) og tirsdag klokka 18 (19) i de angitte periodene.

Laksebestanden i hovedløpet Tanaelva; redusert fisketid i hovedløpet på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Periode med minst 5 % avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10 % avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</td>
<td>24.6-31.7</td>
<td>24.6-10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</td>
<td>24.6-14.7</td>
<td>24.6-21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settegarn</td>
<td>24.6-30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stengsel</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6-30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lákšjohkas laksebestand; redusert fisketid i Nuorgam fiskefelleskaps område
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### Vehčajohkas laksebestand; reduert fisketid fra Vehčajohkas munning nordover på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</th>
<th>Periode med minst 5% avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10% avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6-30.6</td>
<td>10.6-30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</td>
<td>17.6-23.6</td>
<td>10.6-23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settegarn</td>
<td>10.6-23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stengsel</td>
<td>10.6-23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivgarn</td>
<td>10.6-15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ohcejohkas laksebestander; reduert fisketid anvendes fra Ohcejohkas munning nordover på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</th>
<th>Periode med minst 5% avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10% avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6-14.7</td>
<td>10.6-21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</td>
<td>17.6-7.7</td>
<td>10.6-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settegarn</td>
<td>10.6-23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stengsel</td>
<td>10.6-23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivgarn</td>
<td>10.6-15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Váljohkas laksebestand; reduert fisketid fra Váljohkas munning nordover på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</th>
<th>Periode med minst 5% avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10% avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6-30.6</td>
<td>10.6-7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</td>
<td>23.6-30.6</td>
<td>10.6-30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settegarn</td>
<td>10.6-30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stengsel</td>
<td>10.6-30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivgarn</td>
<td>10.6-15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kárášjohkas og sideelvers laksebestander; reduert fisketid i hele hovedløpet på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</th>
<th>Periode med minst 5% avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10% avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6-30.6</td>
<td>10.6-7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Iešjohkas laksebestander; reduert fisketid i hele hovedløpet på grenseelvstrekningen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</th>
<th>Periode med minst 5% avvik</th>
<th>Periode med minst 10% avvik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Stengsel | 10.6-30.6
Drivgarn | 10.6-15.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anárjohkas og dens sideelvers laksebestander; reduert fisketid i hele hovedløpet på grenseelvstrekningen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settegarn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stengsel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivgarn</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anárjohkas og dens sideelvers laksebestander; reduert fisketid i Anárjohka.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiske med strandfiskekort og båtfiskekort</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stangfiske for lokale fiskere</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settegarn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stengsel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivgarn</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kapittel 8
Andre bestemmelser

§ 36.
Båtregister

For registrering av båter i Tanavassdraget gjelder nasjonal lovgivning. Fastsetting av regler skal skje etter samråd med den annen parts ansvarlige myndigheter.

Fiske fra båt er tillatt bare med båt som er registrert i et båtregister for Tanavassdraget, og som har nasjonalitetsskilt og nummer.

Lokale personer med rett til å fiske med garn etter § 2, kan registrere inntil tre båter.

Lokale personer med rett til å fiske med garn etter § 2 som driver turistnæring, kan registrere inntil 15 båter. Andre lokale fiskere, og fiskerettshavere etter § 2 andre ledd punkt 2 kan registrere inntil én båt.

§ 37.
Nærmere om fastsetting av grenser og fiskesteder

Partenes ansvarlige myndigheter fastsetter i fellesskap elveløpets bredd ved middels sommervannstand i hovedløp og biløp, samt djupål i biløp. Djupålen på grenseelvstrekningen fremgår av den til enhver tid siste grenseoppgang mellom Norge og Finland.

Ansvarlig myndighet i den enkelte stat kan fastsette:
1) grense mellom elv og innsjø;
2) grense mellom hovedelv og sideelv;
3) en ny plass for stengsel i tilfelle stengselsplassen blir uegnet på grunn av endringer i elvebunnen eller annen årsak;
4) tillatte kastenotplasser for fiske etter andre fiskearter i innsjøer i Anárjohka.
§ 38. 
Dispensasjon for tiltak som har vern eller utvikling av fiskestammer som formål

Ansvarlig myndighet kan i enkelttilfeller dispensere fra bestemmelsene i fiskereglene når formålet er å fange stamfisk og settefisk til vitenskapelig undersøkelse, praktiske forsøk eller fiskekulturtiltak. Tillatelsen skal være begrunnet med vern av fiskestammer eller fremme av bærekraftig utnyttelse og tiltaket skal være i samsvar med artikel 1 i avtalen.

Tillatelsen gis av myndigheten i det landet der virksomheten utøves. Før tillatelsen gis, skal fiskerrettshavere og den andre partens ansvarlige myndigheter varsles. Den andre partens ansvarlige myndighet skal varsles om tillatelser som er gitt.
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