

A Race to Protect Europe's Natural Heritage

WWF European Snapshot Report on the Status of Implementation of the Habitats Directive

SWEDEN

Score: 17/30

I. Legal Aspects of Implementation			Score: 7/9
<p>Transposition: To what extent has the Habitats Directive been transposed into national or regional law?</p>			
Good/complete transposition <div style="text-align: right;">3</div>	Some gaps remaining <div style="text-align: right;">2</div>	Key/major gaps remaining <div style="text-align: right;">1</div>	Failure to transpose <div style="text-align: right;">0</div>
<p>A recent government proposal to Parliament with amendments in order to transpose Habitats Directive into national legislation is promising. Due to this recent proposal, the score is high. Nevertheless, some problems remain, especially with art 12, 16 and 17.</p>			
<p>Complaints in Progress at the European level: How significant are current Commission complaints in progress against your Member State?</p>			
No outstanding complaints <div style="text-align: right;">3</div>	Some complaints not yet dealt with <div style="text-align: right;">2</div>	Significant complaints not yet dealt with <div style="text-align: right;">1</div>	Decisions of the ECJ not yet dealt with <div style="text-align: right;">0</div>
<p>Sweden being a relatively new EU member, not so many cases are in progress.</p>			
<p>Member State Response to Complaints: How adequate do you consider your Member State's response to Commission complaints to be?</p>			
Good response at stage of Letter of formal notice <div style="text-align: right;">3</div>	Response before case was referral to the ECJ <div style="text-align: right;">2</div>	Response only after ECJ case decided <div style="text-align: right;">1</div>	No response <div style="text-align: right;">0</div>
<p>The cases have so far been dealt with in an appropriate manner.</p>			
II. Protecting Habitats and Species			Score: 6/12
<p>Natura 2000: How adequate is the list of proposed Natura 2000 sites for the protection of habitats and species?</p>			
coherent national network <div style="text-align: right;">3</div>	more than 50 % sufficient <div style="text-align: right;">2</div>	less than 50 % sufficient <div style="text-align: right;">1</div>	no list submitted <div style="text-align: right;">0</div>
<p>Recent significant progress has been made, but the list is not finalised. Regarding marine sites, few sites proposed, but those that are proposed are adequate. The government is hesitating on implementation of the Economic Exclusive Zone policy. Three important marine sites with major areas in the EEZ are still waiting for government decision.</p> <p>The proposed list is not finalised, so it is not yet fully coherent. Corridors and stepping stones, however, are virtually non-existent.</p>			

<p>Natura 2000: How does your Member State score on the putting in place of management measures? (Article 6)</p>			
All of the above measures have been adequately addressed 3	Some of the measures have been adequately addressed 2	Very few measures are being addressed or are in place 1	Measures are non-existent 0
<p>Some conservation plans exist for the reserves, but often these do not address Habitats Directive species and habitats. The impacts of measures is poorly known, or not known at all. Environmental assessments are non-existent, and often the status of habitats and species is very poorly known. Guidelines exist for the implementation of environmental assessments, but they are not comprehensive.</p> <p>A rough guess of the number of sites with management plans would be 20% at the most. There is also a problem with the adequacy of management plans in relation to the Habitats Directive. This figure must rise, and I expect it will.</p>			
<p>Protection of species beyond Natura 2000: How adequate are non-site based measures for the protection of species? (Article 12, 13, 14 and 16)</p>			
All of the requirements have been adequately addressed 3	Some of the of the requirements have been adequately addressed 2	Very few of the requirements are being addressed or are in place 1	Efforts to address the requirements are non-existent 0
<p>Performance on strict protection measures for animal and plant species and measures on takings of specimens of species (Article 14) is not so bad. However, performance on monitoring measures the granting derogations is very poor.</p>			
<p>Complementary measures: Is your Member State giving adequate attention to complementary measures, such as for research, planning and species reintroduction? (Articles 10, 11, 18 and 22)</p>			
Good effort to implement complementary measures 3	Mixed effort to implement complementary measures 2	Poor effort to implement complementary measures 1	No effort to implement complementary measures 0
<p>Planning and sectoral integration with biodiversity issues are quite OK, but not directly connected with the Habitats Directive. The requirements of this Directive have not been integrated into planning and land use legislation. However, research efforts and other measures (2.2) are non-existent or, at best, poor. By-catch monitoring, for example of the Harbour porpoise, is extremely bad.</p> <p>National nature conservation legislation, implementing the Habitats Directive has not been integrated into the existing legislative framework.</p>			
III. Putting Plans into Practice			Score: 4/9
<p>Finance: Is your government devoting adequate human and financial resources to implementation of the Directive?</p>			
Significant additional resources dedicated to implementation of the Directive 3	Some additional resources dedicated 2	Very few additional resources dedicated 1	No additional resources dedicated 0
<p>This is a major problem in Sweden, particularly for the County Councils, which perform most of the work. LIFE funds have been very useful in implementing the Habitats Directive, there have been about 10 LIFE-</p>			

Nature projects in Sweden up until now. ***In one case at least, structural funds are being used in support of Natura 2000. The agri-environmental scheme is one of the most important funds for Natura 2000 in Sweden.*** Lack of Government funding has been the major obstacle for implementation. Over the last two years there has been a minor increase but funding is still insufficient.

Information and Awareness Raising: *Is your government doing enough to provide information and raise awareness about Natura 2000 and biodiversity conservation?*

Good information and awareness raising activities 3	Some good activities 2	Few information and awareness raising activities 1	No information and awareness raising activities 0
--	---------------------------	--	--

For general biodiversity awareness raising the government's performance is good. However Natura 2000 and Habitats Directive awareness raising is very poor in this respect.

Stakeholder Participation: *Is your government doing enough to involve stakeholders and the general public in the Natura 2000 process?*

Significant amount of effort to consult stakeholders + public 3	Good efforts to consult stakeholders + public 2	Limited efforts of consult stakeholders + public 1	No consultations with stakeholders + public 0
--	---	---	--

This relatively good score arises mainly from the great involvement of landowners and other stakeholders, but the involvement of the general public is not so good.

IV. Political Will

In your opinion, has there been a change in political will or momentum in your Member State around implementation of the Directive? Describe the current political climate surrounding the Directive if you can.

Interest in the Directive was extremely low in 1995, when Sweden entered the EU. Since then, interest has increased slowly. In the beginning it was very difficult to understand the Directive, as it was the kind of legislation Sweden was not used to. Decision-makers at many levels of government still show little interest. The situation is slowly improving.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

In order to assess the Habitat Directive's progress properly, we ***need more information on the Favourable Conservation Status for each habitat and species. An assessment of the BG seminar material and the outcome for each species and habitat from the seminars would be*** of great use, even ***crucial in order to fully evaluate the Natura 2000 network.***

Author: Staffan Danielsson, WWF Sweden
Date: May 2001