



Salmar ASA

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.

[Read full terms of disclosure](#)

Contents

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

Select from:

English

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

Select from:

NOK

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

SalMar is one of the leading companies in the international salmon farming industry. The SalMar Group is integrated from roe to smolt to value-added products and sales. SalMar has significant farming operations in both Central and Northern Norway and operates comprehensive harvesting and VAP facilities at Frøya and Aukra, both in Central Norway, and in Senja, Northern Norway. SalMar's headquarters are at Frøya in Sør-Trøndelag. In addition, the company has a subsidiary, Icelandic Salmon, which is Iceland's largest salmon producer. The SalMar Group employs 2 674 full time equivalents (FTE). The company harvested a total of around 266 500 tons of gutted-weight salmon in 2023. SalMar had direct sales to more than 50 countries world-wide. The SalMar Group generated NOK 28.2 billion in gross operating revenue, made an operational EBIT of NOK 8.1 billion and a net profit of NOK 8.5 billion in 2023. All activities in which the SalMar Group have operational control are included in this year's CDP reporting, as for past CDP reporting, and aligned with our public sustainability reporting. It is SalMar's clearly expressed ambition to be the world's best aquaculture company, driven by our vision: a "Passion for Salmon". SalMar wishes to be a driving force for sustainable growth in the global aquaculture industry.

[Fixed row]

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/30/2024

(1.4.2) Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period

Select from:

Yes

(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years

Select from:

Yes

(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for

Select from:

4 years

(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for

Select from:

4 years

(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for

Select from:

4 years

[Fixed row]

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

NONO0010310956

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

SALM

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

517982815

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

No

[Add row]

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

Select all that apply

Iceland

Norway

(1.11) Are greenhouse gas emissions and/or water-related impacts from the production, processing/manufacturing, distribution activities or the consumption of your products relevant to your current CDP disclosure?

Production

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

- Value chain (excluding own land)

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

- Do not own/manage land

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

SalMar does not own or operate any land, we only purchase fish feed from our suppliers.

Processing/ Manufacturing

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

- Upstream/downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

- Do not own/manage land

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

SalMar does not own or operate any land, we only purchase fish feed from our suppliers.

Distribution

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

- Upstream/downstream value chain (excluding direct operations)

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

- Do not own/manage land

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

SalMar does not own or operate any land, we only purchase fish feed from our suppliers.

Consumption

(1.11.1) Relevance of emissions and/or water-related impacts

Select from:

- No

(1.11.2) Primary reason emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

Select from:

- Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(1.11.3) Explain why emissions and/or water-related impacts from this activity are not relevant

SalMar sells fish, the fish is in no need for further processing once it is sold and as it can be eaten raw does not require energy or water for consumption. We have done a quantitative analysis of potential emissions related to storage of fish in retail freezers, and due to uncertainty in calculations and the low amount of potential emissions it was deemed not relevant.

[Fixed row]

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

Soy

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

Production

(1.22.3) Indicate if you have direct soy and/or embedded soy in your value chain

Select from:

Embedded soy only

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Yes, we are providing the total volume

(1.22.5) Total commodity volume (metric tons)

63094

(1.22.8) Did you convert the total commodity volume from another unit to metric tons?

Select from:

No

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

Embedded soy [soy row only]

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

Not applicable

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

100%

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

Yes

(1.22.19) Please explain

We use soybeans for the fish feed needed to produce salmon. % of soya protein has been given from our feed suppliers, and volume of soya has been calculated based on this percentages and total feed used.

[Fixed row]

(1.23) Which of the following agricultural commodities that your organization produces and/or sources are the most significant to your business by revenue?

Cotton

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Dairy & egg products

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

Produced

(1.23.2) % of revenue dependent on this agricultural commodity

Select from:

100%

(1.23.3) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

Yes

(1.23.4) Please explain

SalMar generates revenue through selling its produced salmon

Fruit

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Maize/corn

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Nuts

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Other grain (e.g., barley, oats)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Other oilseeds (e.g. rapeseed oil)

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Poultry & hog

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Rice

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Sugar

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Tea

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Tobacco

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Vegetable

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Wheat

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

Other commodity

(1.23.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

No

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

Upstream value chain

Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

- Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

- Smallholders not relevant, and not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

All direct suppliers are included in our supplier overview. All know suppliers to these suppliers are included also. Next, the mapping process and due diligence processes are risk-based, covering the most high-risk suppliers. The risk mapping can be based on industry risk, geographical risk or social risk.
[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

- Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain

(1.24.1.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain
- End-of-life management

(1.24.1.4) End-of-life management pathways mapped

Select all that apply

- Preparation for reuse

[Fixed row]

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

Soy

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

100%

(1.24.2.4) % of tier 2 suppliers mapped

Select from:

1-25%

(1.24.2.5) % of tier 3 suppliers mapped

Select from:

1-25%

(1.24.2.6) % of tier 4+ suppliers mapped

Select from:

1-25%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

All supplier tiers known have been mapped for this sourced commodity

[Fixed row]

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Same term as our detailed financial planning. Corresponds to the production cycle of Atlantic salmon.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Within the planning horizon of the management. The horizon includes risk and opportunities already experienced in existing operations.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

Select from:

No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Long-term investments, climate targets etc.

[Fixed row]

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization’s process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water
- Plastics
- Biodiversity

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Dependencies

- Impacts
- Risks
- Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain
- Downstream value chain
- End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- Site-specific
- Local
- Sub-national
- National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- Biodiversity indicators for site-based impacts
- LEAP (Locate, Evaluate, Assess and Prepare) approach, TNFD
- TNFD – Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures
- WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

- Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- Environmental Impact Assessment
- IPCC Climate Change Projections
- Life Cycle Assessment

- Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :TCFD

Databases

- Regional government databases

Other

- Scenario analysis
- Desk-based research
- Materiality assessment
- Internal company methods
- Jurisdictional/landscape assessment
- Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- Drought
- Avalanche
- Landslide
- Wildfires
- Heat waves
- Cold wave/frost
- Pollution incident
- Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

- Heat stress
- Soil erosion
- Water stress
- Sea level rise
- Change in land-use
- Ocean acidification
- Temperature variability
- Increased severity of extreme weather events
- Seasonal supply variability/interannual variability
- Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

- Carbon pricing mechanisms
- Changes to national legislation
- Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

- Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
- Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
- Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

Market

- Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
- Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- Availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content
- Changing customer behavior

Reputation

- Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
- Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)
- Stigmatization of sector

Technology

- Inability to increase yield of existing production areas
- Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

- Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NGOs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulators |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local communities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employees | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous peoples |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Investors | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suppliers | |

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The process has been professionalized and done in a more extensive manner following the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive requirements
[Add row]

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?

(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed

Select from:

Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

In our assessments of environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, there were several interconnections discovered. Some activities of the company may have a positive impact on the climate but a negative impact on the environment, and the other way around. Such interconnections are evaluated and trade-offs considered to establish a net positive contribution.
[Fixed row]

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

Yes, we have identified priority locations

(2.3.2) Value chain stages where priority locations have been identified

Select all that apply

- Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

- Areas important for biodiversity

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities

- Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to forests
- Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to biodiversity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Through our assessments of dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, we have identified the most significant locations.

(2.3.5) Will you be disclosing a list/spatial map of priority locations?

Select from:

- Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

SalMar Sensitive areas for Water Scacity and Biodiversity in Valuechain 2024.xlsx
[Fixed row]

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- Qualitative

- Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- Other, please specify :We use a combination of these factors - quantified into cost estimate

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

100000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Frequency of effect occurring
- Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Frequency and likelihood considered on a 1 to 5 scale. Time horizons defined as described in short term, medium term, and long term

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- Qualitative
- Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- Other, please specify :Combination of the above factors, resulting in a cost savings estimate or increase in revenue.

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

100000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- Frequency of effect occurring
 Time horizon over which the effect occurs
 Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Frequency and likelihood considered on a 1 to 5 scale. Time horizons defined as described in short term, medium term, and long term
[Add row]

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health?

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

SalMar has a water management policy, which outlines how the company manages water consumption, water quality, and wastewater discharge, as well as its considerations for water risk and scarcity. It also details the company's commitment towards always treating its wastewater carefully according to site-specific permits before discharging it into the sea. SalMar follows the Norwegian standard NS 9410, for environmental monitoring of benthic impact from marine aquaculture facilities, where water pollutants and all types of impact on water bodies, ecosystems and seabed conditions are measured and monitored. The standard also requires corrective actions to be taken if developments move in an undesirable direction. In the reporting year, SalMar has conducted a comprehensive impact, risk, and opportunity assessment of water pollution. Pollutants have been categorized based on their type and impact, including indicators such as organic spills, inorganic spills, and the loading of nitrogen, carbon, and phosphorus, among others. Monthly metric measurements, by Norwegian standard, of total organic carbon (TOC), oxygen demand, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus in all our wastewater, which is reported to local authorities. When resources cannot be effectively reused, their disposal is managed responsibly. Each SalMar department has a waste management plan outlining the approved receiving facilities for various waste types. Packaging and fish farming equipment, such as collars, nets, and mooring devices, are sent to organizations that reuse these materials. SalMar remains committed to responsible resource management and minimizing waste generation. Through collaboration with our feed suppliers, we now have an established software for measuring, analyzing and predicting our organic and inorganic spill to sea (like carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus), down to each sea site, based on feed composition, feed volumes, digestibility of the feed and the salmon's uptake. This provides us with detailed and specific insights into our environmental footprint at site-level, both for dissolved particles and particulate matter. SalMar also has a defined water management policy, that states that all wastewater from smolt production is purified before being discharged to the recipient. And that SalMars goal is to not affect the recipient negatively, but rather try to improve the water quality in the recipient by choosing the right treatment and discharge point.

[Fixed row]

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities.

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

The identified risk of an inorganic nitrogen or phosphorus spill into the sea poses several potential water-related impacts. Such a spill can lead to eutrophication, a process where excess nutrients stimulate excessive plant growth, particularly algae. This can result in harmful algal blooms, which can block sunlight and deplete

oxygen levels in the water, leading to hypoxia or oxygen depletion. These conditions can severely affect marine life, disrupting ecosystems and diminishing water quality. Prolonged exposure to these pollutants can also compromise the health of aquatic habitats, leading to long-term ecological imbalances and reduced ecosystems and biodiversity.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Resource recovery
- Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- Water recycling
- Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Resource recovery: SalMar delivers its sludge and silage, holding possible inorganic pollutants, to biogas production, and has partnered with a company in aquaponics to manage wastewater. Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements: SalMar follows the Norwegian standard NS 9410, for environmental monitoring of impact from marine aquaculture facilities, with requirements related to inorganic pollutants. SalMar therefore aims to go beyond compliance with these regularity requirements, having them as a minimum, always aiming for the best possible conditions. Water recycling: All SalMar freshwater facilities use RAS technology, where 99% of the water used is reused, minimizing water discharges. Discharge treatment: SalMar uses biofilters at our smolt facilities to filter out organic pollutants, as well as advanced monitoring systems to track and control nutrient levels in wastewater. Our procedures involve optimizing wastewater treatment processes and applying best practices in feed management to reduce nutrient runoff. Regular inspections and maintenance of our infrastructure are conducted to prevent accidental spills. The success of this management approach can be measured by monitoring water quality indicators, such as nutrient levels and oxygen content, and by tracking the absence of negative environmental impacts, such as harmful algal blooms or significant changes in marine ecosystems.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- Other physical pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Organic carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus from fish feed and feces are produced in our activities. Spills to sea may cause altered microbial activity, oxygen depletion and water quality depletion. "Dead zones" may occur if the spill to sea is significant in constrained areas

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

- Resource recovery
- Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- Water recycling
- Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Resource recovery: SalMar delivers its sludge and silage, holding feces, organic carbon etc, to biogas production. SalMar also cooperates with Nutrimar, that uses by-products from SalMars processing facilities to animal feed and oils. Beyond compliance: SalMar use mechanical filters and biofilters at our smolt facilities to effectively filter out organic pollutants. Our procedures also involve regular monitoring of water quality to ensure that pollutant levels remain within safe limits. Additionally, we maintain strict operational controls to minimize waste generation and ensure proper disposal. Water recycling and discharge treatment: Through RAS technology, SalMar limits the overall amount of pollutants being discharged to the environment. SalMar has also invested in high-technology wastewater treatments at its sites.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

Yes, only in our upstream/downstream value chain

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Since we conduct aquaculture activities in our direct operations, environmental risks for forests are more demanding in our upstream value chain

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Iceland
- Norway

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Carbon pricing is already established on certain commodities as of today, like the diesel we use to operate most our workboats. If the carbon tax increases or its scope expands, it could have an effect on our operational expenditure

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Carbon tax is becoming more evident every year, and both the tax reach and significance is anticipated to increase in the years to come.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Current figure is about 30-40MNOK. With a successful transition plan, the impact can be reduced, but with an unsuccessful transition, the impact will increase

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Pricing and credits

Implement internal price on carbon

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Limited isolated cost of an internal price mechanism, but significant costs related to the transition.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Better estimate of current and future costs of carbon tax

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk4

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

Soy

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

Heat wave

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

Brazil

United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Extreme weather events like heat waves can affect the crops of soy and thus limit the availability of this commodity

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Could drive increased costs for fish feed

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

1000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

50000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the estimated costs of transitioning to different feed sources.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

- Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

7000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Volume of soy multiplied by an estimate 0.1 NOK/kg more expensive feed

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Engaging in developing novel feed ingredients in local areas

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

- Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

- Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

- Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Iceland
- Norway

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We operate under strict regulations with regards to discharge quality and volumes. If there were to become even stricter, it would require investments in improved filtering performance

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased capital expenditures

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

As of today, the regulations are already strict. If they were to become stricter it could drive direct costs of more advanced equipment

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the possible cost of new, advanced equipment

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

Engage with local communities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

No cost in engaging with the local communities and lawmakers.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Engaging with local communities and lawmakers to understand the underlying trends and development in discharge permits

Plastics

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk10

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

Iceland

Norway

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Plastics and circular economy are hot topics today, and SalMar is already working to increase its circularity. It is already established that we will see regulations on plastic products regarding their ability to be recycled and reused.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

More expensive products like our packaging and shipment boxes

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

- Take action to move from single-use plastic products/packaging towards reuse models

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Work with suppliers to establish viable alternatives to current products

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

- Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

- Storm (including blizzards, dust and sandstorm)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

- Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Iceland
- Norway

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Extreme weather events like storms have a negative effect on fish welfare and on structural integrity of our farms

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Short-term

The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

Medium

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

Around 10-50 MNOK

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

10-50 MNOK

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

10000000

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

10000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

50000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Based on the resulting consequences from the events during that year, including asset value

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

Improve monitoring of direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Rough estimation of cost related to environmental monitoring or upgrades to structural integrity of farms

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Environmental monitoring can provide us with insights into fish response to different conditions and possibly predict environmental conditions.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

- Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

- Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Brazil
- United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Climate change can have a negative effect on crops and fish stocks that we are reliant on for our fish feed

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

Medium-high

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Could be significant as this is our largest cost driver

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

1

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

350000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial impact of lack of availability of feed ingredients could be significant. If the overall cost of our feed were to increase with 1 NOK/kg, it would result in a 350 MNOK increase in cost.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

10000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Engage in R&D to develop novel feed ingredients

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Explore local novel feed ingredients that diversify the available feed resources

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk5

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

Soy

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

Iceland

Norway

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

If there was to be introduced carbon tax on imported products to the EU, it would increase costs for SalMar

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Unlikely to significantly effect financial position, but could contribute to a change in sourcing strategy

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

500000

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial effect of a possible tax is difficult to quantify. In 2024, 63,000 tons of soy was imported for use in our feed. If there is a tax of 10NOK/ton, this would result in 630,000 NOK as an annual cost. If the tax is tenfold, then the financial effect could reach more than 6.3 MNOK.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

Other diversification, please specify :Source from both inside and outside of EU, and adopt local ingredients for fish feed.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

No direct cost of diversification estimated

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Response would include continuing R&D work and testing of novel feed ingredients. This is already ongoing at SalMar.

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk6

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

Soy

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

Brazil

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Flooding is a pressing issue for vegetable crops used for our fish feed

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

Short-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Periodical increased costs of feed.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

1000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimate based on recent flooding events. Based on periodic increased cost per kilogram of feed

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

Other diversification, please specify

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

No direct cost of diversification estimated

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Response would include continuing R&D work and testing of novel feed ingredients. This is already ongoing at SalMar.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

Risk8

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

Other policy risk, please specify :Water body impact regulations

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Iceland
- Norway

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

There is a risk that regulators may impose restrictions on open cages in sensitive areas to protect ecosystems and wild stocks. There is an ongoing discussion in Canada on the topic, and although the operating practices and ecosystem exposure in Norway and Iceland are not the same, this risk should still be considered

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- Increased direct costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- Very unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

A single open sea cage costs around 3 MNOK today. A closed cage is close to 100 MNOK.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

10000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

A single closed cage costs 100 MNOK. 100 of these cost 10 bNOK

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

Engage with regulators/policy makers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

No cost in engaging with regulators, as this is current practice in SalMar.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Engaging with regulators is essential to have predictability in our operational framework. Also, gaining experience in closed cage operations is a benefit.
[Add row]

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

OPEX

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

36000000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

10000000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Figures are based on the risks disclosed in 3.1.1. Carbon taxation is the transitional OPEX activity and storms is the physical.

Forests

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

OPEX

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

500000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1000000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Figures are based on the risks disclosed in 3.1.1. The transitional risk is related to carbon taxation on imported products and the physical risk is based on heatwave events.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

10000000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.1.2.6) Amount of CAPEX in the reporting year deployed towards risks related to this environmental issue

1

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Figures for transitional risk based on regulations on discharge water quality resulting in a possible 10 MNOK investment in new equipment. No CAPEX disclosed to be vulnerable to physical water risk. Our infrastructures are built based on up-to-date standards that take into account physical risk related to water, and we have not seen any significant alterations to this risk profile.

[Add row]

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

Unknown

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

0

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Due to the nature of SalMars operating locations being in no risk areas of water scarcity none of our financial assets and revenue is at risk due to water scarcity. Central and Northern Norway are our operating areas in Norway. These areas have very low water stress according to the applied identification tools. As per the WWF Water Risk Filter, Norway has a Physical Basin Risk of 1.62 in 2025. This is the lowest Physical Basin Risk score of all countries globally, and therefore we consider the risk level as low.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Iceland

Unknown

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

0

(3.2.4) % of your organization's total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Due to the nature of SalMars operating locations being in no risk areas of water scarcity none of our financial assets and revenue is at risk due to water scarcity. In Iceland, our operating location is in Westfjords. Iceland's basin has very low water stress according to the applied identification tools. As per the WWF Water Risk Filter, Iceland has a Physical Basin Risk of 1.67 in 2025. This is the second lowest physical basin risk globally, and we therefore consider the risk level as low.
 [Add row]

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No water-related regulatory fines in the reporting year.

[Fixed row]

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Select from:

Yes

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.

Select all that apply

Iceland carbon tax

Norway carbon tax

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

Iceland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/31/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/30/2024

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

1500000

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Numeric value converted to NOK.

Norway carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/31/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/30/2024

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Based on estimated average carbon tax in 2024

[Fixed row]

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

Our strategy for complying with the systems include wide engagement with policy and law makers to understand the ongoing processes for developing new regulations. Also we aim for always improving our operations to be as sustainable as possible, and thus being one step in front of upcoming legislation.

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

Access to sustainability linked loans

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

Iceland

Norway

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Climate change is a very important topic for the capital markets, and sustainability-linked loans have now become very popular. SalMar conducted an updated process this year, and have included performance metrics related to climate change in the agreement.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

Increased access to capital at lower/more favorable rates

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

It will improve our access to affordable capital in the selected time horizons.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

- Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

20000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The details of our sustainability-linked loans is available on www.salmar.no

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

No cost related to our SLL

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

For SalMar it is important to secure financial flexibility through having good access to capital. This is ensured through SalMars sustainability-linked credit facilities and through the green bonds. To be able to get these green bonds and sustainability-linked credit facilities, there is a prerequisite that SalMar are able to meet its sustainability set targets, and can prove to be a sustainable aquaculture producer. One of the prerequisite is therefore to continue to reduce our GHG emissions in line with our targets. Sourcing of the company's fish feed is the largest contributor to GHG emissions, followed by transportation and distribution of the company's products to its intended markets. Air freight dominates the transport-related emissions, and looking at ways to improve and finding transportation methods leading to less emissions are one of the ways that SalMar are looking into reducing its GHG emission and meeting our targets. This is an overall ambition, important for SalMars total strategy, and is therefore prioritized at a top level in SalMar.

Forests

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

Opp2

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

- Soy

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

- Increased brand value

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

- Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- Iceland
- Norway

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Guaranteeing no impact on deforestation and conversion of natural habitats from the soy we use for our feed through stringent certification schemes, is a practice that contributes to increased brand value for SalMar.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

Medium

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Improved access to markets.

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Improved access to markets.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

1000000

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

20000000

(3.6.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

40000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Increased revenue due to SalMar being able to guarantee no impact on deforestation and conversion of natural habitats from the soy we use for our feed, through stringent certification schemes, is a practice that contributes to increased brand value for SalMar. As this is financial effects based on increased revenue based on increased demand for products and services, the financial effect figures are estimated based on evaluations of the access to markets, and on what financial opportunities the access will give SalMar, which are known to be substantial.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Unclear what the cost of purchasing only certified soy is

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

SalMar is engaged in several initiatives to promote deforestation-free feed and soy production through our feed suppliers. This includes participation in the ProTerra Stakeholder Council, membership in the MRV Committee, and involvement in the Aquaculture Dialogues in Brazil focused on sustainable soy. These are important communities for ensuring that SalMar's climate and deforestation commitments are upheld. This constitutes a great opportunity for SalMar to maintain and increase our market value as a best practice actor in the aquacultural sector. The strategy not only mitigates potential risks (in the form of stricter regulations over time, etc.) but is a direct opportunity to differentiate ourselves in the market and build a robust foundation to face market changes. This opportunity is conducted in collaboration with SalMar's feed suppliers, working together to uphold these guarantees. This opportunity is therefore prioritized in another part of SalMar's strategy, which is on increasing brand value through certification of soy, compared to sustainability-linked loans and RAS technologies, which are other opportunities that are also prioritized within its segments.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

Increased security of production

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

Iceland

Norway

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- Other, please specify :All basins previously specified that we have operations in, for Norway and Iceland.

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

A water-related opportunity that we are continuing to seize, is the implementation of RAS systems. This brings a lower freshwater withdrawal and discharge, and gives an increased security of production for us.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

- Short-term
 Medium-term
 Long-term
 The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- Medium

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Improved quality of salmon production

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Improved quality of salmon production

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

1000000

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

20000000

(3.6.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term - minimum (currency)

1

(3.6.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

40000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Financial effects of RAS technologies has direct financial effects in terms of usage of less freshwater, but requires more electricity to operate than a flow-trough system. RAS technology has ripple effects that go beyond the quality of the water, on the fish health of the salmon providing more controlled water quality environments, that again can provide quality salmon, reduce mortality, increased growth rate and so on. However, the direct financial effects are therefore complex to calculate, but are known to be substantial.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1000000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost calculation is based on the investment in Tjuin, our newest smolt facility with state-of-the-art RAS technology

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

By continuing to invest in RAS technology and continuously improving production methods, SalMar will realize the full potential of the opportunity that lies within RAS technology. An example of this is through activities such as SalMar investing in a high technology cleaning facility at its new smolt facility Tjuin, both working towards optimal water quality within the facility for optimal fish health, but also to ensure that the water discharge is as clean as possible. This opportunity is prioritized at a high level, as it is a direct opportunity for improved fish health, which is the most important factor for SalMar - producing salmon "on the salmon's terms," placing animal welfare at the heart of its operations, and when it comes to prioritizing opportunities.

[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

Assets

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

23850000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

All our financing is now sustainability linked. Climate change is a central topic in our agreed financing

Forests

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

28000000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

All our salmon is deforestation-free, and thus our entire revenue from salmon production is connected to the identified opportunity

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1000000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The investment in Tjuin is connected to the identified opportunity.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

Quarterly

(4.1.3) Types of directors your board or equivalent is comprised of

Select all that apply

Executive directors or equivalent

Non-executive directors or equivalent

Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

We comply with the law which states that a minimum of 40% of each biological gender is represented on the board.

[Fixed row]

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.

Climate change

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

- Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Ethical Guidelines

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

- Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

- Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
- Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The governance mechanisms are plentiful, and largely self-explanatory

Forests

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Board chair

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

- Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Ethical Guidelines

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

- Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

- Reviewing and guiding annual budgets
- Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
- Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The governance mechanisms are plentiful, and largely self-explanatory

Water

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

- Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Ethical Guidelines

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

- Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding annual budgets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities | |

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The governance mechanisms are plentiful, and largely self-explanatory

Biodiversity

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Board chair
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

- Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Ethical Guidelines

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

- Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and guiding annual budgets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes |

- Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan
- Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
- Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

*The governance mechanisms are plentiful, and largely self-explanatory
[Fixed row]*

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

- Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

- Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

[Fixed row]

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Implementing a climate transition plan issues
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
- Conducting environmental scenario analysis environmental issues
- Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

Other

- Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

- Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

If events or matters arise, the CEO will inform the Board

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Implementing a climate transition plan environmental issues
- Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

Other

- Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

- Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

If events or matters arise, the CEO will inform the Board

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Implementing a climate transition plan issues
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
- Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

Other

- Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

- Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

If events or matters arise, the CEO will inform the Board

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Policies, commitments, and targets

- Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Implementing a climate transition plan environmental issues

- Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to

- Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

Other

- Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

- Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

If events or matters arise, the CEO will inform the Board

[Add row]

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

All employees on bonus programmes have incentives related to performance within their specific field. One of the most widely applied incentive is related to the feed conversion ratio (FCR). If the FCR is reduced, this would mean that less feed is needed in our productions. Feed production is by far the largest contributor to climate change in our value chain.

Forests

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

All employees on bonus programmes have incentives related to performance within their specific field. One of the most widely applied incentive is related to the feed conversion ratio (FCR). If the FCR is reduced, this would mean that less feed is needed in our productions. Feed production is the part of the value chain that is most in contact with forests.

Water

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

(4.5.3) Please explain

All employees on bonus programmes have incentives related to performance within their specific field. One of the most widely applied incentive is related to the feed conversion ratio (FCR). If the FCR is reduced, this would mean that less feed is needed in our productions. Feed spill to the sea and feed production both have impact on water bodies, so improving this parameter is one of the most important things we can do in the Water category
[Fixed row]

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

Progress towards environmental targets

Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

Board approval of climate transition plan

Shareholder approval of climate transition plan

- Achievement of climate transition plan

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Bonus provided based on performance KPIs, partly related to environmental impacts

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Incentives are a motivation driver to stay dedicated and focused on the task at hand. When incentives are linked to environmental conditions, it contributes to ensure that these conditions are monitored closely.

Forests

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Progress towards environmental targets

- Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Board approval of climate transition plan
- Shareholder approval of climate transition plan
- Achievement of climate transition plan

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Bonus provided based on performance KPIs, partly related to environmental impacts

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Incentives are a motivation driver to stay dedicated and focused on the task at hand. When incentives are linked to environmental conditions, it contributes to ensure that these conditions are monitored closely.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- Progress towards environmental targets
- Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- Board approval of climate transition plan
- Shareholder approval of climate transition plan
- Achievement of climate transition plan

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Bonus provided based on performance KPIs, partly related to environmental impacts

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Incentives are a motivation driver to stay dedicated and focused on the task at hand. When incentives are linked to environmental conditions, it contributes to ensure that these conditions are monitored closely.

[Add row]

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

Direct operations

Upstream value chain

Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Policy yields for all companies in the Group

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

- Commitment to not funding climate-denial or lobbying against climate regulations

Social commitments

- Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
- Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

- Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems
- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

- Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Environmental Practices Policy.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Policy yields for all companies in the Group

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Social commitments

- Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

- Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems
- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

- Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Environmental Practices Policy.pdf

Row 3

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Policy yields for all companies in the Group

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species
- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Water-specific commitments

- Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes
- Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes
- Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances
- Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities
- Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Social commitments

- Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
- Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
- Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights
- Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

Additional references/Descriptions

- Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems
- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

- Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Water Management Policy.pdf

Row 4

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Forests

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- Direct operations
- Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Policy yields for all companies in the Group

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
- Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

- Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species
- Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues
- Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

Forests-specific commitments

- Commitment to best management practices for soils and peat
- Commitment to conduct or support restoration and/or compensation to remedy for past deforestation or conversion
- Commitment to no-conversion of natural ecosystems by target date, please specify :2020
- Commitment to no-deforestation by target date, please specify :2020
- Commitment to the use of the High Conservation Value (HCV) approach

Social commitments

- Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
- Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment
- Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights
- Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

Additional references/Descriptions

- Description of commodities covered by the policy
- Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems
- Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

- Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Deforestation and Responsible Sourcing Policy.pdf

[Add row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

(4.10.3) Describe your organization's role within each framework or initiative

Committed to Science Based Targets through our verified GHG reduction targets.

[Fixed row]

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?

(4.11.1) External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select all that apply

Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

(4.11.2) Indicate whether your organization has a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

- Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement
 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
 Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Environmental Practices Policy.pdf

(4.11.5) Indicate whether your organization is registered on a transparency register

Select from:

- Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply

- Mandatory government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

Barentswatch, ID: SalMar

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

The policy is implemented throughout the organization
[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

Resource rent tax

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Financial mechanisms (e.g., taxes, subsidies, etc.)

- Taxes on products or services

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

- National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

- Norway

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

Oppose

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

NA

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

Submitting written proposals/inquiries

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

0

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

The resource rent tax affects our ability to invest in growth

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

- Paris Agreement
 - Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
 - Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation
- [Add row]

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

Select from:

- Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

- ESRS

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

- Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- Strategy
- Governance
- Emission targets
- Emissions figures
- Commodity volumes
- Water accounting figures
- Water pollution indicators
- Content of environmental policies
- Deforestation and conversion footprint
- Deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status metrics
- Risks & Opportunities
- Value chain engagement
- Dependencies & Impacts
- Biodiversity indicators
- Public policy engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

22-114

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

salmar-annual-report-2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Our Annual Report for 2024.

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

- TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

- Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- Governance
- Dependencies & Impacts
- Risks & Opportunities

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

4-18

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

TCFD-report-SalMar-2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Our TCFD report for 2024.

[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

No, but we plan to within the next two years

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

We do not yet have the internal resources, capabilities or expertise, we are however looking to start using scenario analysis in the next two years. This is our second year responding to water and forest CDP, and was a part of our CSRD response.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

- No, but we plan to within the next two years

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

- Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

We do not yet have the internal resources, capabilities or expertise, we are however looking to start using scenario analysis in the next two years. This is our second year responding to water and forest CDP, and was a part of our CSRD response.

[Fixed row]

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

- IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

- Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Policy
- Market
- Liability
- Reputation
- Technology
- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 2.6 Alignment scenario, the below 2C target is reached through stringent regulations and dedicated collective efforts against climate change. The scenario ambitiously presumes that global emissions peak in 2020 and rapidly decline. This likely happens through high carbon taxation, regulations of operating quotas, technology investments and full transparency for all businesses. In this future scenario, high carbon taxes make fossil fuels exhaustingly expensive and opens the door for low-emission alternatives. This, parallel to increased investments in low-emission technology development, affords feasible low-emission solutions to the transport sector. Regulations on operating quotas further incentivize businesses to become green, and laws on transparency in reporting and operating can eliminate greenwashing. In RCP 2.6, transitional risks dominate. The transition is pressing and expensive for most companies. Demands for emission reductions are put into effect in all three scopes of operations.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The scenario represents a possible future situation

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Policy
- Market
- Liability
- Reputation
- Technology
- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 2.5°C - 2.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In the RCP 4.5 Alignment scenario, some mitigating actions are done like applying low emission fuel alternatives, developing strong reforestation programs, decreasing use of croplands and grasslands due to yield increase and dietary changes, and introducing some extent of carbon taxation. The scenario predicts that the global energy intensity will steadily decrease, but that absolute energy consumption will peak before 2040. Both transitional and physical risks are relevant in this scenario. Stringent climate policies are imposed across industries to limit fossil fuel dependency and incentivize low-emission solutions. For fish farmers, it is likely that a transition to electricity or other low-emission power sources will be the main driver within our own operations. The transition is not as pressing as in the RCP 2.6 scenario, and companies' financial viability is considered important in the transition. However, carbon taxation and/or carbon offset projects are likely to become

mandatory which contributes to incentivizing the transition. Close collaboration with suppliers throughout the value chain is necessary to limit Scope 3 emissions. Fish feed compositions are adjusted to better suit stringent emission reduction pathways by increasing R&D investments. Focus moves towards better agricultural practices rather than feed ingredient substitutions. Low-emission transport solutions upstream and downstream are imperative for Scope 3 emission reductions and will require technological advancements for affordable solutions. This is especially important for transport to distant markets. A higher price to distant markets with an included CO2 tax may be one imposed solution, which could potentially alter the trade patterns of Norwegian salmon. The RCP 4.5 alignment scenario brings transitional costs for salmon farmers, but less pressing than in the RCP 2.6 alignment scenario. It also prompts physical risks in the long run, where extreme weather events will be more frequent, but not to the same extent as in the RCP 8.5 alignment scenario.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The scenario represents a possible future situation

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- Policy
- Market
- Liability
- Reputation
- Technology
- Acute physical
- Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In the RCP 8.5 Alignment scenario, business as usual continues and economic growth is prioritized to climate action. Accelerating population growth rates cause an increased demand for resources, which induces a continued global overconsumption of said resources. The seawater and ambient temperatures increase as a consequence of unwillingness to transition to low-emission fuels. The previously seen demands from customers and financial institutes on sustainability fade, and efforts to financially incentivize businesses towards a green transition fall short. Physical risks dominate this scenario, and both acute and chronic risks come into play. The increasing seawater temperatures pose critical predicaments for fish farmers regarding fish welfare, diseases, algal blooms, eutrophication, and biodiversity. Possible changes to ocean current patterns could alter sea conditions like temperature and salinity which would also affect fish health. As a result of

these challenging conditions, the fish farming industry would likely move northward towards the polar regions to better suit the fish health demands. This would cause a large demand for limited farming areas and a high ecological pressure on these polar regions. Higher ambient temperatures would also affect the transport efficiency of the fresh salmon to the market. An increased need for cooling would increase the ratio of ice transported and thus increase costs and emissions per transported fish. Finally, increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events would make salmon aquaculture a less attractive workplace and demand increased resources dedicated to HSE practices, risk management, and structural integrity of the fish farms. This could also affect feed resource availability. The RCP 8.5 pathway would pose a significant threat to SalMar's business viability in the long term, and SalMar should collaborate with national and international decision-makers to ensure that climate action is taken to prevent this from becoming reality.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*The scenario represents a worst-case situation
[Add row]*

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

- Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- Strategy and financial planning
- Resilience of business model and strategy
- Capacity building
- Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

The results show us that it is important for us to continue to work hard to reduce our emissions and contribute to our value chain becoming more climate friendly. Several actions taken were informed by the results of the scenario analysis, one being the investment in increased value added processing capacity. Our strategy of producing local value added products, decrease the climate footprint of our salmon significantly, and is central to our transition plan.
[Fixed row]

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

No, but we plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Most of the boats operating in the aquaculture industry are run on fossil fuels. SalMar aims to expand the number of low emission or zero emission vessels rather than fossil fuel driven vessels, but will still be reliant on fossil fuels until existing vessels are recycled.

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

- We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Stakeholder engagement through established channels and sporadic dialogue

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

- More frequently than annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

Financially viable energy transitions

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

Strong progress: 26% reduction in absolute emissions from 2020 to 2024, moving at a greater pace than required to align with the 1.5 degree target.

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

- Biodiversity

(5.2.14) Explain how the other environmental issues are considered in your climate transition plan

*Deforestation or conversion free production commitment
[Fixed row]*

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

Select from:

- Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

Select all that apply

- Products and services
- Upstream/downstream value chain
- Investment in R&D
- Operations

[Fixed row]

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

- Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Climate change is a significant global challenge and SalMar are active in exploring solutions that may contribute to mitigation. SalMar have decided to expand its local processing capacities both in Central and Northern Norway to produce more products that are ready to eat. Transporting such products rather than whole fish to the market is a significant contributor to climate change mitigation, and reduced SalMar's climate footprint by close to 100,000 tons CO2e in 2023.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

The production of vegetable ingredients for our feed largely happens in areas with local forests, larger degree of water scarcity, and contributes to a significant part of SalMar's overall carbon footprint. SalMar actively works with feed suppliers to ensure that our feed always is 100% deforestation and conversion free, that water is used in a responsible manner, and that our climate footprint is reduced along the trajectory of our targets.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Due to the pressing challenges with the current practices of feed ingredient sourcing, SalMar are actively exploring alternative, novel feed ingredients to make its feed more sustainable. This is done through investments in R&D projects and testing/evaluating the new feed composition's effect on our salmon's welfare and growth.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

- Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

SalMar has a clear target for GHG reductions aligned with the Paris Agreement's 1.5C target. As part of reducing our Scope 1+2 emissions, we work actively to supply onshore electrical power to our sea sites, install hybrid solutions, and invest in hybrid or full electric boats.

[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- Access to capital

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

It is now clear that access to capital is becoming increasingly dependent on companies' environmental performances. Within this fact, lies both risks and opportunities. SalMar is strongly concerned with showcasing true sustainable operations and with this gaining a better access to capital.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

- Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

Looking forward, it is important to make investments into production methods and equipment that is suitable for future expectation and laws. SalMar is therefore gradually increasing its capital expenditure towards low-carbon solutions

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- Direct costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- Risks
- Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

With increased attention on sustainability and pressing global challenges, lawmakers are looking at how they can contribute towards common goals. One potential action could be import tax on certain products which could be of importance to the aquaculture industry. SalMar is monitoring the developments to be prepared for possible viable alterations to our financial planning
 [Add row]

(5.4) In your organization’s financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition	Indicate the level at which you identify the alignment of your spending/revenue with a sustainable finance taxonomy
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A sustainable finance taxonomy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At both the organization and activity level

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

- A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

- EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

300000

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

0.1

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

0.2

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

0.8

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

99.2

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities, widely known by companies of this size

Row 2

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

OPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

3000000

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

0.3

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

0.4

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

0.5

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

8.8

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

91.2

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities, widely known by companies of this size

Row 3

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:

Total across climate change mitigation and climate change adaption

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

Revenue/Turnover

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

0

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

0

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

0

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

100

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

*SalMar's only revenue stream is from production of salmon. This activity is not applicable in the current version of the EU taxonomy.
[Add row]*

(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year.

Row 1

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

CAPEX

OPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

Own performance

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

300000

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.20) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

3000000

(5.4.2.21) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity as % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0.3

(5.4.2.22) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0.3

(5.4.2.23) Taxonomy-aligned OPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total OPEX in the reporting year

0.3

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

EU Taxonomy as published in the Annual Report. Our auditors carried out a pre-assurance to verify the process.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

As per EU Taxonomy instruction. After deriving the Taxonomy-eligible activities, the next step is to evaluate the technical criteria for the activity to ensure substantial contribution and no significant harm. For the Taxonomy-eligible activity 6.10 - Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities, the substantial contribution to Climate Change Mitigation encompasses the vessels' energy consumption being derived at least 25 % from zero direct (tailpipe) CO2 emission fuels, and the vessels not being dedicated to the transport of fossil fuels. SalMar's hybrid and electrical workboats meet this criteria, but the hybrid well-boats on long-term lease could not meet this criteria. The Do No Significant Harm criteria encompassed undertaking an environmental impact assessments and evaluating the risk of environmental impacts and impacts on water quality, fulfilling requirements towards waste handling, scrapping regulations, storage of hazardous materials, limiting emissions to air and to sea, documenting treatment and disposal of ballast water as well as coating used on the vessels, reducing noise and vibrations through choice of propellers and hull design, and overall limiting impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

As per EU Taxonomy instruction. After deriving the Taxonomy-eligible activities, the next step is to evaluate the technical criteria for the activity to ensure substantial contribution and no significant harm. For the Taxonomy-eligible activity 6.10 - Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities, the substantial contribution to Climate Change Mitigation encompasses the vessels' energy consumption being derived at least 25 % from zero direct (tailpipe) CO2 emission fuels, and the vessels not being dedicated to the transport of fossil fuels. SalMar's hybrid and electrical workboats meet this criteria, but the hybrid well-boats on long-term lease could not meet this criteria. The Do No Significant Harm criteria encompassed undertaking an environmental impact assessments and evaluating the risk of environmental impacts and impacts on water quality, fulfilling requirements towards waste handling, scrapping regulations, storage of hazardous materials, limiting emissions to air and to sea, documenting treatment and disposal of ballast water as well as coating used on the vessels, reducing noise and vibrations through choice of propellers and hull design, and overall limiting impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

SalMar Annual Report 2024.pdf

Row 2

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

CAPEX

OPEX

(5.4.2.17) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

137000000

(5.4.2.18) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned CAPEX associated with this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

8.8

(5.4.2.24) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity in the reporting year (currency)

76000000

(5.4.2.25) Taxonomy-eligible but not aligned OPEX associated with this activity as % total OPEX in the reporting year

8.8

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

EU Taxonomy as published in the Annual Report. Our auditors carried out a pre-assurance to verify the process.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

As per EU Taxonomy instruction. After deriving the Taxonomy-eligible activities, the next step is to evaluate the technical criteria for the activity to ensure substantial contribution and no significant harm. For the Taxonomy-eligible activity 6.10 - Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities, the substantial contribution to Climate Change Mitigation encompasses the vessels' energy consumption being derived at least 25 % from zero direct

(tailpipe) CO2 emission fuels, and the vessels not being dedicated to the transport of fossil fuels. SalMar's hybrid and electrical workboats meet this criteria, but the hybrid well-boats on long-term lease could not meet this criteria. The Do No Significant Harm criteria encompassed undertaking an environmental impact assessments and evaluating the risk of environmental impacts and impacts on water quality, fulfilling requirements towards waste handling, scrapping regulations, storage of hazardous materials, limiting emissions to air and to sea, documenting treatment and disposal of ballast water as well as coating used on the vessels, reducing noise and vibrations through choice of propellers and hull design, and overall limiting impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

As per EU Taxonomy instruction. After deriving the Taxonomy-eligible activities, the next step is to evaluate the technical criteria for the activity to ensure substantial contribution and no significant harm. For the Taxonomy-eligible activity 6.10 - Sea and coastal freight water transport, vessels for port operations and auxiliary activities, the substantial contribution to Climate Change Mitigation encompasses the vessels' energy consumption being derived at least 25 % from zero direct (tailpipe) CO2 emission fuels, and the vessels not being dedicated to the transport of fossil fuels. SalMar's hybrid and electrical workboats meet this criteria, but the hybrid well-boats on long-term lease could not meet this criteria. The Do No Significant Harm criteria encompassed undertaking an environmental impact assessments and evaluating the risk of environmental impacts and impacts on water quality, fulfilling requirements towards waste handling, scrapping regulations, storage of hazardous materials, limiting emissions to air and to sea, documenting treatment and disposal of ballast water as well as coating used on the vessels, reducing noise and vibrations through choice of propellers and hull design, and overall limiting impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

SalMar Annual Report 2024.pdf

[Add row]

(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment.

	Details of minimum safeguards analysis	Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting	Indicate whether you will be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1
	<i>Evaluation of current practices and established policies.</i>	<i>Our auditors were active in the process in a so-called "pre assurance process".</i>	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.2) Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.3) Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.4) Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Assumed a linear trend

[Fixed row]

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization’s internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

- Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

- Drive low-carbon investment
- Conduct cost-benefit analysis
- Reduce upstream value chain emissions
- Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
- Influence strategy and/or financial planning
- Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets
- Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making
- Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in risk assessment

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

- Alignment with the price of a carbon tax
- Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme
- Benchmarking against peers
- Price/cost of voluntary carbon offset credits

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

Price estimated and determined based on current standing of carbon tax and value of carbon credits, as well as common practice among large international businesses.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2
Scope 1 or 2)
- Scope 3, Category 6 - Business travel
- Scope 3, Category 1 - Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 5 - Waste generated in operations
- Scope 3, Category 4 - Upstream transportation and distribution
- Scope 3, Category 3 - Fuel- and energy-related activities (not included in

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

- Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

- Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

Increase

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

100

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

1000

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

- Dependencies management
- Risk management
- Opportunity management

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

- No

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

100

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

- Yes

(5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

*Pricing approach is continuously updated to reflect best practice
[Add row]*

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

Climate change

Forests

Water

Plastics

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water
- Plastics

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

- Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- Climate change
- Forests
- Water
- Plastics

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

- No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

- Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

SalMar has a priority to engage with all relevant stakeholders, as such our response is put under the remaining stakeholder groups.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

Climate change

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

- Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

- Dependence on water
- Dependence on commodities
- Impact on pollution levels
- Impact on water availability
- Impact on plastic waste and pollution
- Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions
- Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets
- Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

- 76-99%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Suppliers are considered to have a substantive dependency on the environment if they are dependent on certain environmental conditions or products that are sensitive to environmental change to deliver their product or service to SalMar. Suppliers are considered to having a substantive impact on the environment if they to significantly influence or alter environmental conditions through their actions, either in SalMar's value chain or in other value chains the supplier is involved in.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

- 1-25%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

3

Forests

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

- Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

- Dependence on water
- Dependence on commodities
- Impact on pollution levels
- Impact on water availability
- Impact on plastic waste and pollution
- Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions
- Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets
- Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

- 76-99%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Suppliers are considered to have a substantive dependency on the environment if they are dependent on certain environmental conditions or products that are sensitive to environmental change to deliver their product or service to SalMar. Suppliers are considered to having a substantive impact on the environment if they to significantly influence or alter environmental conditions through their actions, either in SalMar's value chain or in other value chains the supplier is involved in.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

- 1-25%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

2

Water

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

- Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

- Dependence on water
- Dependence on commodities
- Impact on pollution levels
- Impact on water availability
- Impact on plastic waste and pollution
- Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions
- Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets
- Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

- 76-99%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Suppliers are considered to have a substantive dependency on the environment if they are dependent on certain environmental conditions or products that are sensitive to environmental change to deliver their product or service to SalMar. Suppliers are considered to having a substantive impact on the environment if they to significantly influence or alter environmental conditions through their actions, either in SalMar's value chain or in other value chains the supplier is involved in.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

1-25%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

2

Plastics

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

- Dependence on water
- Dependence on commodities
- Impact on pollution levels
- Impact on water availability
- Impact on plastic waste and pollution
- Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions
- Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets
- Impact on deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

76-99%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Suppliers are considered to have a substantive dependency on the environment if they are dependent on certain environmental conditions or products that are sensitive to environmental change to deliver their product or service to SalMar. Suppliers are considered to having a substantive impact on the environment if they to significantly influence or alter environmental conditions through their actions, either in SalMar's value chain or in other value chains the supplier is involved in.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

1-25%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

2

[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize our engagement with suppliers that have the most substantial dependency and/or impact on the environmental issue

Forests

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to forests

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize our engagement with suppliers that have the most substantial dependency and/or impact on the environmental issue

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to water

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize our engagement with suppliers that have the most substantial dependency and/or impact on the environmental issue

Plastics

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

- Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

- In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to plastics

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We prioritize our engagement with suppliers that have the most substantial dependency and/or impact on the environmental issue
[Fixed row]

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

Climate change

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

- Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

- Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

This is not yet included explicitly in all contracts, however, following the environmental requirements pertaining to climate is a prerequisite for a continued supplier relationship.

Forests

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

This is not yet included explicitly in all contracts, however, following the environmental requirements pertaining to forests is a prerequisite for a continued supplier relationship.

Water

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

This is not yet included explicitly in all contracts, however, following the environmental requirements pertaining to water is a prerequisite for a continued supplier relationship.

[Fixed row]

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

Disclosure of GHG emissions to your organization (Scope 1, 2 and 3)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

Second-party verification

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Nothing further

Forests

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

No deforestation or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

On-site third-party audit

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Nothing further

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

Other, please specify :Our suppliers verify their suppliers using on site monitoring. Our suppliers own impact on "water" is negligible in comparison. We ensure that our suppliers' value chains are responsible through engagement and data monitoring.

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

1-25%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

51-75%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Nothing further
[Add row]

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

- Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
- Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones
- Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

Information collection

- Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services
- Invest jointly with suppliers in R&D of relevant low-carbon technologies

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 2 suppliers
- Tier 3 suppliers

Tier 4+ suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

76-99%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

76-99%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

Collection of data and discussion on reduction plans. The data is collected by Tier 1 supplier, but based on activity in their supply chain, spanning many Tier 2+ suppliers. No engagement directly from SalMar towards Tier 2+ suppliers on this topic, but via feed suppliers. The measure of success is the performance towards the set environmental target, and an evaluation is done for the impact of the engagement.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Disclose GHG emissions and validate reduction plan

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

Yes

Forests

(5.11.7.1) Commodity

Select from:

- Soy

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- No deforestation and/or conversion of other natural ecosystems

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Financial incentives

- Include long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments
- Other financial incentive, please specify :Clear "no-go" stance on contributing to deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems.

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 2 suppliers
- Tier 3 suppliers
- Tier 4+ suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

- 100%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

100%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

1

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

We have a clear "no-go" stance on contributing to deforestation and the conversion of natural ecosystems. We engage specifically with the suppliers that are most at risk of breaching this stance. This involves these suppliers ensuring full, unwavering compliance throughout their value chain down to farm level. The stance applies to all suppliers of SalMar. Here, engagement through long-term contracts linked to environmental commitments applies. This is because our supplier contracts are contingent on the continued adherence to our strict DF/DCF policies. Success is measured by performance against our environmental targets, and we evaluate the impact of our engagements accordingly. Through strict requirements and close collaboration with our suppliers, we have consistently met our annual rolling target of sourcing 100% CF/DCF soy for many years.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :No deforestation and conversion

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Information collection

- Collect water quality information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., discharge quality, pollution incidents, hazardous substances)
- Collect water quantity information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., withdrawal and discharge volumes)

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

- Tier 1 suppliers
- Tier 2 suppliers
- Tier 3 suppliers
- Tier 4+ suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

- 1-25%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

- 100%

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

SalMar engages in collaboration with its feed suppliers with feed ingredient producers to ensure a development in terms of water consumption reduction internally and in the supply chain. We therefore work to ensure water consumption reduction targets for our feed suppliers and producers, and put particular focus on water-scarce regions. Collection of data and validation of reduction plans. The measure of success is the performance towards the set environmental target and an evaluation is done for the impact of the engagement. This engagement has positive outcome on feed suppliers development towards a more sustainable production, and reducing pressure on vulnerable water resources and areas. Having demands on water consumption reduction targets require the suppliers to work towards reaching its goals, supports suppliers in improving their environmental practices and therefore contribute to enhance water security. This engagement is an ongoing process, continuously working to improve systems and utilization of resources.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Water discharge/withdraw/consumption/usage volumes and reductions

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

Yes

Plastics

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

Removal of plastic from the environment

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

1-25%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

Engagement on product innovation to remove plastic pollution from the environment. Measure of success is the performance towards the set environmental target and an evaluation is done for the impact of the engagement.

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.8) Provide details of any environmental smallholder engagement activity

Row 1

(5.11.8.1) Commodity

Select from:

Soy

(5.11.8.2) Type and details of smallholder engagement approach

Innovation and collaboration

Other innovation and collaboration, please specify :Collaboration with feed suppliers and various projects with smallholders, see details under "effect of engagement"

(5.11.8.3) Number of smallholders engaged

1

(5.11.8.4) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Environmental smallholder engagement in relation to soya production is operated through collaboration with SalMars feed suppliers. Our feed suppliers requires smallholders to carry out an assessment of their potential adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services, and have measures in place to avoid, minimize or rectify these. SalMar are in continuous discussions with feed suppliers on how to optimize agricultural practices on ground. Our smallholders are today using crop rotation (e.g., rotating soy and wheat) which helps promote nutrient cycling, interrupt pest/disease cycles, and improves soil health and biodiversity. There is also ongoing work for increased adoption of organic farming techniques, limiting pesticide use.

[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Customers are engaged through transparency on forest-risk commodities and collaboration on sustainable sourcing. Their influence helps drive demand for deforestation-free products and supports shared goals across the value chain. Engagement on how they can contribute to reducing the climate impact of the product they are purchasing, for example by purchasing locally processed products rather than whole fish.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Increase in local processing and this GHG emission reduction. Measure of success is the performance towards the set environmental target and an evaluation is done for the impact of the engagement. We also measure (with third party verification) the share of salmon that is locally processed into value added products. Our target is to reach 40% in 2030, and the impact of our engagement moved us from around 30% (adjusted for NRS and NTS volumes) to 36% in the last year. We foresee a steady increase towards our target going forward.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Customers are engaged through transparency on forest-risk commodities and collaboration on sustainable sourcing. Their influence helps drive demand for deforestation-free products and supports shared goals across the value chain

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Customer engagement has led to increased demand for deforestation-free products and improved traceability in our supply chain. Success is measured through customer adoption of sustainable sourcing policies, joint initiatives launched, and progress toward shared forest-related targets.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Customers are key to driving water stewardship across the value chain. Engagement ensures alignment on water risks and supports shared sustainability goals. We share water-related data, collaborate on efficiency measures, and support joint reporting and target-setting.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Customer engagement has led to improved awareness and action on water risks. Success is measured through joint water targets, efficiency improvements, and increased transparency in water-related reporting.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders in creation and review of your climate transition plan

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Engaging investors and shareholders on climate change to ensure transparency, strengthen trust, and align our sustainability strategy with stakeholder expectations. Climate-related risks and opportunities are material to our long-term performance, and active engagement supports informed decision-making and responsible investment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our engagement fosters increased transparency, improved climate disclosures, and stronger alignment between SalMar's strategy and investor expectations. Success is measured through positive investor feedback, inclusion in sustainability indices, and progress in climate-related reporting and performance.

Forests

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Engaging investors on forest-related issues to address deforestation risks in our feed supply chain, particularly linked to soy sourcing. We aim to ensure transparency, demonstrate progress on deforestation-free commitments, and align with investor expectations on nature and biodiversity. Engagement includes disclosure of sourcing practices, traceability efforts, and participation in relevant sustainability frameworks.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Investor engagement on forest-related issues has strengthened awareness of deforestation risks and supported SalMar's efforts toward more sustainable feed sourcing. Success is measured through improved traceability, progress on deforestation-free commitments, and alignment with investor-led sustainability benchmarks.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks
- Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
- Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Engaging investors and shareholders on water-related issues to address the environmental impacts of aquaculture operations and ensure responsible water use and discharge. We aim to align with investor expectations on ecosystem protection and regulatory compliance. Engagement includes transparency on water management practices, reporting on water-related risks, and progress toward minimizing negative impacts on marine and coastal environments.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Investor and shareholders engagement on water-related issues has increased awareness of responsible water use and supported improvements in SalMar's environmental performance. Success is measured through enhanced water reporting, reduced discharge impacts, and alignment with investor expectations and regulatory standards.

[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>Aligned with financial reporting</i>
Forests	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>Aligned with financial reporting</i>
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>Aligned with financial reporting</i>
Plastics	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>Aligned with financial reporting</i>
Biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational control	<i>Aligned with financial reporting</i>

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:

No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

	Has there been a structural change?
	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

- The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	We report both. It is our location-based Scope 2 figure that is included in our Science-Based Scope 1+2 target

[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:

- No

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28689

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3405

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Measurement approach is from actual energy consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from EEA, as approved by the SBTi

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

46981

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Measurement approach is from actual energy consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from EEA, as approved by the SBTi

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1056860

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are based on three main categories: fish feed, packaging and purchased oils. The values are calculated based on supplier data on CO2 factors and volumes, and verified through internal control systems.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Directly calculated from Scope 1 emissions based on DEFRA CO2 factors

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

492477

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Calculated based on transported volumes to the market, using DEFRA CO2 factors.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14408

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Based on volumes and CO2 factors derived from suppliers and DEFRA

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

616

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Data collected from internal systems. CO2 factors verified from both supplier and international standards

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not included in SBTi, not relevant

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No other relevant upstream emissions

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

No other relevant downstream emissions
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	27887	<i>Date input [must be between 11/19/2015 - 11/19/2024]</i>	<i>Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi</i>

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Past year 1	27478	12/30/2023	Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi
Past year 2	28413	12/30/2022	Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi
Past year 3	29694	12/30/2021	Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi
Past year 4	28689	12/30/2020	Measurement approach is from actual fuel consumption in own operations. Emission factors are from DEFRA, as approved by the SBTi

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4377

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65714

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The company measures its Scope 2 emissions based on actual energy consumption data collected from its own operations across all relevant facilities. Emission factors are sourced from the European Environment Agency (EEA) for the respective reporting year and are approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), ensuring methodological consistency with leading climate disclosure standards. The company reports both location-based and market-based emissions. For location-based reporting, national grid average emission factors are used. For market-based reporting, residual mix factors are applied to reflect emissions associated with

untracked or unspecified energy purchases. Inputs include metered electricity consumption (in kWh), and it is assumed that all energy is grid-supplied unless covered by contractual instruments. Where residual mix factors are not available, country-level default factors are applied in line with best practices. The methodology assumes no transmission and distribution losses unless specifically measured. The choice to use both market-based and location-based approaches is to provide full transparency, enable stakeholder comparability, and support internal decisions on energy procurement. Contractual instruments such as renewable energy certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and power purchase agreements (PPAs) are included in market-based accounting only if they meet GHG Protocol quality criteria, including geographic and temporal relevance.

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3531

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

46981

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The company measures its Scope 2 emissions based on actual energy consumption data collected from its own operations across all relevant facilities. Emission factors are sourced from the European Environment Agency (EEA) for the respective reporting year and are approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), ensuring methodological consistency with leading climate disclosure standards. The company reports both location-based and market-based emissions. For location-based reporting, national grid average emission factors are used. For market-based reporting, residual mix factors are applied to reflect emissions associated with untracked or unspecified energy purchases. Inputs include metered electricity consumption (in kWh), and it is assumed that all energy is grid-supplied unless covered by contractual instruments. Where residual mix factors are not available, country-level default factors are applied in line with best practices. The methodology assumes no transmission and distribution losses unless specifically measured. The choice to use both market-based and location-based approaches is to provide full transparency, enable stakeholder comparability, and support internal decisions on energy procurement. Contractual instruments such as renewable energy certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and power purchase agreements (PPAs) are included in market-based accounting only if they meet GHG Protocol quality criteria, including geographic and temporal relevance.

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6949

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The company measures its Scope 2 emissions based on actual energy consumption data collected from its own operations across all relevant facilities. Emission factors are sourced from the European Environment Agency (EEA) for the respective reporting year and are approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), ensuring methodological consistency with leading climate disclosure standards. The company reports both location-based and market-based emissions. For location-based reporting, national grid average emission factors are used. For market-based reporting, residual mix factors are applied to reflect emissions associated with untracked or unspecified energy purchases. Inputs include metered electricity consumption (in kWh), and it is assumed that all energy is grid-supplied unless covered by contractual instruments. Where residual mix factors are not available, country-level default factors are applied in line with best practices. The methodology assumes no transmission and distribution losses unless specifically measured. The choice to use both market-based and location-based approaches is to provide full transparency, enable stakeholder comparability, and support internal decisions on energy procurement. Contractual instruments such as renewable energy certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and power purchase agreements (PPAs) are included in market-based accounting only if they meet GHG Protocol quality criteria, including geographic and temporal relevance.

Past year 3**(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2963

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1365

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The company measures its Scope 2 emissions based on actual energy consumption data collected from its own operations across all relevant facilities. Emission factors are sourced from the European Environment Agency (EEA) for the respective reporting year and are approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), ensuring methodological consistency with leading climate disclosure standards. The company reports both location-based and market-based emissions. For location-based reporting, national grid average emission factors are used. For market-based reporting, residual mix factors are applied to reflect emissions associated with untracked or unspecified energy purchases. Inputs include metered electricity consumption (in kWh), and it is assumed that all energy is grid-supplied unless covered by contractual instruments. Where residual mix factors are not available, country-level default factors are applied in line with best practices. The methodology assumes no transmission and distribution losses unless specifically measured. The choice to use both market-based and location-based approaches is to provide full transparency, enable stakeholder comparability, and support internal decisions on energy procurement. Contractual instruments such as renewable energy certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and power purchase agreements (PPAs) are included in market-based accounting only if they meet GHG Protocol quality criteria, including geographic and temporal relevance.

Past year 4

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3360

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

791

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The company measures its Scope 2 emissions based on actual energy consumption data collected from its own operations across all relevant facilities. Emission factors are sourced from the European Environment Agency (EEA) for the respective reporting year and are approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), ensuring methodological consistency with leading climate disclosure standards. The company reports both location-based and market-based emissions. For location-based reporting, national grid average emission factors are used. For market-based reporting, residual mix factors are applied to reflect emissions associated with untracked or unspecified energy purchases. Inputs include metered electricity consumption (in kWh), and it is assumed that all energy is grid-supplied unless covered by contractual instruments. Where residual mix factors are not available, country-level default factors are applied in line with best practices. The methodology assumes no transmission and distribution losses unless specifically measured. The choice to use both market-based and location-based approaches is to provide full transparency, enable stakeholder comparability, and support internal decisions on energy procurement. Contractual instruments such as renewable energy

certificates (RECs), Guarantees of Origin (GOs), and power purchase agreements (PPAs) are included in market-based accounting only if they meet GHG Protocol quality criteria, including geographic and temporal relevance.

[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

587733

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Supplier-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category includes emissions from feed, packaging and oils, feed and packaging emissions are provided directly by Tier 1 suppliers, and oils are calculated using Ecoinvent emission factors. No assumptions are made in this category data is based directly on consumption and suppliers. The emissions include both Land use change and land management emissions in line with FLAG guidance.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from capital goods were evaluated through quantitative calculations using a n average spend factor from DIFI Norwegian state emission factor and based on actual spend from SalMar. However, due to large uncertainties in in estimations, the category has been excluded from our SBTi approved target and thus our CDP response.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

9401

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Calculated directly from Scope 12 emission Fuel and energy related activities have been added to all our Scope 1 and 2 emissions in this category. Other upstream fuel activities have been added to their allocated category under Scope 3. This category includes upstream WTT emissions from fuel such as diesel, petrol and MGO, as well as upstream emissions from electricity and T&D losses. Emission factors are from DEFRA and EIA.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

567307

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution covers all transportation and WTT emissions from SalMars salmon distribution worldwide. This includes transport of feed, packaging and distribution from third parties, paid by SalMar. Emission factors are from DEFRA, and directly from Tier 1 suppliers. Key activities include Freight goods, shipping, and truck.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1253

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- Supplier-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

The waste category includes all in-house waste from own operations separated by waste disposal method. Emissions factors are from DEFRA, and data is supplier specific.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

501

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- Supplier-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions in the business travel category is derived from direct distances from our third-party travel agency and emission factors from DEFRA.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 7 and determined it to be not relevant to our GHG inventory. Based on our internal analysis and the nature and geographic distribution of our operations, emissions from employee commuting are considered negligible in relation to our overall emissions profile. This assessment has also been reflected in our approved SBTi target, where Category 7 was not included due to its immateriality. As such, employee commuting does not contribute meaningfully to our Scope 3 emissions and is not considered a priority area for reduction efforts. Therefore, we have concluded that emissions from employee commuting are not relevant to SalMar's Scope 3 reporting.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 8 and determined it to be not relevant to our business operations. SalMar does not lease any upstream assets, such as facilities, equipment, or vehicles, that are owned by other entities and used in our operations. All significant assets used in our operations are either owned by SalMar or fall under our operational control and are therefore already included in our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reporting, in accordance with the operational control approach. As there are no relevant upstream leased assets outside our operational boundary, there are no additional emissions to account for under this category. Therefore, we have concluded that Scope 3 Category 8 is not relevant to our GHG inventory.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions from containing and cooling salmon in stores around the world before the product reach the final customer. Exclusion evaluation was based on quantitative emissions calculations on SalMar's geographical destinations of products, the emission factors in these regions and the total sold volume. For the merged/acquired companies, we estimate the Category 9 emissions based on the same factor as used for SalMar ASA (DEFRA). This assumes that the merged/acquired companies sell their salmon to the same markets/regions. This is a reasonable simplification given that detailed information is unobtainable. However, due to the uncertainty of the calculation, the category has been excluded by our SBTi.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

From quantitative calculations from direct carbon emissions allocated to a processing supplier of SalMar due to lack of data collection. The division got allocated its emissions based on allocation key for gutted fish weight and SalMars own Scope 1&2 emissions. The data foundation was deemed too uncertain in estimation for inclusion in emission targets.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 11 and determined it to be not relevant to our business operations. Our primary product is salmon, which is sold for direct human consumption. There are no significant GHG emissions associated with the use phase of our product by end consumers. The act of consuming salmon, whether cooked or raw, does not result in emissions attributable to our value chain. This conclusion is based on a qualitative assessment of the product's lifecycle.

Unlike energy-intensive goods or products requiring fuels, machinery, or refrigeration by the end-user beyond standard household usage, salmon does not contribute to emissions during its consumption phase in a way that would be material for Scope 3 accounting. Furthermore, any minimal emissions that may result from consumer preparation (e.g., home cooking) are not directly attributable to the product itself and fall outside the scope of our emissions responsibility per the GHG Protocol guidance. Based on this evaluation, we have concluded that emissions from the use of sold products are not relevant to our organization's total GHG footprint.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

*This category was deemed too uncertain in estimation for inclusion in emission target from quantitative calculations. The end-of-life emissions from packaging was based on the styrofoam and reusable cardboard packaging purchased and an end-of-life emission factor from the EPD. This was verified in the initial application process. For NRS and SalmoNor, the packaging weight was estimated from the sold volume. SalMar does not sell only whole fish, but processes significant volumes at its own processing facilities before sending the finished product to the market. Since the removed (inedible) substances from SalMar's salmon processed at SalMar's processing facilities have already been accounted for in Scope 3 Category 10, it was here vital to include only the organic waste that is sent to the market. The calculations are done as follows: Actual volume of fish sent to market (Weight of all sold fish if it all was sent as whole fish to the market x Edible yield of a whole salmon as per industry standard factor: 73%) Inedible substances sent to the market can now be derived * End-of-life emissions from organic waste is derived using a DEFRA emission*

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 13 and determined it to be not relevant to our business operations. Our company does not lease any assets to other entities after the point of sale. Once our products (primarily salmon) are sold, we retain no ownership or leasing arrangements related to their further use, storage, or distribution. This conclusion is based on a qualitative review of our business model and value chain. We do not own or control any assets that are leased to third

parties for downstream activities, such as retail facilities, cold storage, or transport equipment. As such, there are no emissions associated with downstream leased assets that would be attributable to our Scope 3 inventory. Given the absence of downstream leased assets in our operations, this category is not relevant.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 14 (Franchises) and determined it to be not relevant to our business operations. SalMar does not operate under a franchise business model and does not own or license any franchises. All operations are owned and managed directly or through consolidated subsidiaries. As there are no franchisees operating under the SalMar brand or using our assets under franchise agreements, there are no associated emissions to account for under this category. This assessment is based on a qualitative evaluation of our corporate structure and operating model. Therefore, emissions from franchises are not applicable or material to our Scope 3 GHG inventory.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We have assessed Scope 3, Category 15 and determined it to be not relevant to our GHG inventory. SalMar uses the operational control approach for GHG emissions reporting, meaning that emissions from all operations over which we have control are already accounted for under Scope 1, Scope 2, or the relevant Scope 3 categories. We do not manage a portfolio of investments for which we are required to account for financed emissions under this category. Additionally, our current Science Based Targets initiative submission does not include Category 15, as it is not considered relevant based on our organizational structure and reporting boundary. Given that all material emissions from entities under our operational control are already captured, and we do not hold investments that would trigger additional reporting obligations under this category, we have concluded that Scope 3 Category 15 is not relevant to SalMar's emissions profile.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Nothing further that has not been accounted for and that is not negligible

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Nothing further that has not been accounted for and that is not negligible
[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2023

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

771933

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

8701

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

527509

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

863

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

480

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Scope 3 Capital Goods were evaluated through quantitative calculations using a n average spend factor from DIFI Norwegian state emission factor and based on actual spend from SalMar. However, due to large uncertainties in in estimations, the category has been excluded from our SBTi approved target and thus our CDP response. Employee Commuting has been deemed negligible for Scope 3 approved SBTi target

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

734482

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

7380

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

504584

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

1435

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

357

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All categories provided as included in approved SBTi target.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2021

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

892599

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

8056

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

515934

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

9729

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

533

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All categories provided as included in approved SBTi target.

Past year 4

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2020

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

1061527

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

9308

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

492477

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

14408

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

All categories provided as included in approved SBTi target.

[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

salmar-annual-report-2024.pdf,24_SAL_Letter_to_CDP.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

266-268

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

- Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

- Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

- Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

- Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

salmar-annual-report-2024.pdf,24_SAL_Letter_to_CDP.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

266-268

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

salmar-annual-report-2024.pdf,24_SAL_Letter_to_CDP.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1**(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category**

Select all that apply

- Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
- Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
- Scope 3: Business travel

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

salmar-annual-report-2024.pdf,24_SAL_Letter_to_CDP.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

266-268

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:

Increased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Increased use of renewable energy at sea sites through supplying the sites with on shore power or hybrid solutions. The emission change value is derived through calculations of total Scope 1+2 emissions per production volume in 2024 relative to 2023 and assessed against the total emission change value. The value of 1000 is an estimate based on reductions in Scope 1. 1000 tCO2e equals 3.1% of the total Scope 1+2 emissions for the reporting year 2024.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2255

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

7

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Higher production in smolt which is energy intensive. Calculations for this category was made from Total change in Scope 1+2 emissions from 2023 to 2024 (1255 tCO₂e) plus the decrease from change in renewable (1000 tCO₂e) which equals 2255 tCO₂e. 2255 is 7.0% of the total Scope 1+2 emissions.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:

Location-based

(7.14) Do you calculate greenhouse gas emissions for each agricultural commodity reported as significant to your business?

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

1198458

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

Reduced emissions from fish feed farming

Soy

(7.14.1) GHG emissions calculated for this commodity

Select from:

Yes

(7.14.2) Reporting emissions by

Select from:

Total

(7.14.3) Emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

1

(7.14.5) Change from last reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(7.14.6) Please explain

*Included in the commodity of fish farming as it is part of the fish feed
[Fixed row]*

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:

Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

27547

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

5

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

335

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Iceland	3018	1	4665
Norway	24869	4376	61048

[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>Fish Farming Smolt</i>	552
Row 2	<i>Fish Farming</i>	27245
Row 3	<i>Processing and sales</i>	90

[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>Fish Farming</i>	878	16895
Row 2	<i>Fish Farming Smolt</i>	2013	28091
Row 3	<i>Processing and sales</i>	1475	20582
Row 4	<i>Admin</i>	11	146

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27887

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4377

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65714

(7.22.4) Please explain

All consolidated

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

All consolidated

[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:

Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

SalMar ASA, SalMar AS, SalMar Farming and SalMar Settefisk

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

Aquaculture

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

ISIN code – bond

(7.23.1.4) ISIN code – bond

NO0010310956

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23554

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4376

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61049

(7.23.1.15) Comment

All emissions by SalMar ASA, SalMar Farming, SalMar AS and SalMar Settefisk

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

SalMar Aker Ocean

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

Aquaculture

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

ISIN code – bond

(7.23.1.4) ISIN code – bond

NO0010310956

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1315

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

SalMar Aker Ocean is owned by SalMar in 2024 fully consolidated in the carbon accounting.

Row 3

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Icelandic Salmon

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

Aquaculture

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

Ticker symbol

(7.23.1.7) Ticker symbol

ISLAX

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3018

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

4665

(7.23.1.15) Comment

*Icelandic Salmon is owned by SalMar ASA, and is fully consolidated into the carbon accounting.
[Add row]*

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:

More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

104088

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

104088.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

86585

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

84257

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

170842.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

45940

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

45940.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

132525

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

188345

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

320870.00

[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from:

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

104088

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Petrol and diesel.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No usage

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

104088

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

*Petrol and diesel.
[Fixed row]*

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

Iceland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier) from a grid that is 95% or more low-carbon and where there is no mechanism for specifically allocating low-carbon electricity

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

Hydropower (capacity unknown)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

8710

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

Iceland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

A portion of our operations are located in Iceland, where the national electricity grid is among the cleanest worldwide. Over 95% of electricity generation in Iceland comes from renewable hydropower and geothermal resources. Under a market-based reporting approach, this means the emission factor for electricity consumed by our Icelandic facilities is close to zero. Because the residual mix in Iceland is already overwhelmingly renewable, our operations there do not rely on additional contractual instruments to substantiate renewable sourcing. The grid itself provides a structurally low-carbon supply. This ensures that our market-based Scope 2 disclosures for Iceland are both accurate and credible, reflecting the true nature of the electricity available to those facilities. Iceland's electricity grid qualifies as "green" under the market-based approach because renewable generation is the structural baseline of the system, not an optional add-on

[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Iceland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8711

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8711.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

162061

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

45940

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

208001.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.00000122

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

32264

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

26426000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

11

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Reduced revenue due to biological challenges in the sea

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.109

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

32264

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

295761

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

9

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Reduced revenue due to biological challenges in the sea

[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

3.66

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

1083238

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

295761

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

10

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Reduced growth in sea reduces the denominator (produced tons)

[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

Absolute target

Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SalMar TVR.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/28/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

- Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28689

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3360

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

32049.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

18588.420

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

27887

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4377

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

32264.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-1.60

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

No exclusions

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

42% reduction

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Move energy consumption from fossil fuel to renewable electrical power

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SalMar TVR.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/28/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

Methane (CH₄)

Nitrous oxide (N₂O)

Carbon dioxide (CO₂)

Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃)

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
- Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
- Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
- Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1061527

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9308

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

492477

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14408.0

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

616

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1578336.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1578336.000

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

87.05

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

915434.880

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

314660

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9401

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

567307

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1253

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

501

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

893122.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

893122.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

103.37

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Minor exclusions as per described by GHG Protocol categories

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

42% reduction

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Use more low-emission products

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

- Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

12/31/2020

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

Location-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1

103

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2

12

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

115.0000000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

66.7000000000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

42

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1

94

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2

15

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes

109.0000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

12.42

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Covers all activities relevant emissions

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

42% reduction

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Transition to low carbon energy sources

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

Row 3

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Int 2

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

12/31/2020

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- Methane (CH4)
- Nitrous oxide (N2O)
- Carbon dioxide (CO2)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

- Category 1: Purchased goods and services
- Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
- Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

Category 5: Waste generated in operations

Category 6: Business travel

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2020

(7.53.2.15) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services

3795

(7.53.2.17) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

33

(7.53.2.18) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

1761

(7.53.2.19) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations

52

(7.53.2.20) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

2.0

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3

5643.0000000000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

5643.0000000000

(7.53.2.36) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services covered by this Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.38) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) covered by this Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.39) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by this Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.40) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations covered by this Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.41) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel covered by this Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100.0

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

3272.9400000000

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

42

(7.53.2.62) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services

1987

(7.53.2.64) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel- and energy-related activities

32

(7.53.2.65) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

1605

(7.53.2.66) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations

4

(7.53.2.67) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

2

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3

3630.0000000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes

3630.0000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

Yes, it covers land-related and non-land related emissions (e.g. SBT approved before the release of FLAG target-setting guidance)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

84.93

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Covers all activities and all relevant emissions within the specified categories

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

42% reduction

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Transition to low carbon production methods for feed, and achieve more sustainable transport to market

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

Other climate-related targets

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

Other, energy productivity, please specify :Tonnes fish processed locally to value-added products

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

metric ton of product

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

36

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

40

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

42

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

150.0000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved and maintained

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes. Local harvesting and processing are important focus areas for SalMar. The processing of salmon reduces both the weight and volume of the products to be transported, which cuts transport-related carbon emissions. In 2023, 36 percent of our harvested volume was processed locally in Norway. This has reduced emissions by 90,000 tonnes CO₂e, compared with the entire volume sent to markets as whole fish. The level of processing is greatest with respect to overseas markets, which is also where the greatest emission reductions are obtained. This target is connected to our SBTi approved Scope 3 target.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

Science Based targets initiative - approved other

(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SalMar Certificate.pdf

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all production

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Local value creation, reduced transport-related emissions, increased quality control and increased operational flexibility

(7.54.2.21) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

High priority toward value added products

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

Other, energy productivity, please specify :Number of sites supplied by onshore electrical power (hybrid/el)

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

Other, please specify :Number of sites

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

72

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

54.8387096774

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

 Underway**(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?**

Yes, our Science-based Scope 1+2 absolute emission target. As part of our efforts to make the aquaculture sector more environment-friendly, SalMar aims to be more energy efficient. Using electricity from onshore to power our sea farms and the electrification of the boats we use are among the areas we are actively working on. Electrifying our value chain will be the biggest contributor to a reduction in Scope 1 emissions.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

 Science Based targets initiative - approved other**(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter**

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all sites

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Reduced Scope 1+2 emissions, reduced operational costs.

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Continue to invest in hybrid/el systems

[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	0	Numeric input
To be implemented	0	0
Implementation commenced	0	0

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Implemented	1	1000
Not to be implemented	0	<i>Numeric input</i>

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Other, please specify :Providing electrical power to sea sites

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

10000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

>30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

No

[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

Internal finance mechanisms

(7.55.3.2) Comment

SalMar is always looking for opportunities for better energy efficiency. Most of the measures will pay off in long and short term and are therefore financed through internal mechanisms
[Add row]

(7.68) Do you encourage your suppliers to undertake any agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits?

Select from:

Yes

(7.68.1) Specify which agricultural or forest management practices with climate change mitigation and/or adaptation benefits you encourage your suppliers to undertake and describe your role in the implementation of each practice.

Row 1

(7.68.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

MP1

(7.68.1.2) Management practice

Select from:

Biodiversity considerations

(7.68.1.3) Description of management practice

We encourage our main Suppliers of Fish feed to make sure all feed raw materials are grown in areas not threatened by deforestation. We are given documentation on the % of raw materials which comply with this. We also use only non-GMO raw materials. This is discussed between Our Company and the Fish Feed Suppliers when we negotiate agreements. Furthermore, we work with our feed suppliers to ensure sustainable and responsible agricultural practices.

(7.68.1.4) Your role in the implementation

Select all that apply

- Knowledge sharing

(7.68.1.5) Explanation of how you encourage implementation

We encourage Our Suppliers of Fish feed to make sure all the source raw materials comply with international standard. Especially the issue of deforestation is relevant for sourcing of soy in Brazil. We are given documentation on the proportion of the raw materials we buy which comply to international recommendations regarding deforestation and other important issues (ProTerra certified soy).

(7.68.1.6) Climate change related benefit

Select all that apply

- Emissions reductions (mitigation)
- Increasing resilience to climate change (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for fossil fuel (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for fertilizers (adaptation)
- Reduced demand for pesticides (adaptation)

(7.68.1.7) Comment

No further comments

[Add row]

(7.68.2) Do you collect information from your suppliers about the outcomes of any implemented agricultural/forest management practices you have encouraged?

Select from:

- Yes

(7.70) Do you know if any of the management practices mentioned in 7.68.1 that were implemented by your suppliers have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation?

Select from:

- Yes

(7.70.1) Provide details of those management practices implemented by your suppliers that have other impacts besides climate change mitigation/adaptation.

Row 1

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

MP1

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

Biodiversity

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

A demand for only non-GMO raw materials, such as soy.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Resulted in more farms growing non-GMO soy which we believe have a positive impact on biodiversity.

Row 2

(7.70.1.1) Management practice reference number

Select from:

MP2

(7.70.1.2) Overall effect

Select from:

Positive

(7.70.1.3) Which of the following has been impacted?

Select all that apply

Soil

Water

(7.70.1.4) Description of impacts

Engagement for sustainable and responsible agricultural practices by our feed suppliers and their suppliers.

(7.70.1.5) Have any response to these impacts been implemented?

Select from:

Yes

(7.70.1.6) Description of the response(s)

Continuous work from our feed suppliers towards feed farmers on the ground - contributing to increased knowledge on responsible farming.

[Add row]

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

Green Bond Principles (ICMA)

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Heat

Other, please specify :Food production

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

SalMar has received a Green Bond to allocate proceeds to Green Projects. These include the building of a new processing factory in Northern Norway to increase our local processing capacity, building a state-of-the-art smolt facility in Central Norway for minimizing water consumption and optimizing logistics, and investment in new licenses to produce more healthy salmon for the global population. Salmon is one of the most sustainable proteins produced on Earth.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

Other, please specify :Own calculation of avoided emissions

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

Other, please specify :Local processing

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Metric tons CO2e from transport to market with locally processed salmon products

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Metric tons CO2e from transport to market with whole salmon

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

Gate-to-gate

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

140000

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

SalMar's carbon footprint was 140,000 tCO2e lower in 2024, than it would have been if all salmon was sold as whole salmon and delivered to markets as whole products.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

40

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Disclosure volume (metric tons)	Volume type	Sourced volume (metric tons)
Soy	63093.8	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sourced	63093.8

[Fixed row]

(8.2.1) Provide details on any soy embedded in animal products sourced by your organization.

Soy

(8.2.1.1) Disclosure of embedded soy

Select from:

Some or all of our embedded soy volume is included in our “Sourced volume” as reported in column 4 of 8.2

(8.2.1.2) Description of embedded soy use and soy tiers

All soy we use are part of the fish feed. These are sourced in Tier 2+ level of our supply chain.

(8.2.1.3) Volume calculation methodology

The volume calculation is based on the data provided in reports produced by our feed suppliers, and the methodology is in line with ProTerra and Europe Soya's requirements for DF/DCF assurance. Though relying on these established certifications, we ensure that our volumes calculated are accurate.

(8.2.1.4) Embedded soy disclosure volume (metric tons)

63093.4

(8.2.1.5) % of sourced volume that is embedded soy

100

(8.2.1.6) Traceability system

Select from:

Yes, we have a traceability system for our embedded soy

(8.2.1.7) Description of traceability system

Our traceability system is built on data provided by our feed suppliers, enabling us to trace 100% of the soy used in our fish feed back to its origin of production. In 2024, the soy was sourced from the Brazilian regions of Minas Gerais, Paraná, Mato Grosso, and Goiás, as well as from the state of South Dakota in the United States. This traceability is an integral part of our supplier requirements and procurement practices.

(8.2.1.8) % of embedded soy disclosure volume traceable to country/area of soy production

100

(8.2.1.9) % of embedded soy disclosure volume for which the soy production origin is unknown

0

(8.2.1.10) DF/DCF status assessed for embedded soy

Select from:

Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.2.1.11) % of embedded soy disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.2.1.12) Methodology used to determine DF/DCF status

*The method used to determine DF/DCF status is certifications, providing full assurance: ProTerra and Europe Soya. The cutoff date is 2008.
[Fixed row]*

(8.5) Provide details on the origins of your sourced volumes.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

Brazil

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

Minas Gerais, Paraná, Mato Grosso, and Goiás.

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

56153.5

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

- Independent smallholders
- Single contracted producer
- Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

All soy volumes (soy protein concentrate) sourced from Brazil are of known origin, with no volume categorized as unknown. Origin data is provided through reports from our feed suppliers and verified using methodologies aligned with ProTerra and Europe Soya certification requirements for deforestation- and conversion-free (DF/DCF) assurance. These Brazilian states are located primarily within the Cerrado biome, a region where we apply strict sourcing criteria to avoid any links to deforestation or native vegetation conversion. The traceability system ensures transparency and compliance with our supplier requirements.

Soy

(8.5.1) Country/area of origin

Select from:

- United States of America

(8.5.2) First level administrative division

Select from:

- States/equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.3) Specify the states or equivalent jurisdictions

(8.5.4) Volume sourced from country/area of origin (metric tons)

6940.3

(8.5.5) Source

Select all that apply

- Independent smallholders
- Single contracted producer
- Multiple contracted producers

(8.5.6) List of supplier production and primary processing sites: names and locations (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024.pdf

(8.5.7) Please explain

All soy volumes (soy protein concentrate) sourced from the United States are also of known origin. In 2024, soy was procured from the state of South Dakota, which is outside of tropical forest biomes and not classified as high-risk for deforestation or land conversion. As with our Brazilian sourcing, traceability is ensured through supplier reports and certification-aligned methodologies based on ProTerra and Europe Soya standards. This ensures that our procurement from the U.S. aligns with our commitment to DF/DCF sourcing.

[Add row]

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Soy

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

- Yes, we have a no-deforestation target

(8.7.2) No-deforestation or no-conversion target coverage

Select from:

- Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

- Yes, we have other targets related to this commodity

[Fixed row]

(8.7.1) Provide details on your no-deforestation or no-conversion target that was active during the reporting year.

Soy

(8.7.1.1) No-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

- No-deforestation

(8.7.1.2) Your organization's definition of "no-deforestation" or "no-conversion"

SalMar defines "no-deforestation" and "no-conversion" in line with ProTerra and Europe Soya standards, which prohibit deforestation or conversion of natural ecosystems after the 2008 cut-off date. This applies to all soy used in our feed and covers high-risk biomes such as the Cerrado. The definition is aligned with the Accountability Framework Initiative (AFi)

(8.7.1.3) Cutoff date

Select from:

- 2008

(8.7.1.4) Geographic scope of cutoff date

Select from:

Applied globally

(8.7.1.5) Rationale for selecting cutoff date

Select from:

Compliance with initiative, please specify :ProTerra and Europe Soya cut-off date

(8.7.1.6) Target date for achieving no-deforestation or no-conversion

Select from:

2018

[Add row]

(8.7.2) Provide details of other targets related to your commodities, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target, and progress made against them.

Soy

(8.7.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 1

(8.7.2.2) Target contributes to no-deforestation or no-conversion target reported in 8.7

Select from:

Yes, this target contributes to our no-deforestation target

(8.7.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(8.7.2.4) Commodity volume covered by target (metric tons)

Select from:

Total commodity volume

(8.7.2.5) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Traceability

% of volume traceable to traceability point

(8.7.2.6) Traceability point

Select from:

Country/area of origin

(8.7.2.8) Date target was set

12/31/2019

(8.7.2.9) End date of base year

12/30/2023

(8.7.2.10) Base year figure

100

(8.7.2.11) End date of target

12/30/2024

(8.7.2.12) Target year figure

100

(8.7.2.13) Reporting year figure

100

(8.7.2.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved and maintained

(8.7.2.16) Global environmental treaties/ initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

(8.7.2.17) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target coverage captures all soy utilized in our fish feed, across all sourcing locations.

(8.7.2.19) List the actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

ProTerra certification: Ensures that soy used in fish feed is produced without deforestation or conversion of native ecosystems, directly supporting Target 1 of the GBF, which aims to protect and restore 30% of the world's land and sea areas. By preventing deforestation, ProTerra contributes to maintaining biodiversity, a core objective of the GBF. Other: Communication with feed suppliers, digitalization, certifications and requirements.

(8.7.2.20) Further details of target

This is an annual average target designed to maintain our DCF status. In addition to our rolling "achieved and maintained" target for soy, SalMar has also pledged to eliminate deforestation across all key deforestation-linked commodities by December 31, 2025, as part of our approved FLAG target. This commitment supports SalMar in monitoring forest-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. In our IRO (Impact, Risk, Opportunity) assessments, soy plays a central role as a critical natural resource we rely on to operate. We recognize the indirect negative impacts that can result from our use of soy and work actively to mitigate these- this target being one such example. At the same time, we aim to contribute positively, leveraging our role as a prominent actor in the aquaculture sector. These impacts, along with our dependency on soy, are directly linked to both financial risks and opportunities.

[Add row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Soy

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

Chain-of-custody certification

Supplier engagement/communication

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

All soy can be traced through certifications (ProTerra and Europe Soya), and this is the tool utilized by Salmar. We rely on business-to-business traceability disclosures from our feed suppliers, supported by the third-party certifications. These systems enable full traceability back to the production regions.

[Fixed row]

(8.8.1) Provide details of the point to which your organization can trace its sourced volumes.

Soy

(8.8.1.1) % of sourced volume traceable to production unit

89

(8.8.1.2) % of sourced volume traceable to sourcing area and not to production unit

11

(8.8.1.3) % sourced volume traceable to country/area of origin and not to sourcing area or production unit

0

(8.8.1.4) % of sourced volume traceable to other point (i.e., processing facility/first importer) not in the country/area of origin

0

(8.8.1.5) % of sourced volume from unknown origin

0

(8.8.1.6) % of sourced volume reported

100.00

[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

Soy

(8.9.1) DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity

Select from:

Yes, deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status assessed

(8.9.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF in the reporting year

100

(8.9.3) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through a third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance

(8.9.4) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of production unit

0

(8.9.5) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through monitoring of sourcing area

0

(8.9.6) Is a proportion of your disclosure volume certified through a scheme not providing full DF/DCF assurance?*Select from:* No*[Fixed row]*

(8.9.1) Provide details of third-party certification schemes used to determine the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of the disclosure volume, since specified cutoff date.

Soy**(8.9.1.1) Third-party certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance**

Forest management unit/Producer certification

 ProTerra certification**(8.9.1.2) % of disclosure volume determined as DF/DCF through certification scheme providing full DF/DCF assurance**

100

(8.9.1.3) Comment*Attached certification from one of many producers*

(8.9.1.4) Certification documentation

CJ Selecta - ProTerra V5.0 - exp. 05.05.2026 (002).pdf
[Add row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint
Soy	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.10.1) Provide details on the monitoring or estimating of your deforestation and conversion footprint.

Soy

(8.10.1.1) Monitoring and estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint

Select from:

We monitor the deforestation and conversion footprint in our value chain

(8.10.1.2) % of disclosure volume monitored or estimated

100

(8.10.1.3) Reporting of deforestation and conversion footprint

Select all that apply

- During the reporting period
- Since a specified cutoff date
- During the last 5 years

(8.10.1.4) Year of cutoff date

2008

(8.10.1.5) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint in the reporting period (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.6) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint since the specified cutoff date (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.7) Known or estimated deforestation and conversion footprint during the last five years (hectares)

0

(8.10.1.9) Describe the methods and data sources used to monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint

SalMar monitors its deforestation and conversion footprint using a robust traceability system for soy sourcing, relying on third-party certifications like ProTerra and Europe Soya. This system ensures full traceability of soy, with data provided by feed suppliers, who disclose the origin and volume of soy used in the fish feed. These disclosures are cross-checked with the certifications to verify compliance with DF and DCF standards. SalMar conducts annual IRO assessments to evaluate forest-related dependencies and mitigate indirect deforestation impacts. Monitoring occurs annually, aligning with the company's sustainability targets, including its commitment to eliminate deforestation across key commodities by 2025. This ongoing process supports SalMar in meeting its deforestation and conversion goals while ensuring transparency in its supply chain.

[Add row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations

Select from:

- Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

- Human rights protected under international law
- Tax, anti-corruption, trade and customs regulations

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

- Certification
- Supplier self-declaration

(8.14.4) Indicate if you collect data regarding compliance with the Brazilian Forest Code

Select from:

- Yes

(8.14.5) Please explain

SalMar ensures legal compliance through third-party certifications, ProTerra and Europe Soya, which include strict compliance with national laws in countries of origin, including the Brazilian Forest Code. These certifications cover environmental regulations, land use legality, and traceability. Ask ChatGPT
[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

- No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

- Benefits of engaging in landscapes/jurisdictions unclear

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

We are already 100% deforestation and conversion free in our value chain

[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

- Yes

(8.16.1) Provide details of the external activities to support the implementation of your policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains

Row 1

(8.16.1.1) Commodity

Select all that apply

- Soy

(8.16.1.2) Activities

Select all that apply

- Involved in industry platforms

(8.16.1.3) Country/area

Select from:

Worldwide

(8.16.1.4) Subnational area

Select from:

Not applicable

(8.16.1.5) Provide further details of the activity

Roundtable on Sustainable Soy (RTRS). It is important that our feed suppliers are updated and well-informed on responsible soy sourcing. The RTRS has developed a certification standard for deforestation-free soy, and is working closely with global policy makers to advocate deforestation-free supply chains.

[Add row]

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

Yes

(8.17.1) Provide details on your project(s), including the extent, duration, and monitoring frequency. Please specify any measured outcome(s).

Row 1

(8.17.1.1) Project reference

Select from:

Project 1

(8.17.1.2) Project type

Select from:

- Forest ecosystem restoration

(8.17.1.3) Expected benefits of project

Select all that apply

- Reduce/halt biodiversity loss
- Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.4) Is this project originating any carbon credits?

Select from:

- No

(8.17.1.5) Description of project

SalMar works closely with its feed suppliers, Ewos and Skretting, on matters related to ecosystem restoration, reforestation, and conservation of forests and other ecosystems. Through the ProTerra certification, and ProTerra Stakeholder Council, membership in the MRV Committee, and involvement in the Aquaculture Dialogues in Brazil, SalMar focuses on sustainable soy. These are important communities for ensuring that SalMar's climate and deforestation commitments are upheld. These actions are voluntary, but are highly important to SalMar, due to our dependence on soy. This ensures best practice, which is not only important for sustainable development in the sourcing locations, but also safeguards SalMar's strong position in the sector. Through our initiatives, several deforestation and reforestation projects are initiated. An example of a specific project is the "Funding for Soy Farms in the Cerrado" project, initiated by Skretting, with a longstanding support of the Cerrado region. This includes being one of 23 founding signatories of the Business Statement of Support to the Cerrado Manifesto, a commitment to working with Brazilian stakeholders to halt deforestation in the region.

(8.17.1.6) Where is the project taking place in relation to your value chain?

Select all that apply

- Project based in sourcing area(s)

(8.17.1.7) Start year

2017

(8.17.1.8) Target year

Select from:

Indefinitely

(8.17.1.9) Project area to date (Hectares)

20

(8.17.1.10) Project area in the target year (Hectares)

20000000

(8.17.1.11) Country/Area

Select from:

Brazil

(8.17.1.12) Latitude

-24.083333

(8.17.1.13) Longitude

-49.95

(8.17.1.14) Monitoring frequency

Select from:

Annually

(8.17.1.15) Total investment over the project period (currency)

100000

(8.17.1.16) For which of your expected benefits are you monitoring progress?

Select all that apply

Reduce/halt biodiversity loss

Restoration of natural ecosystem(s)

(8.17.1.17) Please explain

The initiative "Funding for Soy Farmers in the Cerrado" aims to preserve the natural vegetation and biodiversity of the Cerrado region, and to halt deforestation by providing farmers with financial incentives to produce soy only on existing agricultural land. In late 2019, Skretting became the first feed company and one of only three private sector stakeholders to-date to provide crucial, long-term financial support to the Funding for Soy Farmers in the Cerrado initiative. The project will strive to halt further deforestation in the Cerrado. The monitoring of progress is ongoing. Through this, SalMar will indirectly help conserve its fragile plant and animal life. Because regulations alone are not sufficient to protect the region's biodiversity, this will be achieved by incentivising farmers to produce soy only on existing agricultural land and to leave remaining forests and other important native vegetation untouched. Funding will also support the sensitive Cerrado biome in becoming a verified zero deforestation area for soy. With approximately 250 million tonnes of carbon being released annually from this landscape through deforestation, preliminary studies have ascertained that around US\$ 250 million is needed to reach this goal. Skretting has pledged €1 million over five years, and through this recognises that while soy is a key ingredient in aquaculture and animal feed production, it's also critical that landowners act responsibly and contribute to the protection of the environment. It has been estimated that there are more than 20 million hectares of existing agricultural land suitable for soy expansion in the Cerrado. Expanding into these areas rather than newly converting native vegetation presents a much more realistic and sustainable pathway for the sector's development.

[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The total volume of our water withdrawals is measured using direct monitoring through sensors installed at withdrawal points. These sensors provide continuous and accurate measurements of water intake volumes from our operational sites. This method ensures a high level of data reliability and consistency across reporting periods.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The total volume of our water withdrawals is measured using direct monitoring through sensors installed at withdrawal points. These sensors provide continuous and accurate measurements of water intake volumes from our operational sites. This method ensures a high level of data reliability and consistency across reporting periods.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The quality of water withdrawals is assessed through filtration of incoming water, which serves as a control step to ensure that water used in our operations meets required quality standards.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The total volume of water discharged from our operations is measured using direct monitoring through sensors installed at discharge points. These sensors provide continuous and accurate measurements of discharge volumes, ensuring reliable tracking and reporting of water outflows.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The total volume of water discharged from our operations is measured using direct monitoring through sensors installed at discharge points. These sensors provide continuous and accurate measurements of discharge volumes, ensuring reliable tracking and reporting of water outflows.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge volumes by treatment method are summarized based on the treatment methods used at each plant. We are familiar with the specific treatment processes applied at all of our operational sites, and this knowledge allows us to accurately classify and allocate measured discharge volumes to the appropriate treatment categories.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters is determined through a combination of measured data and estimations based on filter efficiency. At our facilities, filtration systems are in place to treat water prior to discharge, and the efficiency of these systems is used to estimate removal of solids and other parameters where direct measurements may not be available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters is determined through a combination of measured data and estimations based on filter efficiency. At our facilities, filtration systems are in place to treat water prior to discharge, and the efficiency of these systems is used to estimate removal of solids and other parameters where direct measurements may not be available.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water discharge temperature is measured using sensors installed in our tanks, which continuously monitor the temperature of the water. Since this water is later discharged to the environment, we know the temperature at the point of discharge based on these sensor readings.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Total water consumption is calculated as the difference between water withdrawal and water discharge volumes. Both withdrawal and discharge are measured using sensors installed at our facilities, providing reliable data. The volume of water consumed represents the portion of water that is not returned to the environment, either due to evaporation, incorporation into biomass, or other uses.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

he measurement of water recycled and reused is based on the use of recirculating aquaculture systems (RAS) at our facilities. These systems enable the continuous treatment and reuse of water within the production cycle, significantly reducing the need for fresh water withdrawal. Water volumes recycled through RAS are monitored through operational controls and system performance data, providing a reliable estimate of the amount of water reused in our salmon farming processes.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

The provision of fully functioning, safely managed wash services to all workers is standard practice in our operating areas, Norway and Iceland. These services comply with local regulations and industry best practices, ensuring that all employees have access to hygienic and safe wash facilities as part of our commitment to worker health and safety.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our response in this row relates to our facilities, which refers to all salmon production and farming facilities operated by the company. This includes hatcheries, sea farms, and processing plants that are directly managed under SalMar's operational control. These facilities form the basis of our environmental data collection and reporting, including water-related aspects such as withdrawal, discharge, and consumption.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

49919

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Recirculating aquaculture systems

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

49832

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

- Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

- Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Recirculating aquaculture systems

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

87

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

SalMar's water consumption originates from various sources, and a substantial part of it comes from ice used for transportation of salmon. This stands for 54 000 m³ of the total consumption in 2024, while consumption from workforce, sludge generation and water uptake in salmon are the remaining sources of water consumption.

To address the amount of ice used for transportation, dry ice has now been adopted, to cool the salmon during transportation while reducing direct water consumption.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

WRI Aqueduct

WWF Water Risk Filter

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Central and Northern Norway and Westfjords in Iceland are our operating areas. These areas have very low water stress according to the applied identification tools

[Fixed row]

(9.2.5) What proportion of the produced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(9.2.5.1) The proportion of this commodity produced in areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

(9.2.5.2) % of total agricultural commodity produced in areas with water stress

Select from:

0%

(9.2.5.3) Please explain

Our operating areas include Central and Northern Norway and the Westfjords region in Iceland. These regions have very low water stress, as determined by the tools we use to assess water risk. Specifically, we apply the WWF Water Risk Filter, which projects a Physical Basin Risk score of 1.62 for Norway and 1.67 for Iceland in 2025. Both scores fall within the “very low risk” category according to WWF’s criteria. Given that Norway and Iceland rank among the three lowest-risk countries globally for water stress, we consider water-related risks in our operations to be minimal. The metric is used to inform our water management strategy, guiding us to focus on water efficiency and sustainability rather than risk mitigation investments related to scarcity. The percentage reported in column 2 reflects the proportion of our facilities located within these low-risk areas, which has remained stable over the past year. We anticipate this proportion to remain steady at least one year beyond the current reporting period.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.6) What proportion of the sourced agricultural commodities that are significant to your organization originate from areas with water stress?

Soy

(9.2.6.1) The proportion of this commodity sourced from areas with water stress is known

Select from:

Yes

(9.2.6.2) % of total agricultural commodity sourced from areas with water stress

Select from:

0%

(9.2.6.3) Please explain

Water stress in the locations where our soy is farmed has been assessed using the WWF Water Risk Filter 2024 and is classified as low water stress. This assessment covers all key sourcing regions in our soy value chain. The metric is used within our organization to guide sustainable sourcing decisions and prioritize supplier engagement on water stewardship. The low water stress classification supports our confidence that water-related risks in our soy supply chain are minimal. The percentage reported in column 2 represents the proportion of our soy sourced from high risk areas. This proportion has remained stable over the last year, and we expect this trend to continue at least one year beyond the current reporting period
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

30346

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Divestment from water intensive technology/process

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Divestment in sites based on flow-through systems

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not withdrawn

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

17612

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Increased production in Iceland

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not withdrawn

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not withdrawn

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1961

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Other, please specify :Minor source

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Minor source

[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

All water usage filtered and discharged to sea

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

49842

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

All water usage is filtered and discharged to the sea. The thresholds for what is 'much higher' and 'much lower' for the change in volumes compared to the previous reporting year is over 20% decrease or increase. The thresholds for 'higher' and 'lower' is between 10-20% increase or decrease from last year. 'About the same' is between 10% increase or decrease. We therefore classify this years treated volume as 'lower' in comparison with the previous reporting year, as it is between 10-20% decrease in total water discharge volumes from last years reporting. This decrease is primarily due to our investments in water-efficient technologies (RAS), and future anticipated trends of water discharge is a sustained decrease in water discharge levels. This is due to RAS being implemented across the organization, and the technology and its usage is continuously improved at all our facilities.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

All water usage filtered and discharged to sea

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

*All water usage filtered and discharged to sea
[Fixed row]*

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

49842

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

100%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps. The rationale is to be able to remove as much of the unwanted organic and inorganic substances before discharging the water to sea. We comply with our discharge limits set by the regional and national governing bodies. These limits are central to the application process for the facilities, and we must continuously deliver our results to these bodies. The thresholds for what is 'much higher' and 'much lower' for the change in volumes compared to the previous reporting year is over 20% decrease or increase. The thresholds for 'higher' and 'lower' is between 10-20% increase or decrease from last year. 'About the same' is between 10% increase or decrease. We therefore classify this year's treated volume as 'lower' in comparison with the previous reporting year, as it is between 10-20% decrease in treated volume. It is important to note that our reporting is not showcasing a decrease in the degree of treatment of our water discharge, as all water discharge still has multiple filtering/treatment steps, but it is the total volume of water discharge from our facilities that is lower this year compared to last year, which explains the decrease. Moving forward, the anticipated trends of water discharge is expected to decrease, as described in 9.2.8, due to water efficient technologies. Our level of treatment on our water discharge are still going to be at 100% in the future, as water filtering/treatment only will improve, and we will continue with the practice of treating all water discharge.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

All water discharge has multiple filtering/treatment steps

[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

0

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

Nitrates

Phosphates

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

Our salmon production and farming facilities do not emit nitrates or phosphates to water. All water discharged from our operations is filtered, and this treatment process effectively removes these substances before release, resulting in zero emissions to receiving water bodies in the reporting year. These emissions (or lack thereof) relate to all facilities under our operational control, located in Central and Northern Norway and the Westfjords of Iceland. These areas are not near vulnerable communities and are classified as low water stress according to the WWF Water Risk Filter. While current filtration ensures no release of nitrates or phosphates, we continue to operate and monitor our water treatment systems to maintain this status. Given that these pollutants are already effectively managed through filtration, no additional reduction plan is required at this time.

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

6

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

51-75

(9.3.4) Please explain

Smolt facilities are dependent on continuous access to freshwater. The percentage includes counting harvesting facilities, but not counting fish farms at sea.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We have assessed upstream value chain operations and identified what operations and areas have a high water-related dependency, impact, risk and opportunity, but not identified at facility level.

[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

- Other, please specify :Beistadfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

64.076102

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

11.239406

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1023

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1023

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1019.9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

1023

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.08

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Much higher water consumption this year, this is due to Tjuin being a new smolt facility, and for last year's reporting, the facility had still not completed a full production year. Both water withdrawals, discharges, and total water consumption is classified as "much higher" this year, as it has been over a 20% increase from last year to this year's reporting. In addition, a new method of calculating consumption, including consumption by the workforce, sludge generation, as well as water

uptake in the salmon, has also altered the calculation methodology, which results in total consumption compared with the previous year being higher for all sites. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from the freshwater surface come from a nearby lake.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Follafoss

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

Other, please specify :Beistadfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

63.98384

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

11.111598

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

20442

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

20442

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

20380.5

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

20442

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Smolt facility, consumption varies with the amount of fish produced. Water withdrawals and discharge are classified as "about the same" as the percentage change is less than 10% (around 3-4%). The total water consumption is classified as "much higher" this year, as it has been over 20% decrease in total water consumption from last year to this year's reporting. This is due to the change in calculating water consumption, including human consumption and sludge generation, as well as uptake in salmon. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from the freshwater surface come from a nearby lake.

Row 3**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Langstein

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

Other, please specify :Åsenfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

63.54751

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

10.90333

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1416

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1416

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1411.8

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4.2

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

 Much higher**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Langstein is a cleaner fish facility. Water withdrawals are classified as lower, over 10% decrease, and discharges are classified as about the same as in the last reporting year, as the difference from last year is less than 10%. Water consumption is, however, much higher this year, due to the new calculation method as described above. Therefore, the water discharge is also affected by this. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from the freshwater surface come from a nearby lake.

Row 4**(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number**

Select from:

 Facility 4**(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)**

Osan

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

- Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

- Other, please specify :Eiterfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

64.955139

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

11.690349

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

- No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

633

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

633

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

631.1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

633

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Osan site was sold in Q4 2024. Numbers for 2024 are therefore included in this reporting, but will not be included in 2025. Water withdrawals and discharge are classified as "higher", as the percentage change is above 10% compared to 2023 reporting. This is due to regular variations related to production at the site, combined with a warm summer and need of using more water to cool down the water. The total water consumption is classified as "much higher" this year, as it has been over 20% increase in total water consumption from last year to this years reporting. This is due to the change in calculating water consumption, including human consumption and sludge generation, as well as uptake in salmon. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from freshwater surface comes from a nearby lake.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Senja

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

Other, please specify :Tranøyfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

69.138274

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

17.324187

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

4013

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

4013

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

4000.91

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

4013

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

12.09

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

- Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Smolt facility, consumption varies with the amount of fish produced. Water withdrawals and discharge are classified as "much higher", as the percentage change is above 20% compared to the 2023 reporting. This is due to increased production at the site, opening new parts of the facility, and increasing production. The total water consumption is classified as "much higher" this year, as it has been over 20% increase in total water consumption from last year to this year's reporting. This is due to the change in calculating water consumption, including human consumption and sludge generation, as well as uptake in salmon. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from the freshwater surface come from a nearby lake.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

- Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Dåfjord

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

- Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

- Dependencies

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

Other, please specify :Dåfjorden

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

69.993485

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

19.38933

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1238

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1238

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1234.3

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

1238

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3.7

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Smolt facility, consumption varies with the amount of fish produced. Water withdrawals and discharge are classified as "about the same", as the percentage change is less than 10% compared to the 2023 reporting. The total water consumption is classified as "much higher" this year, as it has been over a 20% increase in total water consumption from last year to this year's reporting. This is due to the change in calculating water consumption, including human consumption and sludge generation, as well as uptake in salmon. All water volumes are sourced from direct measurements from the facility, by water sensors. Withdrawals from the freshwater surface come from a nearby lake.

[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE3000, ESRS STANDARD / CSRD

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not relevant because it is not reported on publicly and thus not verified by third party

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

ISAE3000, ESRS STANDARD / CSRD

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We have in our public reporting made an estimate of discharges being equal to withdrawals, which based on recent calculations, is a good estimate

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We have in our public reporting made an estimate of discharges being equal to withdrawals, which based on recent calculations, is a good estimate

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We have in our public reporting made an estimate of discharges being equal to withdrawals, which based on recent calculations, is a good estimate

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

We have in our public reporting made an estimate of discharges being equal to withdrawals, which based on recent calculations, is a good estimate
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

26426177841

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

529381.15

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

Increased (improved). Anticipate increase in revenue and decrease in water withdrawal. Biological challenges had an impact on SalMars revenue in 2024, an expected increase in revenue and decrease in water withdrawal are hence expected to improve the water withdrawal efficiency.

[Fixed row]

(9.8) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you produce.

Cattle products

(9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

Fish and seafood from aquaculture

(9.8.1) Water intensity information for this produced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

(9.8.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

169

(9.8.3) Numerator: water aspect

Select from:

Freshwater withdrawals

(9.8.4) Denominator

Select from:

Kilograms

(9.8.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

Much lower

(9.8.6) Please explain

We use a water intensity value considering our freshwater withdrawal in liters per kilogram produced salmon at sea. The reported value compared to previous year is lower due to our transition to recirculating aquaculture systems, and enhanced water utilization. The metric is used internally to evaluate our water dependency and for industry comparisons /strategic positioning. We anticipate our water intensity to continue to decrease aligned with our water withdrawal reduction target. Our strategy going forward will be to invest in technology that will allow us to reduce our water withdrawal and increase efficiency of production, like RAS systems. We will also aim to identify what sources of water withdrawals should be prioritized first for most effective withdrawal reductions.

[Fixed row]

(9.9) Provide water intensity information for each of the agricultural commodities significant to your organization that you source.

Soy

(9.9.1) Water intensity information for this sourced commodity is collected/calculated

Select from:

Yes

(9.9.2) Water intensity value (m3/denominator)

0.4

(9.9.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

Total water consumption

(9.9.4) Denominator

Select from:

Kilograms

(9.9.5) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

About the same

(9.9.6) Please explain

In 2024, SalMar sourced 68,894.7 metric tons of soy for fish feed. The water intensity is calculated using average data from the Water Footprint Network, which estimates that 2,500 cubic meters of water are required per metric ton of soy. The intensity value has not changed from the previous reporting year, as the same

emission factor (2,500 m3/ton) was used. While the absolute water footprint has increased slightly due to a rise in the volume of soy sourced, the intensity remains unchanged, reflecting consistency in both sourcing profile and calculation methodology. This metric is used internally to support water dependency assessments and inform strategic planning related to raw material sourcing, particularly feed ingredients. Although it is not yet used in active operational decision-making, the company is integrating this metric into broader ESG performance tracking to improve long-term water management. As more accurate, supplier-specific data becomes available, this intensity figure is expected to be used to monitor trends, evaluate risk exposure, and guide sustainable sourcing strategies. SalMar has a clear strategy in place to reduce water intensity over time. This includes: -Ongoing supplier engagement aimed at improving transparency on water usage and sourcing practices - Evaluation of alternative, lower-water-use feed ingredients, including novel protein sources -Assessments in collaboration with feed suppliers to identify concrete actions for reducing water dependency in the supply chain -Continuous improvement of data quality to enable more targeted and effective KPI tracking We anticipate a downward trend in water intensity in the coming years as a result of these efforts. This approach is embedded in our long-term sustainability strategy, which aims to reduce environmental impacts while strengthening supply chain resilience.

[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Salmon is widely recommended to eat by national and international health authorities

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

The definition used for low water impact is the following: Water withdrawal per produced unit of food stuff is lower than other comparable protein sources, which is the classification used to define salmon (our product) as low water impact. The threshold is set using the lowest level of water withdrawal observed in land-based animal protein production, which is poultry. Accordingly, the upper limit for the "low water impact" category is defined as 4,300 litres of freshwater per kilogram of edible meat.

(9.14.4) Please explain

The production of salmon is SalMar's core business activity and part of our direct operations. Salmon farming has inherently low freshwater intensity, as marine grow-out phases do not rely on freshwater. Freshwater consumption was in 2024 at 86,677 m³ with zero consumption in water-stressed areas. SalMar applies UN SDG6 as a benchmark for responsible water use. Criteria for low water impact classification are based on water quantity and intensity during production, aligned with CDP Water Guidance. Production of farmed Atlantic salmon requires approx. 2,000 litres of freshwater per kg of edible meat, which is significantly less than other proteins. Compared to beef, pork and poultry which has 15,400, 6,000 and 4,300 per kg of edible meat. See Salmon Farming Industry Handbook 2025 attached.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]
Water withdrawals	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	Select from:	Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]

	Target set in this category	Please explain
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Other	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	<i>All targets are demonstrated under the other relevant target categories.</i>

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

Reduction in total water withdrawals

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

63

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

50

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

50

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Covers all direct operations. Target is/was to reduce freshwater withdrawal by 20% from 2022 to 2030, and progress towards the target is publicly reported in our Annual Report.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Investments in water-efficient technology such as RAS (Resirculating Aquaculture Systems)-systems has contributed to achieving a reduction of 20% in freshwater withdrawal since 2022. SalMar will continue to invest and further reduce freshwater withdrawal moving forward.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Nothing further.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (including suppliers)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

Other WASH, please specify :Stay in line with norwegian government target of SDG 6

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2024

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

99

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

As a company with operations in Norway, we indirectly contribute to WASH through the country's strong regulatory and policy framework. Norway has near-universal access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, supported by national targets aligned with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Strict state regulations ensure high-quality water supply, wastewater treatment, and hygiene services across the population. By operating within this system, our facilities and employees are covered by these high-performing services, meaning WASH-related risks are minimal. While we do not run standalone WASH programs domestically, our compliance with and reliance on Norway's robust infrastructure represents an indirect contribution, as our operations are embedded in a state-led framework that consistently guarantees equitable and secure access to WASH. Norwegian statistics has set WASH to 68%, Salmar shows better results in management.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Key actions included adhering to state requirements for water use and wastewater management, ensuring employee access to high-quality facilities, and monitoring for any deviations from standards. By operating within Norway's robust, state-led framework, we were able to sustain our WASH performance consistently.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Nothing further.

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

Target 3

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

Reduction in concentration of pollutants

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2024

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

99

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/30/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

All operations must be within pollution permits. National statistics in Norway for proportion of population connected to chemical and/or biological wastewater treatment facilities was in 2020 at 65%. SalMar has strict rules for chemicals and pollution and is seeking to hold a higher percentage level than the Norwegian state average. This target is already achieved, and is now being maintained across all operations.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Investment in filtering systems

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*Nothing further.
[Add row]*

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Microplastics

Reduce the potential release of microplastics and plastic particles

(10.1.3) Please explain

SalMar aims at reducing the potential release of microplastics and plastic particles into the seas. We participate in R&D work looking into feasible material change from plastics to biodegradable material for equipment in the aquaculture industry.

[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce any packaging or equipment ourselves. We only produce salmon.

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce any packaging or equipment ourselves. We only produce salmon.

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce any packaging or equipment ourselves. We only produce salmon.

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

We do not produce any packaging or equipment ourselves. We only produce salmon.

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

Yes

(10.2.2) Comment

Our salmon is typically delivered in plastic packaging to the markets

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

NA

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

NA

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

NA

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

No

(10.2.2) Comment

We only produce salmon. Our engagement with plastics is through our product being sent to market and certain aquaculture equipment
[Fixed row]

(10.5) Provide the total weight of plastic packaging sold and/or used and indicate the raw material content.

	Total weight during the reporting year (Metric tons)	Raw material content percentages available to report	Please explain
Plastic packaging used	176	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	Insufficient insights into each plastic component. Will try to align the data in the coming year.

[Fixed row]

(10.5.1) Indicate the circularity potential of the plastic packaging you sold and/or used.

	Percentages available to report for circularity potential	% of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice at scale	Please explain
Plastic packaging used	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> % recyclable in practice and at scale	100	<i>All plastics used in our packaging is recyclable.</i>

[Fixed row]

(10.6) Provide the total weight of waste generated by the plastic you produce, commercialize, use and/or process and indicate the end-of-life management pathways.

Usage of plastic

(10.6.1) Total weight of waste generated during the reporting year (Metric tons)

176

(10.6.2) End-of-life management pathways available to report

Select all that apply

Preparation for reuse

(10.6.3) % prepared for reuse

1

(10.6.12) Please explain

Unclear on specific value, as it depends on market practice.

[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

- Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

- Land/water management
- Species management

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	<p>Select from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we use indicators 	<p>Select all that apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pressure indicators <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify :% of feed from certified farms/origins, % ASC certified farms, % MOM-B Score <= 2

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Some of our sea sites are located in or near national reserves or protected areas
UNESCO World Heritage sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	None of our sites are within these areas
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	None of our sites are within these areas
Ramsar sites	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	None of our sites are within these areas
Key Biodiversity Areas	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Some of our sites are located in Key Biodiversity Areas
Other areas important for biodiversity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	None of our sites are within these areas

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

- Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

Norway

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Smøla

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

1

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Conventional salmon farming operations.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

- Site selection
- Scheduling
- Operational controls

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

We continuously assess our impact on the seabed, the effluence from our sea farms and the risk of escape incidents that could negatively impact biodiversity. All operations are in accordance with regional and national laws.

[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

All data points in module 1

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

See page 266-267 of our Annual Report (attached) for information about the third party verification process. See page 24 for a summary of environmental KPI scoresheet, showcasing some main environmental KPIs for SalMar, all verified by third party assurance.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024 (14).pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

All data points in module 1

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

KPIs like grams of antibiotics used, frequency of interactions with marine mammals and birds and fish escapes are all verified and have an impact on water and marine resources.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024 (14).pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

Forests

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

All data points in module 1

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Our KPI "B-analysis benthic score 2" is verified by a third-party and is relevant for our impact on the surrounding environment to our sites.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

SalMar Annual Report 2024 (14).pdf

[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information	Attachment (optional)
	You may find all KPIs and other relevant information in relation to the question above in our Annual report for 2024.	SalMar Annual Report 2024 (14).pdf

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Executive Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute

