Land-Based Salmon Farming in Norway: Assessment of Sustainability and Value Creation Claims

Executive Summary

Land-based salmon farming in Norway occupies a compelling but precarious position at the intersection of environmental ambition and financial reality. The sustainability thesis — that removing salmon from open net pens eliminates the sea lice problem — is directionally correct but incomplete, because it trades one set of environmental liabilities (parasites, wild salmon mortality, chemical treatments) for another (energy intensity, carbon footprint, freshwater consumption). The value creation thesis is more nuanced still: land-based operators benefit from free licensing and escape the regulatory ceiling of the Traffic Light System, but face capital intensity roughly 3–11× that of sea-based peers, production costs that remain above breakeven at cyclical price troughs, and a spot price environment that averaged NOK 77/kg in 2025 — well below the NOK 93/kg of 2024 and punishing for operators still scaling.

This report evaluates both claims across five dimensions: biological/environmental performance, regulatory dynamics, financial economics, market structure, and risk.

---

1. The Sea Lice Problem: Scale, Cost, and Regulatory Response

1.1 Biological and Economic Impact of Sea Lice in Conventional Farming

Sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis*) remain the single largest biological and economic drag on Norwegian sea-based salmon farming. The numbers are stark:

- **Mortality**: Norwegian farmed salmon mortality in the sea phase was 15.4% in 2024, down from 16.7% in 2023, with 57.8 million fish lost. In a four-year study ending in 2020, mortality from sea lice infestation in western Norwegian fjords exceeded 30%. The government's stated target is 5% — a threefold reduction from current levels.
- **Direct cost**: Sea lice management was estimated at up to NOK 18 billion across the Norwegian industry in 2023. Per-kilogram costs of delousing have escalated dramatically: from ~NOK 0.79/kg in 2011 to NOK 2.45/kg by 2013, with Nofima estimating approximately NOK 5 billion/year by 2019 (~9% of industry revenue). Treatment-specific costs include cleaner fish at ~NOK 1.2/kg, mechanical treatments at ~NOK 0.55/kg, and bath treatments at NOK 0.5–1/kg.
- **Indirect cost**: Delousing operations increase mortality by 14–31% depending on method. Average harvest weight has been declining for a decade, partly attributed to premature harvesting driven by lice pressure. Sea lice have contributed to rising feed conversion ratios and lower smolt yields, further inflating all-in production costs, which hit a record NOK 49/kg in 2022 (a 45% surge since 2016).
- **Resistance**: Salmon lice have developed resistance to most available chemical treatments, forcing a shift to thermal and mechanical methods (which accounted for 54% and 27% of treatments respectively by 2019). These non-medicinal methods carry higher fish welfare costs and are themselves subject to diminishing efficacy.

1.2 Regulatory Architecture: The Traffic Light System and Its Successor

Norway's Traffic Light System (TLS), implemented in 2017, divides the coastline into 13 production areas and regulates biomass growth based on estimated sea lice-induced mortality of wild salmon. Green-light areas can increase Maximum Allowable Biomass (MAB) by up to 6%; red-light areas must reduce production. This system has effectively capped supply growth at ~3% annually since 2012, down from ~10% before.

The April 2025 White Paper *Fremtidens havbruk* ("The Future of Aquaculture") proposed a paradigm shift: replacing biomass-based licenses with performance-driven permits tied to sea lice emissions, mortality rates, and environmental impact. Key proposals included tradable sea lice emission quotas, a "lost fish" tax on mortality, and the removal of quantity restrictions. However, in June 2025, the Norwegian Parliament determined these proposals were not ready for implementation. The current TLS will remain in place, supplemented by an environmental technology incentive scheme launching in autumn 2025.

This regulatory stasis has a direct bearing on the value creation thesis for land-based farming: the TLS continues to constrain sea-based supply, supporting prices, while land-based licenses remain free and uncapped by biomass restrictions.

---

2. Sustainability Assessment: Does Land-Based Farming Solve the Problem?

2.1 Sea Lice Elimination: The Core Claim

The claim that land-based farming eliminates sea lice is substantially correct. Closed recirculating aquaculture systems (RAS) and hybrid flow-through systems (HFS) physically separate farmed salmon from the marine environment, removing the vector for *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* infestation. Salmon Evolution reports mortality rates of approximately 3% — dramatically below the 15.4% industry average — and superior-grade shares of ~95%, reflecting the absence of lice-related stress, delousing treatments, and secondary infections. Andfjord Salmon has reported >99.8% survival rates in its latest smolt batches, with growth rates 30% ahead of standard sea-pen benchmarks.

Verdict: Strong. Land-based systems effectively eliminate sea lice as a biological and cost factor. This removes an estimated NOK 5–18 billion/year in industry-wide costs and eliminates the welfare and mortality impact of delousing treatments.

2.2 Wild Salmon Protection

Wild Atlantic salmon populations in Norway have halved over the past two decades, with sea lice from farms identified as a primary driver. By removing farmed salmon from coastal waters, land-based systems eliminate a significant source of lice larvae that infect wild smolts during outmigration. This addresses the core externality that the TLS was designed to manage.

Verdict: Strong. Land-based farming fully addresses the wild salmon interaction problem.

2.3 Carbon Footprint and Energy: The Counter-Argument

This is where the sustainability narrative fractures:

- **Farm-gate emissions**: A 2025 meta-analysis of life cycle assessment studies found that RAS systems have a notably higher global warming potential (GWP effect size: +4.31) compared to flow-through systems (effect size: −0.24). An earlier study found RAS production generates a carbon footprint of 7.01 kg CO_2-eq/kg live weight vs. 3.39 for net-pen production in Norway — roughly double.
- **SINTEF/NTNU/SNF finding**: A joint Norwegian study concluded that land-based production in Norway carries a 28% higher carbon footprint than net-pen production, driven primarily by energy demand for water recirculation, temperature control, and oxygen management.
- **Energy demand**: RAS systems require enormous energy inputs. Salfjord has secured 55 MW of grid power (with 55 MW more in queue) for its planned 36,500 MT facility. Energy is the single largest differentiator: where Norway's hydropower grid is >98% renewable, this mitigates the carbon impact substantially. However, in jurisdictions with fossil-heavy grids (like China, where RAS energy accounted for 50% of Nordic Aqua Partners' footprint in 2024), the carbon argument collapses.
- **Freshwater use**: Growing 75,000 MT of salmon in 99% RAS would require 4.16 billion litres of freshwater just to fill tanks, plus ongoing replacement volumes.
- **Qualified carbon advantage**: SINTEF found that RAS-produced salmon in Shanghai generates approximately one-third fewer emissions than fresh Norwegian salmon air-freighted to the same market. The sustainability case for land-based is strongest where it replaces long-distance air freight to distant markets, not where it replaces local sea-based production with low-carbon energy.

Verdict: Mixed. In Norway specifically — with its renewable grid and proximity to European markets — the carbon premium of land-based production is modest (~28%). For proximity-to-market plays replacing air freight, the case is stronger. But claiming blanket sustainability superiority over sea-based production is unsupported by current LCA data.

2.4 Other Environmental Dimensions

- **Escape risk**: Eliminated. Land-based systems have zero interaction with wild ecosystems.
- **Pollution/eutrophication**: Contained. Waste streams can be treated rather than dispersed.
- **Antibiotic use**: Already minimal in Norwegian sea-based farming due to vaccination; not a meaningful differentiator.
- **Biodiversity impact**: Eliminated for marine ecosystems; potential terrestrial impacts from facility construction.

---

3. Value Creation Assessment

3.1 Capital Intensity: The Fundamental Constraint

Land-based salmon farming is extraordinarily capital-intensive relative to sea-based:

Metric	Land-Based (RAS/HFS)	Sea-Based (Net Pen)
CAPEX per kg capacity	EUR 11–22 / ~USD 40	EUR 1.7–5.6
Ratio	3–11× sea-based	Baseline
License cost	Free (Norway)	NOK 150M+ per 780t MAB license

Key examples:

- **Atlantic Sapphire** (US): ~USD 22/kg CAPEX, invested >$600M, produced only a few thousand tonnes before collapse. Stock fell 99% over two years.
- **Salmon Evolution** (Norway): Phase 1 at Indre Harøy (7,900t HOG capacity); Phase 2 construction underway adding 10,100t for 18,000t total. Net interest-bearing debt reached NOK 1,358M by Q3 2025.
- **Baring Farsund**: NOK 300M for Phase 1 (1,200t), with full 24,000t build estimated at NOK 4–5 billion.
- **Salfjord**: Targeting 36,500t at Tjeldbergodden.

The free licensing is a significant offset: sea-based licenses trade at NOK 150M+ for 780t MAB, implying a notional cost of NOK 4.60/kg in interest alone. Land-based operators avoid this entirely. However, they face higher operating costs (energy, water treatment, infrastructure maintenance) and the pure capital expenditure dwarfs the license savings.

3.2 Production Cost and Margin Structure

Salmon Evolution, the most advanced operator, provides the clearest financial window:

Period	Price Realization (NOK/kg)	Farming EBITDA/kg	Farming Cost (NOK/kg)
Q1 2024	~108	+40.2	~68
Q2 2025	—	Negative	~81.2
Q3 2025	~61	Negative (~-22/kg)	~76 (normalized)

At Q1 2024 spot prices (~NOK 108/kg), Salmon Evolution was handsomely profitable at NOK 40/kg EBITDA. By Q3 2025, with spot prices at ~NOK 61/kg and normalized costs at ~NOK 76/kg, the operation was deeply underwater. This demonstrates the core vulnerability: **land-based economics are binary around a spot price threshold of roughly NOK 75–80/kg.**

For context, the average Norwegian salmon spot price in 2025 was NOK 77.21/kg — 17% below the 2024 average of NOK 92.74/kg. The 2025 peak was NOK 129.5/kg (Week 1) and the trough was in the low NOK 50s range. Spot prices were approaching NOK 100/kg by December 2025, with Sitagri forecasting continued strength into Q1 2026.

Salmon Evolution claims a 5–7 NOK/kg price premium over conventional farming based on quality and sustainability credentials. If sustainable, this narrows the cost gap but does not close it at cyclical price troughs.

3.3 Scale and Market Share

Global land-based production remains negligible:

- **2023**: ~13,000 tonnes globally
- **2024**: ~23,000 tonnes (BCG estimate) — roughly doubling, but still <1% of the ~2.7 million tonnes of global Atlantic salmon production
- **Land-based market size**: Estimated at USD 4.2B in 2024, projected to USD 6.5B by 2033 (5.5% CAGR)

BCG's 2024 report characterized the sector as being at an "inflection point," citing technological maturation and rising investor confidence. However, the track record of scale-up failures (Atlantic Sapphire, AquaBounty, Proximar, BioFish) remains a serious data point. The co-founder of Atlantic Sapphire himself stated in 2025 that the economics are unviable in the US at current build costs (~$40/kg capacity).

3.4 Supply Constraint Tailwinds

The value creation case for land-based is paradoxically strengthened by the very regulatory system it seeks to circumvent:

- Norwegian sea-based supply growth is constrained to ~2–3% annually by the TLS. Norway targets 1.56 million tonnes in 2025, up ~2.2% YoY.
- Global demand continues to grow at ~6% annually (end-consumer spending now exceeds €30B).
- BCG estimates the medium-term demand runway at ~25% above current levels at prevailing prices, equivalent to supply growth during 2018–2025.
- Household penetration is only 50–75% in mature markets and as low as 10% in China.

This structural supply-demand imbalance supports elevated spot prices, which in turn support land-based economics. The proposed regulatory overhaul (if eventually implemented) could further tighten supply by penalizing high-lice and high-mortality farms, potentially reducing effective sea-based capacity.

3.5 Competitive Response from Sea-Based Incumbents

Sea-based farming is not static:

- **Post-smolt strategies**: Major players (Mowi, Lerøy, SalMar) are investing in larger smolt production on land before transfer to sea, reducing sea-phase exposure to lice.
- **Semi-closed containment**: Technologies like Eide Fjordbruck's 72-metre submerged tanks in Hardangersfjord represent a middle ground — sea-based but lice-resistant.
- **Low-carbon logistics**: New freezing technologies and low-carbon fuel for sea transport could erode land-based proximity-to-market advantages.
- **Operational EBIT**: Mowi's Q1 2025 operational EBIT was EUR 214M, with continued strong margins from established operations at scale. The financial moat of incumbents is vast.

---

4. Risk Matrix

Risk Factor	Land-Based	Sea-Based
Sea lice	Eliminated	High and rising (NOK 5–18B/yr)
Mortality	~3% (Salmon Evolution)	~15% industry average
Wild salmon impact	None	Significant (TLS red-light zones)
Carbon footprint (Norway)	~28% higher at farm gate	Lower, but air freight erodes advantage
CAPEX per kg	3–11× higher	Lower, but rising license costs
Spot price sensitivity	Breakeven ~NOK 75–80/kg	Breakeven ~NOK 45–55/kg
Technology/execution risk	High (multiple high-profile failures)	Mature, proven at scale
Regulatory risk	Low (free licenses, no TLS)	High (TLS, proposed reforms, resource rent tax)
Financing risk	Elevated (negative sentiment post-Atlantic Sapphire)	Strong cash flows support investment
Scale-up risk	Unproven beyond ~8,000t/facility	Proven at >1M tonnes nationally

---

5. Key Metrics Dashboard

Metric	Value	Source/Date
Norwegian sea-phase salmon mortality (2024)	15.4% (57.8M fish)	Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries
Government mortality target	5%	2025 White Paper
Sea lice industry cost (2023)	~NOK 18 billion	Jensen (2024)
Norwegian salmon spot price (2025 average)	NOK 77.21/kg	Akvafakta/Fish Farming Expert
Norwegian salmon spot price (2024 average)	NOK 92.74/kg	Akvafakta
Norwegian salmon spot price (Dec 2025)	Approaching NOK 100/kg	Undercurrent News
Forward price guidance (2026)	Strong recovery expected	Sitagri, Salmon Evolution Q3 2025
Global land-based production (2024)	~23,000 tonnes	BCG
Global Atlantic salmon production (2025e)	~2.93 million tonnes	FAO
Land-based share of global production	<1%	BCG / World Fishing
Salmon Evolution normalized farming cost	~NOK 76/kg	Q3 2025 earnings
Salmon Evolution price premium	5–7 NOK/kg vs. conventional	Company guidance
Sea-based production cost (2022 record)	NOK 49/kg	SalmonBusiness/industry report
Sea-based license value	NOK 150M+ per 780t MAB	Market transactions
Land-based license cost (Norway)	Free	Regulatory framework
RAS carbon footprint vs. net pen (Norway)	+28% at farm gate	SINTEF/NTNU/SNF
RAS vs. net pen GWP (global LCA meta-analysis)	RAS effect size +4.31	Budhathoki et al. (2025)
Norwegian production growth (2025e)	+2.2% YoY to 1.56M tonnes	FAO/NCR
Global demand CAGR (end-consumer spending)	~6% annually	BCG
Salmon Evolution Q1 2024 EBITDA/kg	NOK 40.2	Company report
Salmon Evolution Q3 2025 EBITDA/kg	Negative (~-22)	Company report

6. Conclusions

On sustainability: Land-based farming definitively solves the sea lice problem and eliminates harm to wild salmon populations — two of the most severe sustainability failures of Norwegian aquaculture. However, it introduces a material energy and carbon penalty (~28% higher in Norway, potentially 2× globally), significant freshwater demands, and large land requirements. The net sustainability calculus depends critically on location, energy source, and the counterfactual (replacing air-freighted imports is positive; replacing adjacent sea-based production with clean energy is questionable). Any ESG or sustainability claim must be qualified accordingly.

On value creation: The economics are viable but fragile. Land-based operators can be highly profitable when spot prices exceed ~NOK 90–100/kg (as in Q1 2024), but are loss-making at cyclical troughs around NOK 60–70/kg. The structural supply constraint from Norway's TLS provides a tailwind, and free licensing is a genuine regulatory arbitrage. However, capital intensity remains 3–11× that of sea-based, financing conditions have tightened following high-profile failures, and no operator has yet demonstrated sustained profitability at scale beyond ~8,000 tonnes. The sector is at an inflection point — production is scaling rapidly (doubling in 2024) — but remains a high-risk, high-conviction bet on (a) sustained elevated salmon prices, (b) continued regulatory constraint on sea-based growth, and (c) operational execution at scales not yet proven.

For a **sustainability consulting firm**: The sea lice elimination narrative is robust and evidence-based, but must be contextualised against the energy/carbon trade-off. A credible sustainability assessment requires a full life cycle analysis that accounts for energy source, transport substitution, and regional grid mix.

For a **hedge fund equity analyst**: Land-based salmon is a leveraged play on the salmon spot price with asymmetric downside. The key variable to monitor is the spread between realised price and all-in cost (~NOK 75–80/kg for the best operators). Regulatory developments (TLS reform, resource rent tax, new licensing rounds) will determine whether the supply constraint — the single most important value driver — persists. The Norwegian Parliament's June 2025 decision to maintain the status quo TLS is near-term positive for both land- and sea-based incumbents.

Sources: Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries, FAO, BCG, Salmon Evolution company filings, Akvafakta, Sitagri Salmon Index, SINTEF/NTNU/SNF, Nordic Credit Rating, SeafoodSource, SalmonBusiness, Undercurrent News, Fish Farming Expert, peer-reviewed literature (Abolofia et al. 2017, Liu & Vanhauwaer Bjelland 2014, Budhathoki et al. 2025, Overton et al. 2019, Walde et al. 2023, Zhang et al. 2023). Data as of February 2026.