



“People and Wetlands: The Vital Link”
**7th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties
to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971),
San José, Costa Rica, 10-18 May 1999**

Agenda item XI: Issues arising from Resolutions and Recommendations of previous meetings of the Conference of the Parties

Issue 3:

**Review of the official descriptions, conservation status, and
management plans for Ramsar sites, including the situation of
particular sites in the territory of specific Contracting Parties¹**

Contents

Introduction

Official descriptions and maps of designated Ramsar sites

Management planning at Ramsar sites

Preparation of Management Plans by Contracting Parties

Review of the Management Planning Guidelines by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel

The Montreux Record and Management Guidance Procedures

Status of the Record of Ramsar sites where changes in ecological character have occurred, are occurring, or are likely to occur (the Montreux Record)

Advice on Management Guidance Procedures and related conducted since COP6

Actions taken pursuant to Recommendation 6.17: *Ramsar sites in the territories of specific Contracting Parties*

Responses to question 5.3 of the National Report format which asked Contracting Parties to identify those sites where “*there has been a change in the ecological character (either positive or negative) at any of your Ramsar sites or is this likely to occur in the near future?*”

Annex 1. Sites for which Ramsar Information Sheets have yet to be provided

Annex 2. Sites for which suitable maps have yet to be provided

Annex 3. Sites for which Ramsar Information Sheets in one of the official working languages of the Convention have yet to be provided

Annex 4. Sites for which updated Ramsar Information Sheets have yet to be provided

Annex 5. Report of the review of the Management Planning Guidelines by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel

Annex 6. Table summarising the current status of the Montreux Record

Annex 7. Advice regarding Management Guidance Procedures and the current status of Montreux Record sites

Annex 8. Actions taken pursuant to Recommendation 6.17: *Ramsar sites in the territories of specific Contracting Parties*

Annex 9. References and summary information for instances where Contracting Parties advised that there “has been change in the ecological character at any Ramsar site or . . . this is likely to occur in the near future”: Question 5.2 of the National Report format.

¹ See also the related draft resolution Ramsar COP7 DOC. 15. 12.

Note - at the time of finalising this document (10 March 1999), the following Contracting Parties had yet to submit National Reports and therefore could not be considered in the preparation of Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Belize (2 sites), Croatia (4 sites), El Salvador (1 site)*, Gabon (3 sites), Guinea-Bissau (1 site), Luxembourg (1 site)*, Madagascar (2 sites)* and Mauritania (2 sites).

* these are new Contracting Parties and were not expected to submit National Reports

Introduction

1. At the 6th Conference of the Contracting Parties, a number of Resolutions and Recommendations were adopted relating to the official descriptions and management of Ramsar Listed sites. These were:
 - Resolution VI.1 on Working definitions for ecological character, guidelines for describing and maintaining the ecological character of listed sites, and guidelines for operation of the Montreux Record;
 - Resolution VI.13 on Submission of information on sites designated for the Ramsar List of Wetlands of International Importance;
 - Recommendation 6.13 on Guidelines on management planning for Ramsar sites and other wetlands;
 - Recommendations 6.17 and 6.17.1-5 on Ramsar sites in the territories of specific Contracting Parties.
2. Further, COP6 adopted a Strategic Plan for the Convention in which the fifth General Objective is devoted to the description and management of Wetlands of International Importance. More specifically within General Objective 5:
 - Operational Objective 5.1 considers the maintenance of ecological character at Ramsar sites including the working definition of ecological character adopted in Resolution VI.1, the Montreux Record of sites where changes in ecological character have occurred, are occurring, or are likely to occur, and the application of the Management Guidance Procedure;
 - Operational Objective 5.2 considers management planning at Ramsar sites;
 - Operational Objective 5.3 insists that Contracting Parties should provide up-to-date and complete Ramsar Information Sheets and maps to describe designated sites.
3. Within this review the actions taken relating to a number of the above since COP6 are described. Based on these findings, a draft COP7 decision, Ramsar COP DOC. 15.12, has been prepared as provided. Note that the follow-up actions taken in response to Resolution VI.1 on the working definitions of ecological character and the change in ecological character have been undertaken by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) and are

considered in a separate document (Ramsar COP7 DOC. 15.10), which will be presented to Technical Session IV at COP7.

Official descriptions and maps of designated Ramsar sites

4. By Notification 5/1997, dated 9 July 1997, the Ramsar Bureau reminded Contracting Parties that through Resolution VI.13 of COP6 they were asked to submit by 31 December 1997 a map and completed Ramsar Information Sheet (RIS) relating to any listed site for which these had not been submitted previously. In the same Notification Contracting Parties were requested, also in accordance with Resolution VI.13, to review their site descriptions and provide updated site descriptions using the new RIS, for those sites designated prior to 31 December 1990. The deadline for the submission of such updates was 30 June 1998.
5. In a memorandum to all Contracting Parties in June 1998 the matters referred to in these notifications were again brought to the attention of all Administrative Authorities. At the time of finalising this document (10 March 1999), the response to these requests is as indicated in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 below.

Sites for which Ramsar Information Sheets and maps have yet to be provided

6. At the time of COP6 there were 132 sites in 22 Contracting Parties for which adequate descriptions had not been submitted and 51 sites in 13 Contracting Parties for which a suitable map had not been provided. As of 10 March 1999 there remain 55 sites in 11 Contracting Parties where site descriptions using the approved Ramsar Information Sheet have not been provided and 10 sites in six Contracting Parties where a suitable map is yet to be forthcoming. The details of these are given in Annexes 1 and 2. Note that excluded from both categories referred to here are the former states of the USSR (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan) which each have one site for which neither RIS or map have been provided. At this time, these are not considered Contracting Parties of the Convention as they have yet to submit instruments of succession.

Sites for which Ramsar Information Sheets in one of the official working languages of the Convention have yet to be provided

7. In addition to the above sites for which no information has been provided, there also remain a number of sites where the official description has not been provided in one of the working languages of the Convention. At the time of COP6 this applied to 71 sites in four Contracting Parties. As of 10 March 1999 this remains the case for 66 sites in three Contracting Parties. Annex 3 provides details of the these Contracting Parties and sites.

Sites for which updated Ramsar Information Sheets have yet to be provided

8. Of the 512 sites designated prior to 31 December 1990, revised information conforming with the new Ramsar Information Sheet format was required from 31 Contracting Parties for a total of 172 sites. As of 10 March 1999 this information had been provided by 19 Contracting Parties for 98 sites. Annex 4 provides the details of where revised information remains outstanding from 12 Contracting Parties for a total of 74 sites.
9. **Recommendation**
 - i) That those Contracting Parties referred to in Annexes 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this document be urged to submit, as a matter of urgent priority, adequate site descriptions or maps as appropriate.

Management planning at Ramsar sites

Preparation of Management Plans by Contracting Parties

10. Action 5.2.3 of the Strategic Plan of the Convention states that “*by the 8th COP (2002), management plans or other mechanisms*” should be “*in preparation, or in place, for at least half of the Ramsar sites in each Contracting Party.*”
11. In the National Reports submitted for COP7, Contracting Parties were asked to indicate their progress with pursuing this goal. As of 10 March 1999, the status of progress with the preparation and implementation of management plans for Ramsar sites on a region by region basis was as shown below. The information provided up to this date indicates that management plans are in place for 168 sites (18%) and plans are being prepared or revised for a further 248 sites (26%). Further, Contracting Parties have advised that for 288 sites (30%) management plans are being implemented.
12. While it may seem an error to suggest that more plans are being implemented than are apparently fully prepared, this reflects, in part, the fact that some plans are being revised and others are being implemented while still undergoing preparation. Also, there are many instances where Ramsar sites fall within larger management areas, or are only partially covered by management plans for adjoining areas. These situations have been included in the statistics for “Plans being implemented” even though the circumstances vary greatly. The same explanation applies for the apparent anomaly shown for “Plans include monitoring” where Contracting Parties have advised that for 358 sites (38%) some form of monitoring regime is in place. It should not be assumed, however, that this suggests 358 sites have a comprehensive monitoring framework as encouraged by the Convention (Article 3.2 and Resolution VI.1). In many cases Contracting Parties have indicated a positive reply to this question when only one or a few suitable parameters are being monitored.
13. Closer examination of the table below indicates some apparent regional differences in the progress with management planning. Most notably, in terms of site management “Plans being prepared (or updated)” there is much activity in Eastern Europe, the Neotropics, North America and Oceania, but noticeably less in Africa, Asia and Western Europe. In terms of “Plans fully prepared” the highest percentages are found in Oceania, North America and the Neotropics, followed by Africa. Note that in this case also many Contracting Parties have

included situations where a Ramsar site is partially covered by an existing management plan for an adjoining area, or forms part of a larger management area. Here again, the lowest incidence of fully prepared site plans is found in Western Europe and Asia, both at just 6% of sites. However, when the figures for “Plans being implemented” are examined, a different trend is obvious with Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa lagging behind the other regions.

14. Perhaps the most pleasing finding from this survey are the figures for “Plans include monitoring”, which show this being under way at levels from 22% (North America) up to 52% (Neotropics) of sites in the various regions. This is an encouraging sign that Contracting Parties are taking seriously their obligations under Article 3.2 to “*arrange to be informed at the earliest opportunity if the ecological character of any wetland in its territory and included in the List has changed, is changing or is likely to change.*” However, as indicated in paragraph 11 above, it should not be assumed from these figures that comprehensive monitoring frameworks are in place for 358 Ramsar sites, as in many cases Contracting Parties have advised that this monitoring is limited or restricted to only one or a few suitable parameters.
15. For more detailed information on management planning at Ramsar sites presented country by country, refer to the respective Regional Overviews, Ramsar COP7 DOCS. 6-12.

Status of management plans for Ramsar sites (Actions 5.1.2, 5.2.3)

Region	Number of Ramsar sites	Plans being prepared (or updated)	Plans fully prepared	Plans being implemented	Plans include monitoring
Africa	76 (68)	15 (22%)	24 (35%)	16 (23%)	25 (37%)
Asia	70 (70)	10 (14%)	4 (6%)	15 (21%)	22 (31%)
Eastern Europe	145 (141)*	50 (35%)	13 (9%)	20 (14%)	50 (35%)
Neotropics	65 (62)	28 (45%)	28 (45%)	28 (45%)	32 (52%)
North America	59 (59)	20 (34%)	35 (59%)	35 (59%)	13 (22%)
Oceania	56 (56)	30 (54%)	35 (62%)	17 (30%)	18 (32%)
Western Europe	495 (494) ⁽¹⁾	95 (19%)	29 (6%)	157 (32%)	198 (40%)
Totals	966 (950)	248 (26%)	168 (18%)	288 (30%)	358 (38%)

In the Number of Ramsar sites column, () indicates the number of sites considered here, allowing for those Contracting Parties which had not submitted National Reports as of 10 March 1999 - namely Belize (2 sites), Croatia (4 sites), El Salvador (1 site), Gabon (3 sites), Guinea-Bissau (1 site), Luxembourg (1 site), Madagascar (2 sites) and Mauritania (2 sites)

For Asia - four sites in the former USSR have not been included here.

* includes 20 sites in the Asian part of the Russian Federation

⁽¹⁾ includes sites in Greenland (11), and in the dependent territories of three Contracting Parties which are located in other regions

16. Overall, this review of management planning shows that encouraging progress has been made toward achieving the target set by Action 5.2.3 of the Strategic Plan. If it is assumed that all of the plans being prepared and revised at present are finalised within the not too distant future, then this will amount to a total of 416 or 44% of sites for which some form of management plan will be in place. It has to be hoped that the pattern of the present, where there are claimed to be more management plans being implemented than have been finalised, continues into the future. Based on this survey it would seem there may be grounds for COP7 to consider revising the target set in Action 5.2.3 of the Strategic Plan to a higher level as a way to further encourage activities in this very important area of the Convention's work. It is of concern that the extent of management planning in some regions is noticeably less than in others. For these regions it should be a high priority in the next triennium to increase the level of management planning.

17. Recommendations

- i.) That COP7 consider reviewing the target for management planning at Ramsar sites, as set by Action 5.2.3 of the Strategic Plan, and setting a more ambitious target.
- ii) That Contracting Parties be urged to continue their efforts to prepare and implement management plans for Ramsar sites, and further encouraged to ensure that these include appropriate monitoring regimes.

Review of the Management Planning Guidelines

18. The review of the Convention's *Guidelines on Management Planning for Ramsar Sites and Other Wetlands* (Resolution 5.7) was undertaken by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel in response to Recommendation 6.13 from COP6. Annex 5 provides a full description of the

project and its findings based on two questionnaires sent to all Contracting Parties and other interested organisations in 1997 and 1998.

19. **Recommendations**

- i) Refer to the final section of Annex 5, which provides the overall conclusions and recommendations of this project.

The Montreux Record and Management Guidance Procedures

Status of the Record of Ramsar sites where changes in ecological character have occurred, are occurring, or are likely to occur (the Montreux Record)

20. A summary of the current status of the Montreux Record is provided in Annex 6. This shows that since its inception in 1990, a total of 69 sites from 32 Contracting Parties have been entered into the Record. Note that excluded from this figure are the single sites in three former states of the USSR: Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. These states have yet to become Contracting Parties of the Convention. Of these 69 sites, 11 have been removed from the Montreux Record by the Contracting Parties, leaving, as at the date this document was finalised (10 March 1999), 58 sites. Six sites have been removed from the Montreux Record since COP6; these being sites in Algeria, Bolivia, Germany, Mexico, South Africa and Venezuela.
21. Of the 58 Montreux Record sites as at 10 March 1999, official Management Guidance Procedures (with a formal report submitted by the Bureau to the Administrative Authority) have been completed for 39 sites, and for four of these sites, two MGPs have been done (Islamic Republic of Iran for 2 sites, Tunisia and Uruguay 1 site each). Since COP6 MGPs have been completed for 9 sites (1 in Costa Rica, 1 in Denmark, 1 in Guatemala, 3 in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and 3 in Italy). In addition the Bureau has also visited and provided advice on a number of other sites as indicated in Annex 6. More detailed information on each Montreux Record site is given in Annex 7. Those Contracting Parties with Montreux Record sites were asked to include in their National Reports up-to-date advice on the situation at each. This advice, where provided, has been included in Annex 7.
22. Reference to Annex 7 reveals that a number of Contracting Parties, as stated in their National Reports for COP7, are giving consideration to the removal of sites from the Montreux Record. This is in recognition of positive actions which have been taken, in response to either the recommendations of Management Guidance Procedures, less formal site visits by Bureau personnel, or internal reviews. The Convention should welcome such attention to site management problems by these Contracting Parties and urge them to complete and submit as soon as possible the questionnaire designed for this purpose (Resolution VI.1). At the same time, the advice by some Contracting Parties is that while actions are under way to address management problems, it is premature to consider the removal of these sites from the Montreux Record. The actions of these Contracting Parties should also be acknowledged, and these countries are urged to continue to seek ways to re-establish the ecological character of these sites. It is of concern that a number of Contracting Parties failed to provide an update

on the status of their Montreux Record site(s) through the National Report process. It is hoped that they will be able to do so at the time of COP7.

Promoting application of the Montreux Record as a Convention tool

23. It is evident that there has been a marked slowing down in the entry of sites into the Montreux Record over the past four years; only three sites having been added after 1994, with all others added between 1990 and 1994. It is the view of the Standing Committee and Ramsar Bureau that this reflects the continuing poor image of the Montreux Record as a so-called red or black list of sites. At the time it was established by Recommendations 4.8 and 5.3, the Montreux Record was recognised as a suitable response to the obligations accepted by Contracting Parties through Articles 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2 of the Convention. It was also seen as giving Contracting Parties the option to request expert assistance in addressing management problems through a Management Guidance Procedure. In fact, there have been several “success” stories under the Montreux Record, and there seems to be a need to promote these more widely to assist in creating a more positive perception of this important Ramsar Convention tool.

Renaming the Management Guidance Procedure (MGP)

24. While recognising that the MGP was formerly known as the Monitoring Procedure, the Ramsar Bureau brought to the attention of the 21st meeting of the Standing Committee its view that the name Management Guidance Procedure still does not convey to those unfamiliar with Ramsar jargon what such an action under the Convention is truly about. The phrase “Management Guidance Procedure” is also difficult to express in French and Spanish. The Standing Committee agreed with the view of the Bureau on this matter and is recommending that the Management Guidance Procedure be renamed (for the final time) to *Ramsar Advisory Mission*.

25. Recommendations

- i) That COP7 acknowledge the efforts of Algeria, Bolivia, Germany, Mexico, South Africa and Venezuela, which have undertaken actions resulting in the removal of six sites from the Montreux Record since COP6;
- ii) Further, that those Contracting Parties with sites on the Montreux Record, and especially those for which a Management Guidance Procedures has been conducted, be urged to increase their efforts to address the management problems of these sites with a view to the early removal of these sites from the Record;
- iii) Also, that those Contracting Parties with Montreux Record sites, and which have failed to provide an update on the current status of these sites as part of their National Reports or other appropriate means, be requested to do so as soon as possible;

- iv) That the Ramsar Bureau be requested to promote the “success stories” of the Montreux Record as a way to demonstrate to all Contracting Parties the benefits which accrue from placing sites in the Record; and,
- v) That the *Management Guidance Procedure* be renamed the *Ramsar Advisory Mission*.

Actions taken pursuant to Recommendation 6.17: *Ramsar sites in the territories of specific Contracting Parties*

- 26. In the National Report format for COP7 approved by the Standing Committee, question 5.5 asked that those Contracting Parties specifically referred to in Recommendation 6.17 and Recommendations 6.17.1-5 should provide advice on their actions to address the issues and concerns raised therein. These responses are presented in Annex 8.
- 27. Recommendations 6.17 and 6.17.1-5 drew attention to site management issues in a large number of countries, 11 of these being related to Montreux Record sites. The information relating to these latter sites is given in Annexes 6 and 7. For the remaining sites, most of the relevant Contracting Parties provided some information on the issues of concern addressed in Recommendations 6.17 and 6.17.1-5. In order of consideration in the Recommendations, and in Annex 8, this relates to issues in the Netherlands, Poland, Russian Federation, Vietnam, Hungary, Chile, South Africa, Bolivia, Peru, Austria, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Bangladesh, France, Germany and Australia. Regrettably, not all of these Contracting Parties provided a response to the issues raised in Recommendation 6.17 as indicated in Annex 8.
- 28. **Recommendations**
 - i) That those Contracting Parties referred to in Recommendations 6.17 and 6.17.1-5 and which did not provide, as part of their National Reports, comprehensive updates on the matters raised in these Recommendations, be urged to do so as soon as possible.

Responses to question 5.3 of the National Report format which asked Contracting Parties to identify those sites where “*There has been a change in the ecological character (either positive or negative) at any of your Ramsar sites or is this likely to occur in the near future?*”

- 29. In the National Report format for COP7 approved by the Standing Committee, question 5.3 asked Contracting Parties to identify those sites where “*there has been a change in the ecological character (either positive or negative) at any of your Ramsar sites or is this likely to occur in the near future?*”
- 30. From those National Reports submitted at the time of finalising this document (10 March 1999), 35 Contracting Parties had responded to this question by indicating that they had one or more Ramsar sites within their jurisdictions where a change in ecological character had occurred or was likely to occur in the near future. As detailed in Annex 9, these Contracting Parties were Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Comoros, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Germany, Guinea,

Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Peru, Sri Lanka, The Gambia, Togo, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. Thirty-three of these Contracting Parties identified a total of 110 sites and two (Mexico and Pakistan) referred to all or most of their sites. **A summary of this advice is provided in Annex 9; however, in order to gain a full understanding of the threats and management issues concerned, reference to the full National Reports posted on the Ramsar Web site is urged in all cases.**

31. A number of the Contracting Parties which provided advice on their so-called “sites of concern” provided extensive and detailed information on the issues and approaches being taken to rectify problems. Notable among these are Australia, Germany, Ireland, Japan and the United Kingdom, and these Contracting Parties deserve commendation for responding so forthrightly to this question in their National Reports. Reference to Annex 9 will also indicate that a large number of Contracting Parties did not give any indication of the actions they are taking to deal with site management problems and threats. While this was not requested by question 5.3 of the National Report format, these Contracting Parties are urged to provide this advice to the Bureau in accordance with Article 3.2 of the Convention.
32. **Recommendations**
 - i) That the following Contracting Parties be commended by COP7 for the detailed information they provided relating to management problems, and the responses to these, for a number of their Ramsar sites: Australia, Germany, Ireland, Japan and the United Kingdom;
 - ii) That those Contracting Parties which have advised through their National Reports for COP7 that changes in ecological character have occurred or are imminent at a Ramsar site (Question 5.3) be urged to consider entering these sites on the Montreux Record as a matter of priority.

Annex 1

Contracting Parties which have yet to provide Ramsar Information Sheets for Ramsar sites²

COUNTRY	Site name	Designation
ALGERIA	Lac Oubeira	04-11-83
BELIZE	Crooked Tree Lagoon Area	22-04-98
	Mexico and Jones Lagoon Area	22-04-98
GABON	Wongha-Wonghé	30-12-86
	Petit Loango	30-12-86
	Setté Cama	30-12-86
GERMANY	Wattenmeer, Elbe - Weser - Dreieck	26-02-76
	Wattenmeer, Jadebusen & westliche Wesermündung	26-02-76
	Wattenmeer, Ostfriesisches Wattenmeer & Dollart	26-02-76
	Niederelbe, Barnkrug - Otterndorf	26-02-76
	Elbaue, Schnackenburg - Lauenburg	26-02-76
	Dümmer	26-02-76
	Diepholzer Moorniederung	26-02-76
	Steinhuder Meer	26-02-76
	Unteres Odertal, Schwedt	31-07-78
	Peitzer Teichgebiet	31-07-78
	IRAN, Islamic Republic of	Deltas of Rud-e-Shur, Rud-e-Shirin and Rud-e-Minab
IRELAND	Wexford Wildfowl Reserve	15-11-84
	The Raven	31-07-86
	Pettigo Plateau	31-07-86
	Slieve Bloom Mountains	31-07-86
	Owenduff catchment	31-07-86
	Owenboy	01-06-87
	Knockmoyle/Sheskin	01-06-87
	Lough Barra Bog	01-06-87
	North Bull Island	06-09-88
	Rogerstown Estuary	25-10-88
	Baldoyle Bay	25-10-88
	Clara Bog	06-12-88
	Mongan Bog	06-12-88
	Raheenmore Bog	06-12-88
	Tralee Bay	10-07-89
	Easky Bog	30-05-90
The Gearagh	30-05-90	

² Three Ramsar sites in the territory of the former USSR - Kirov Bays (Azerbaijan), Issyk-kul Lake (Kyrgyzstan), and Krasnovodsk and North-Cheleken Bays (Turkmenistan) - have not been included in this list.

	Coole Lough & Garryland Wood	30-05-90
	Pollardstown Fen	30-05-90
	Meenachullion Bog	30-05-90
	Bannow Bay	11-06-96
	Trawbreaga Bay	11-06-96
	Cummeen Strand	11-06-96
MAURITANIA	Banc d'Arguin	22-10-82
MONACO	Monaco coastal zone	20-08-97
NETHERLANDS Aruba Netherlands Antilles Netherlands Antilles Netherlands Antilles Netherlands Antilles Netherlands Antilles	Alde Feanen	07-01-93
	De Deelen	07-01-93
	Deurnese Peelgebieden	07-01-93
	Bargerveen	07-01-93
	Het Spaans Lagoen	23-05-80
	Het Lac	23-05-80
	Het Pekelmeer	23-05-80
	Klein Bonaire Island and adjacent sea	23-05-80
	Het Gotomeer	23-05-80
	De Slagbaai	23-05-80
SPAIN	Salinas de Ibiza y Formentera	30-11-93
YUGOSLAVIA	Obedska Bara	28-03-77
	Ludasko Lake	28-03-77

Annex 2

**Contracting Parties which have yet to provide suitable maps
for Ramsar sites**

COUNTRY	Site name	Designation
BAHRAIN	The Huwar Islands	27-10-97
BELIZE	Mexico and Jones Lagoon Area	22-04-98
INDIA	Wular Lake	23-03-90
	Harike Lake	23-03-90
	Loktak Lake	23-03-90
	Sambhar Lake	23-03-90
NETHERLANDS (Aruba) (Netherlands Antilles)	Het Spaans Lagoen	23-05-80
	De Slagbaai	23-05-80
SOUTH AFRICA	Nylsvley Nature Reserve	06-07-98
The Former Yugoslav Republic of MACEDONIA	Lake Prespa	03-05-95

Annex 3

**Contracting Parties which have yet to submit Ramsar site descriptions in an
official working language of the Convention**

COUNTRY	Site name	Language
----------------	------------------	-----------------

GERMANY	Rhein, Eltville - Bingen	German
	Donauauen & Donaumoos	German
	Lech - Donau - Winkel	German
	Ismaninger Speichersee & Fischteichen	German
	Ammersee	German
	Starnberger See	German
	Chiemsee	German
	Ostseeboddengäwasser Westrügen - Hiddensee - Zingst	German
	Krakower Obersee	German
	Ostufer Müritz	German
	Niederung der Untere Havel/Gölper See	German
	Galenbecker See	German
	Rieselfelder Münster	German
	Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg	German
	Unterer Niederrhein	German
	Hamburgisches Wattenmeer	German
	Mühlenberger Loch	German
	Bodensee: Wollmatinger Ried - Giehrenmoos & Mindelsee	German
	ITALY	Vincheto di Cellarda
Sacca di Bellocchio		Italian
Valle Santa		Italian
Punte Alberete		Italian
Palude di Colfiorito		Italian
Palude di Bolgheri		Italian
Laguna di Orbetello		Italian
Lago di Burano		Italian
Lago di Nazzano		Italian
Lago di Fogliano		Italian
Lago dei Monaci		Italian
Lago di Caprolace		Italian
Lago di Sabaudia		Italian
Lago di Barrea		Italian
Stagno di S'Ena Arrubia		Italian
Stagno di Molentargius		Italian
Stagno di Cagliari (a.k.a. Santa Gilla)		Italian
Le Cesine		Italian
Valle Cavanata		Italian
Stagno di Cábras		Italian
Stagno di Corru S'Ittiri, Stagni di San Giovanni e Marceddi		Italian
Stagno di Pauli Maiori		Italian
Valle Campotto e Bassarone		Italian
Laguna di Marano: Foci dello Stella		Italian
Saline di Margherita di Savoia	Italian	
Lago di Tovel	Italian	

	Torre Guaceto	Italian
	Valle di Gorino	Italian
	Valle Bertuzzi	Italian
	Valli residue del comprensorio di Comacchio	Italian
	Piallassa della Baiona e Risega	Italian
	Ortazzo e Ortazzino	Italian
	Saline di Cervia	Italian
	Stagno di Sale Porcus	Italian
	Stagno di Mistras	Italian
	Valli del Mincio	Italian
	Torbiera d'Iseo	Italian
	Palude Brabbia	Italian
	Palude di Ostiglia	Italian
	Biviere di Gela	Italian
	Laguna di Venezia: Valle Averno	Italian
	Vendicari	Italian
	Isola Boscone	Italian
	Bacino dell'Angitola	Italian
	Palude della Diaccia Botrona	Italian
NETHERLANDS	Krammer-Volkerak	Dutch
	Verdronken Land van Saeftinge	Dutch
	Zwarte Meer	Dutch

Annex 4

**Contracting Parties which have yet to submit revised site descriptions
conforming with the revised Ramsar Information Sheets**

COUNTRY	Site name	Designation	Date of data
BULGARIA	Arkoutino	24-09-75	09/81
	Durankulak Lake	28-11-84	11/84
DENMARK (Greenland)	Aqajarua-Sullorsuaq	27-01-88	01/88
	Qínnguata Marraa-Kuussuaq	27-01-88	01/88
	Kuannersuit Kuussuat	27-01-88	01/88
	Kitsissunnguit	27-01-88	01/88
	Naternaq	27-01-88	01/88
	Eqalummiut Nunaat-Nassuttuup Nunaa	27-01-88	01/88
	Ikkattoq	27-01-88	01/88
	Kitsissut Avallit (Ouder Kitsissut)	27-01-88	01/88
	Heden (Jameson Land)	27-01-88	01/88
	Hochstetter Forland	27-01-88	01/88
	Kilen	27-01-88	01/88
	GHANA	Owabi	22-02-88
GUINEA-BISSAU	Lagoa de Cufada	14-05-90	03/90
INDIA	Chilka Lake	01-10-81	07/81
	Keoladeo National Park	01-10-81	07/81
	Wular Lake	23-03-90	09/89
	Harike Lake	23-03-90	09/89
	Loktak Lake	23-03-90	09/89
	Sambhar Lake	23-03-90	09/89
IRELAND	Castlemaine Harbour	30-05-90	01/90
ITALY	Pian di Spagna - Lago di Mezzola	14-12-76	01/89
	Vincheto di Cellarda	14-12-76	01/89
	Sacca di Bellocchio	14-12-76	01/89
	Valle Santa	14-12-76	01/89
	Punte Alberete	14-12-76	01/89
	Palude di Colfiorito	14-12-76	01/89
	Palude di Bolgheri	14-12-76	01/89
	Laguna di Orbetello	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Burano	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Nazzano	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Fogliano	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago dei Monaci	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Caprolace	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Sabaudia	14-12-76	01/89
	Lago di Barrea	14-12-76	01/89
	Stagno di S'Ena Arrubia	14-12-76	01/89
	Stagno di Molentargius	14-12-76	01/89
	Stagno di Cagliari (a.k.a. Santa Gilla)	14-12-76	01/89

	Le Cesine	06-12-77	01/89
	Valle Cavanata	10-03-78	01/89
	Stagno di Cábras	28-03-79	01/89
	Stagno di Corru S'Ittiri, Stagni di San Giovanni e Marceddì	28-03-79	01/89
	Stagno di Pauli Maiori	28-03-79	01/89
	Valle Campotto e Bassarone	28-03-79	01/89
	Laguna di Marano: Foci dello Stella	14-05-79	01/89
	Saline di Margherita di Savoia	02-08-79	01/89
	Lago di Tovel	19-09-80	01/89
	Torre Guaceto	21-07-81	01/89
	Valle di Gorino	04-09-81	01/89
	Valle Bertuzzi	04-09-81	01/89
	Valli residue del comprensorio di Comacchio	04-09-81	01/89
	Piallassa della Baiona e Risega	04-09-81	01/89
	Ortazzo e Ortazzino	04-09-81	01/89
	Saline di Cervia	04-09-81	01/89
	Stagno di Sale Porcus	03-05-82	01/89
	Stagno di Mistras	03-05-82	01/89
	Valli del Mincio	05-12-84	01/89
	Torbiere d'Iseo	05-12-84	01/89
	Palude Brabbia	05-12-84	01/89
	Palude di Ostiglia	05-12-84	01/89
	Biviere di Gela	12-04-88	01/89
	Laguna di Venezia: Valle Averte	11-04-89	01/89
	Venticari	11-04-89	01/89
	Isola Boscone	11-04-89	01/89
	Bacino dell'Angitola	11-04-89	01/89
KENYA	Lake Nakuru	05-06-90	08/90
MALI	Walado Debo/Lac Debo	25-05-87	12/86
	Séri	25-05-87	12/86
	Lac Horo	25-05-87	12/86
UNITED KINGDOM (Turks and Caicos Islands)	North, Middle & East Caicos Islands	27-06-90	05/90

Annex 5

Review of Management Planning Guidelines of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)

by

**Dr Makoto Komoda (Japan) and Dr Roberto Schlatter (Chile), members of
the Convention's Scientific and Technical Review Panel
(with the assistance of the Ramsar Bureau)**

BACKGROUND

1. At its 5th Conference of the Contracting Parties held in Kushiro, Japan, in 1993, Resolution 5.7 adopted *Guidelines on Management Planning for Ramsar Sites and Other Wetlands*. At the following Conference of the Contracting Parties, held in Brisbane, Australia, in 1996, Recommendation 6.13 was adopted which among a range of actions requested that the Convention's Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) "*monitor the Ramsar Guidelines on Management Planning, including a review of the most recent advances in the total or integrated management approach to management planning, and to report its conclusions, as well as the ten case studies of the best practice of management planning (Action 5.2.2 of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 1997-2002), to the 7th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties.*" Action 5.2.2 of the Strategic Plan also requests the STRP, the Bureau, and the NGO Partners of the Convention to "*publish for the guidance of Contracting Parties, before the 7th COP (1999), ten best practice case studies of management planning for Ramsar sites, at local, regional and catchment or coastal zone levels.*"
2. In response to these requested actions the authors of this report, assisted by the Bureau, developed two questionnaires which were distributed to Contracting Parties and others in the three official languages, seeking views on the usefulness of the Guidelines for Management Planning. The results of these two questionnaires are given in the following sections.
3. The first questionnaire was circulated in January 1997 and sought responses to questions about the relevance, application, training assistance and viability aspects of the Management Planning Guidelines. The second questionnaire, distributed in January 1998, was targeted more at site managers and those persons with direct experience in the preparation and implementation of management plans at Ramsar and other wetland sites. This second questionnaire sought more specific feedback on the processes for developing and updating management plans, the management principles taken into consideration in those processes, the implementation of the plan including evaluation practices, and the major constraints that had been experienced with implementation.
4. On the matter of the ten best practice case studies, the STRP accepted the Bureau's advice that through the other projects under way in preparation for COP7 (specifically the ones developing Guidelines for involving local and indigenous people in wetlands management and Guidelines for integrating wetlands conservation and wise use into river basin management), there were to be at least this number of suitable case studies documented, and that further case studies would not be required.

RESULTS

Results of Questionnaire #1

5. As indicated in paragraph 3, the first questionnaire survey was designed to assess the usefulness and applicability of the Management Planning Guidelines. There were a total of 43 responses: 34 from Contracting Parties and 9 others from regional organizations, as follows - Australia, Austria, Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Norway, People's Republic of China, Philippines, Peru, Romania, Spain, Slovak Republic, Suriname, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia. From these responses the following conclusions have been drawn.

Relevance of the Guidelines

6. It was a clear indication from the respondents that the Management Planning Guidelines remain relevant and are an important part of the Convention promoting the conservation and wise use of wetlands. Nearly all respondents indicated that they consider the Management Planning Guidelines are either "very relevant" (27, 63%) or "fairly relevant" (13, 30%) to the objectives of the Convention.

Application

7. Nearly 70% (30) of the respondents stated that they have applied the Management Planning Guidelines and/or relevant domestic guidelines although there seems to be variation in the intensity of this application. Those who claimed to have not applied the Guidelines expressed a variety of difficulties with their application. The widely recognised obstacles include financial limitations, enforcement difficulties, shortage of scientific personnel, insufficient scientific information and shortage of field equipment.
8. About 50% (20) of the respondents noted that non-governmental agencies were at least partly responsible for preparation and/or implementation of management plans at Ramsar sites and/or other wetlands in their regions and countries. This suggests that NGOs are very much involved with the implementation of the Convention in many countries.

Training Assistance

9. Over 30% of the respondents (13) said that they have provided technical training to other countries while 40% of respondents (18) said that they have received training from other countries. Varying types of technical training programmes were reported, ranging from training of overseas students to the establishment of training centres. In some countries NGOs have played a significant role with international training assistance. The survey showed that the assistance provided in training is greatly appreciated, but there was a general call for expansion of these efforts in the interests of enhancing wetland conservation and wise use.

Viability

10. Seven respondents (14%) said that the Management Planning Guidelines should be amended. Two suggested they were unduly long and complicated.
11. In contrast, nearly 80% of the respondents (34) rejected this view. While some agreed that the Guidelines were complex, the majority suggested that they were still viable. A number of suggestions were made for how to improve the usefulness of the guidelines. Some respondents called for the further development of definitions, and other suggested that the guidelines should be more specific.

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS from Questionnaire #1

12. The responses to the first Questionnaire indicate that while some Contracting Parties are finding difficulty in applying the Management Planning Guidelines, the majority of those that responded find the concept and structure of the guidelines suitable for use as they were adopted at Ramsar COP5 (Kushiro). However, it was also clear that some Contracting Parties saw there being benefits to the Convention's making improvements to the Guidelines. The second questionnaire (see paragraphs 16-25 below) was developed with this intent: to identify those aspects of modern management planning practices where the Convention should consider the development of supplementary guidance to the Contracting Parties.
13. From the responses to the first questionnaire, one of the areas of concern is the apparent lack of links between management planning and monitoring. This is a significant issue as the review of management objectives and measures based upon monitoring information should be considered as essential in the process of wetland management.
14. The first questionnaire has also shown that the complexity of the guidelines is impeding their application in some Contracting Parties. It is recommended that this matter be the subject of priority for training assistance in the future, particularly through regional and international level co-operation between Ramsar Parties.
15. This survey has also shown a varied perception of the Management Planning Guidelines among the Contracting Parties that replied. It is assumed that the objective of the Guidelines is to help give direction to the process of management planning at Ramsar sites and/or other wetlands. The supervisor of the international course on wetland management, organised by the National Institute for Inland Water Management in the Netherlands, Frank Alberts, sees the Guidelines this way: *"In our course we don't present the guidelines as a detailed blueprint but put emphasis on the basic format of the guidelines formed by the three major questions: What is the situation? What to do? and How to do it?"*

Results of Questionnaire #2

16. As indicated in paragraph 12 above, the second questionnaire was designed to follow up on those issues identified as priorities for further consideration, and for which it may be helpful

to develop further guidance for the Contracting Parties. As such the second questionnaire sought more specific feedback on:

- i. the processes applied in developing and updating management plans;
- ii. the management principles taken into consideration in those processes;
- iii. the implementation of the plan including evaluation practices; and
- iv. the major constraints that had been experienced with implementation.

17. There were responses from 28 Contracting Parties, which related to management planning at 93 wetland sites. A number of these responses came directly from people with hands-on experience with management planning at wetlands. Responses came from the following: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, India, Israel, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Slovak Republic, South Africa, The FYR of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Zambia. From these responses the following conclusions have been drawn.

18. **Development and revision of Management Plans**

- a. *Stakeholder consultation* - In the development of management plans most respondents indicated there had been the involvement of non-government and government stakeholders. In many cases workshops were held during the development process for this purpose. Few Parties received assistance from international institutions for this initiative, but did involve their own technical experts.
- b. *Baseline planning information* - While most respondents indicated that basic information was available to underpin management planning, only a very few respondents indicated that environmental impact assessments were undertaken for any of the activities foreshadowed through the plan.
- c. *Financial and human resources* - The planning process in more than half of the Parties did consider financial and human resources, as well as staff training issues. The remainder were considering or initiating the development of human resource capacity building and staff training, as well as fundraising for these activities.
- d. *Revisions of the management plan* - The second questionnaire revealed that revisions occur at least every 5 to 10 years in those few Contracting Parties which have longer, more established management planning approaches. As most Contracting Parties have only recently implemented such actions, regular revisions should be encouraged through the Convention, especially with such revisions based on appropriate monitoring information.

19. **Production of Management Plans**

- a. *Zonation and multiple-use principle* - Almost all Contracting Parties that responded referred to having some form of zonation which seeks to regulate human uses in part or all of

the site. Some (3) also indicated that they have adopted the multiple-use principle in part or for the whole wetland.

- b. Buffer zones* - More than half of the Parties indicated they employ some form of buffer zones around their sites.
- c. Precautionary principle* - About 40% (11) of the respondents indicated that they have adopted the precautionary principle within management planning.
- d. Cost-benefit analysis* - Cost-benefit analysis as part of management planning is only rarely applied.

20. Implementation of Management Plans

- a. Prepared under specific legislation* - In most of the Parties the preparation of management plans is done under specific legislation or a national policy instrument. The Ramsar Management Planning Guidelines are not required under these legal/policy instruments.
- b. Responsibility for implementation of the Plan* - In most cases the responsibility for implementation of the management plan lies with the government institution. In several Contracting Parties implementation is being done by NGOs. In most cases there is a body/committee which oversees and discusses the implementation of the management plan.
- c. Staff training* - While less than clear responses were obtained here, it seems that in only a few cases has staff training been undertaken as part of the implementation of the management plan.
- d. Involvement of local people in implementation* - Again, while the responses were far from precise, it seems that the involvement of local people with the implementation of management plans is not common. This contrasts with the earlier indication (see paragraph 18.a) that in most cases there is consultation with the local stakeholders during the development of the Management Plan. It would seem that this involvement does not generally flow through to the implementation process.
- e. Private sector activities - tourism especially* - Almost all Contracting Parties which responded had some sort of tourism activity within their wetlands sites which was also considered as an element of the management plan.

21. Evaluating the implementation of Management Plans

- a. Regular monitoring* - Some form of monitoring activity seems to be undertaken by almost all Contracting Parties which responded, but very few variables are monitored. This activity is generally performed by trained staff and in some cases by technical experts. It was not clear from the responses how monitoring data was used, if at all, to give

feedback for future revisions of the management plan or to guide day to day management.

22. **Constraints to implementation of Management Plans**

Many Contracting Parties indicated that a lack of funds was a major constraint for their implementation of the management plan. Others advised that they lack trained personnel and that legislative/administrative conflicts were a problem. Some respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient baseline information.

23. **Financial support for implementation of Management Plans**

Most countries do have some funds available for implementation of the management plan, but, as indicated in paragraph 22 above, never enough for a proper and speedy implementation. Most sites do for the moment have secured funds but on a short term basis only.

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS from Questionnaire #2

24. The responses to the second questionnaire have assisted greatly to identify some of the specific aspects of management planning where it is obvious that the Ramsar Convention should provide further, more detailed, guidance. These are in the areas of:
- a. impact assessment;
 - b. zonation and multiple use;
 - c. buffer zones;
 - d. application of the precautionary principle; and
 - e. cost-benefit analysis.
25. As was identified through the first questionnaire, there is a need for the Convention to promote more strongly monitoring activities and regular reviews of management plans based upon the findings of this monitoring.
26. A pleasing result was that in most countries management plans are being prepared under legal instruments. However, it is of some concern that while many Contracting Parties would seem to be aware of, and are applying the Management Planning Guidelines, this application has not been reflected through legislation and policy instruments related to wetlands. These instruments do not, as a rule, recognise or promote the application of the Convention's Management Planning Guidelines.
27. As was also shown by the first questionnaire, there is an urgent need for training (such as through workshops) and development assistance in many countries to allow Management Plans to be prepared and appropriately implemented.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

28. Based on the two questionnaires and related consultations undertaken by the authors and the Bureau during this review project, the following conclusions and recommendations are offered:
- 28.1 The Management Planning Guidelines remain valid and provide a useful framework for the development of plans that all Contracting Parties are urged to promote and apply.
 - 28.2 Contracting Parties should be further urged to ensure that wherever possible the application of the Management Planning Guidelines is promoted, especially through policies (such as National Wetland Policies), strategies and legislation relating to wetlands. This should be reflected in the Guidelines for developing National Wetland Policies and for Reviewing laws and institutions relating to wetland conservation and wise use which will be considered at COP7.
 - 28.3 Contracting Parties should be strongly encouraged to support the involvement of local stakeholders and NGOs in the development and, where appropriate, the implementation of Management Plans, and be recognised through the Convention's Guidelines for establishing participatory processes to involve local communities and indigenous people in the management of wetlands which will be considered at COP7.
 - 28.4 In preparing management plans Contracting Parties should be urged to ensure that a clear and suitable monitoring regime is included, and that results from such monitoring form the basis for regular reviews of the management plan and consequent changes in management practices where indicated. Contracting Parties should be encouraged to apply the *Framework for designing a wetland monitoring programme* as adopted through Resolution VI.1 at COP6, and the subsequent guidance in this area which will be considered at COP7.
 - 28.5 All Contracting Parties should be encouraged to seek ways to provide appropriate training for those people involved with the development and implementation of management plans. Training workshops are one appropriate way to provide this training. In particular, the development assistance community and other donors should be urged to give high priority to supporting such training in developing countries and those in transition. The transfer of expertise and knowledge in this area, possibly as part of twinning arrangements, should be a recognised priority under the Convention's Guidelines for International Cooperation to be considered at COP7.
 - 28.6 In order to make the application of the Management Planning Guidelines even more helpful for Contracting Parties in the future, the STRP, assisted by the Bureau and others as necessary, should be directed to prepare supplementary guidance on the following aspects of management planning:

- a. impact assessment as an element of planning and management;
- b. applying zonation and multiple use principles;
- c. the design and maintenance of buffer zones;
- d. application of the precautionary principle in management planning; and
- e. cost-benefit analysis as a part of management planning and decision making.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

29. The authors would like to thank the following two persons for their valuable comments and opinions regarding how to improve the Ramsar Management Planning Guidelines and also the general application of management planning:

Mike Alexander, Countryside Council for Wales, Plas Penhros, Bagor. Gwynedd LL57 2LQ, Wales, U.K. (Fax: +44 1248 355 782)

Frank Alberts, Head of Land Use Planning Division, Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, Institute of Inland Water Management & Waste Water Treatment, PO BOX 17 NL-8200 AA, Lelystad, NETHERLANDS (Fax: + 31 320 298 381, e-mail: falberts@euronet.nl)

Annex 6

Table summarising the current status (as at 1 March 1999) of the Montreux Record

1. The Montreux Record is known officially as the *Record of Ramsar sites where changes in ecological character have occurred, are occurring, or are likely to occur*. It was established by Recommendations 4.8 of the 4th Conference of the Contracting Parties, in Montreux, Switzerland, in 1990 and then further elaborated through Recommendation 5.4 of the 5th Conference of the Contracting Parties in Kushiro, Japan, in 1993.
2. Management Guidance Procedures (MGP) are expert missions to Montreux Record sites undertaken at the request of the Contracting Party concerned. They are normally done by a team of external experts coordinated by the Ramsar Convention Bureau. Once the mission has been completed, a report is prepared, with recommendations for addressing the management problems detected by the mission. The report is submitted to the Contracting Party as independent expert advice for how the government can act to restore or retain the ecological character of the Ramsar site in question.

Annex 6: Current Status of the Montreux Record

Country	Name of site	Montreux Record - Date entered	Montreux Record - Date removed	Details of Management Guidance Procedure, site visits, and other actions taken (Annex 7 supplies more detail)
Algeria	1. Lac Oubeira	4.7.90	18.11.97	MGP - November 1990
Algeria	2. Lac Tonga	16.6.93		MGP - November 1990. Further MGP planned for 1998 but not done due to security concerns.
Austria	3. Donau-March-Auen	4.7.90		MGP - April 1991
Belgium	4. Schorren van de Beneden Schelde	4.7.90		MGP - January 1988
Belgium	5. De Ijzerbroeken te Diksmuide en Lo-Reninge	4.7.90	17.1.94	No MGP; site removed following receipt of progress report from Belgian authorities.
Bolivia	6. Laguna Colorada	16.6.93	7.8.96	No MGP. Preparations done for MGP in November 1994, but cancelled by the Administrative Authority
Bulgaria	7. Durankulak Lake	16.6.93		Bureau visited the site in May 1995
Bulgaria	8. Lake Srebarna	16.6.93		Bureau visited the site in May 1995 and again in October 1998 in joint mission with World Heritage Convention (refer Annex 7 for details).
Costa Rica	9. Parque Nacional Palo Verde	16.6.93		MGP - March/April 1998 Report submitted December 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Croatia	10. Kopacki Rit	16.6.93		Bureau visited the site in September 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Czech Republic	11. Litovelské Pomoraví	26.2.97		No formal MGP, but the Bureau visited the site in August 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Czech Republic	12. Novozámecký a Brehynsky rybník	18.9.94		No formal MGP, but the Bureau visited the site in August 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Czech Republic	13. Trebonské rybníky	18.9.94		Czech Authority have advised MGP not required, but site should be retained on Montreux Record.
Denmark	14. Ringkøbing Fjord	4.7.90		MGP - August 1996 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Egypt	15. Lake Badarwil	4.7.90		MGP - October 1991. High level mission proposed by the Bureau for May or August 1998 did not take place.
Egypt	16. Lake Burullus	4.7.90		MGP - October 1991
Germany	17. Unterer Niederrhein	16.6.93	8.1.99	MGP - April 1993. Requests to remove the site received prior to COP6. Montreux Record Questionnaire and request for removal of site received in January 1999. Site subsequently removed.

Germany	18. Ostfriesisches Wattenmeer & Dollart	4.7.90		MGP - September 1990
Greece	19. Amvrakikos gulf 20. Artificial Lake Kerkini 21. Axios, Loudias, Aliakmon delta 22. Evros delta 23. Kotychi Lagoons 24. Lake Mikri Prespa, 25. Lake Vistonis, Porto Lagos, Lake Mitrikou & adjoining lagoons 26. Lakes Volvi & Koronia 27. Messolonghi lagoons 28. Nestos delta & adjoining lagoons	4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90 4.7.90		MGP - All sites - November 1988 Follow-up mission in May 1989 Bureau visited the Administrative Authority in March 1998. Joint Government/Bureau Commission established to report on all ten sites before COP7. Refer Annex 7 for details.
Guatemala	29. Laguna del Tigre	16.6.93		MGP - July/August 1997 Report submitted February 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Iceland	30. Mývatn-Laxá region	4.7.90	16.6.93	Preliminary MGP mission - June 1992; site removed following progress report submitted to COP5.
Iceland	31. Thjórsarver	4.7.90	16.6.93	Site removed following progress report submitted to COP5.
India	32. Chilka Lake	16.6.93		MGP was planned for November 1998 but did not take place.
India	33. Keoladeo National Park	4.7.90		MGP - February 1990, and a second was planned for November 1998 but did not take place
India	34. Loktak Lake	16.6.93		
Iran, Islamic Republic of	35. Alagol, Ulmagol & Ajgol Lakes	16.6.93		
Iran, Islamic Republic of	36. Anzali Mordab (Talab) complex	31.12.93		MGPs - January 1992 and May 1997 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Iran, Islamic Republic of	37. Hamoun-e-Puzak, South End	4.7.90		MGP - January 1992
Iran, Islamic Republic of	38. Hamun-e-Saberi & Hamun-e-Helmand	4.7.90		MGP - January 1992
Iran, Islamic Republic of	39. Neyriz Lakes & Kamjan Marshes	4.7.90		MGPs - January 1992 and April 1997 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Iran, Islamic Republic of	40. Shadegan Marshes & mudflats of Khor-al Amaya and Khor Musa	16.6.93		MGP - May 1997 (refer Annex 7 for details).

Iran, Islamic Republic of	41. Shurgol, Yadegarlu & Dorgeh Sangi Lakes	4.7.90		
Italy	42. Laguna di Orbetello	31.12.93		MGP - November 1998. Report submitted to the Italian Government in November 1998. (refer Annex 7 for details)
Italy	43. Palude della Diaccia Botrona	31.12.93		MGP - November 1998. Report submitted to the Italian Government in November 1998. (refer Annex 7 for details)
Italy	44. Stagno di Cagliari	4.7.90		No formal MGP. Bureau site visit in December 1996 and visit to the Administrative Authority in March 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Italy	45. Stagno di Molentargius	4.7.90		No formal MGP. Bureau site visit in December 1996 and visit to the Administrative Authority in March 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details).
Italy	46. Torre Guaceto	31.12.93		MGP - November 1998. Report submitted to the Italian Government in November 1998. (refer Annex 7 for details)
Jordan	47. Azraq Oasis	4.7.90		MGP - March 1990, Bureau visited again in February 1998
Mexico	48. Ría Lagartos	4.7.90	7.8.96	MGP - June 1989. Follow-up mission in September 1991
Netherlands	49. De Groote Peel	4.7.90	16.6.93	No MGP. Site removed at request of Dutch authorities, following submission of progress report.
Poland	50. Jezioro Siedmiu Wysp (Seven Islands)	4.7.90		MGP - July 1989. Follow-up mission in March 1994.
Poland	51. Slonsk Reserve	16.6.93		Polish authorities have advised MGP not required
Senegal	52. Djoudj	16.6.93		MGP - December 1988
Senegal	53. Bassin du Ndiel	4.7.90		MGP - December 1988
South Africa	54. Saint Lucia System	4.7.90	11.3.96	MGP - April - May 1992
South Africa	55. Blesbokspruit	6.5.96		
South Africa	56. Orange River Mouth	26.9.95		
Spain	57. Doñana	4.7.90		Coordination Commission of the State Administration and the Autonomous Administration of Andalucía established in April 1998
Spain	58. Las Tablas de Daimiel	4.7.90		MGP - March 1988. Commission established with Bureau participation.
Trinidad & Tobago	59. Nariva Swamp	16.6.93		MGP - May 1995, Report submitted February 1998 (refer Annex 7 for details)

Tunisia	60. Ichkeul	4.7.90		MGPs -April 1988 and December 1989. Joint mission with World Heritage Convention in February 1999 (refer Annex 7 for details)
Uganda	61. Lake George	4.7.90		MGP planned but had to be cancelled.
Ukraine	62. Karkinitzka & Dzharylgatska Bays	4.7.90		
Ukraine	63. Yagorlytska Bay	16.6.93		MGP - November 1990
Ukraine	64. Tendrivska Bay	16.6.93		MGP - November 1990
United Kingdom	65. Dee Estuary	4.7.90		Preparatory mission February 1993 MGP - November 1994
United Kingdom	66. Bridgend Flats, Islay	4.7.90	9.11.91	No MGP; site removed following report from CP that threat to the site had been avoided.
United States of America	67. Everglades	16.6.93		
Uruguay	68. Bañados del Este y Franja Costera	4.7.90		MGPs - October 1988 and May 1993
Venezuela	69. Cuare	16.6.93	7.8.96	No formal MGP
Former USSR	70. Issyk-kul Lake (Republic of Kyrgystan)	4.7.90 (exUSSR)		Kyrgyzstan has not yet become a Contracting Party as an independent State.
Former USSR	71. Kirov Bay (Republic of Azerbaijan)	4.7.90 (exUSSR)		Azerbaijan has not yet become a Contracting Party as an independent State.
Former USSR	72. Lakes of the lower Turgay & Irgiz (Republic of Kazakhstan)	16.3.93 (exUSSR)		Kazakhstan has not yet become a Contracting Party as an independent State.

Annex 7

Information provided in COP7 National Reports for sites on the Montreux Record

The numbers shown refer to those given in the table in Annex 6

Algeria

1. **Lac Oubeira.** On 31 December 1996 the Algerian Government requested that Lac Oubeira be taken off the Montreux Record. This was justified by the success of implementing the measures recommended by the Management Guidance Procedure (MGP) of 1990. These actions resulted in substantial regrowth of vegetation and the recovery of waterbird populations. The site was removed from the Montreux Record on 18 November 1997.
2. **Lac Tonga.** The Administrative Authority of Algeria requested a second MGP (the first was in 1990) on 31 December 1996. So far, it has not been possible to carry out this mission.

Austria

3. **Donau-March-Auen.** The COP7 National Report advised that for the 'Donau-Auen' part of the site, which was designated as a National Park in 1996, a management plan has been completed for implementation at the beginning of 1999. A 'Ramsar concept' has been developed for the second part of the site, the 'March-Thaya-Auen', and this concept has been integrated into two management projects for the area, financed by the European Union's LIFE programme. In spite of these positive developments, the COP7 National Report concludes that, "as long as the main threat of a Danube-Oder-Elbe shipping channel exists the site cannot be removed from the Montreux Record".

Belgium

4. **Schorren van de Beneden Schelde.** In 1987, the Belgian authorities informed the Ramsar Bureau that 28 hectares of the site had been deleted "in the urgent national interest" (Article 2.5) for construction of a container terminal. 2,200 ha of the Ijzerbroeken (a wet meadow site in another part of Belgium) was designated for the Ramsar List in compensation (Article 4.2). The Belgian authorities indicated in 1995 that a second container terminal was under construction adjacent to the Ramsar site boundary. It was expected that a change of water currents and sedimentation rates would have an effect on the ecological character of the site. Belgium's COP7 National Report concludes that "the ecological effects of the construction of two container terminals at the border of the Ramsar area are not clear yet, although major changes in bird populations did not occur on a short term. The construction of a third container terminal and a new tidal dock, in combination with a further deepening of the Zeeschelde estuary during the coming years, will however be responsible for an additional pressure on the ecological values of the estuary, including the 3 mudflat- and saltmarsh areas that form the Ramsar site". No advice is given on whether the site should be retained in the Montreux Record.

5. **De Ijzerbroeken te Diksmuide en Lo-Reninge.** Removed from the Montreux Record prior to COP6 (17 January 1994), following receipt of a report from the Belgian authorities on the positive management measures being implemented at the site.

Bolivia

6. **Laguna Colorada.** The Government of Bolivia included this site in the Montreux Record because of the potential threat posed by the proposed construction of a geothermal power station. This development was stopped and a management plan prepared for the site. At the Panamá Regional Meeting in 1995, Bolivia announced their intention to request that Laguna Colorada be removed from Montreux Record. This was formally requested at COP6 in Brisbane in 1996. The site was removed from the Montreux Record on 7 August 1996.

Bulgaria

7. **Durankulak Lake.** A representative of the Ramsar Bureau visited this site in May 1995. The COP7 National Report notes that a management plan has been developed for the site by the Government in conjunction with the NGO 'Le Balkan' and the Bulgarian-Swiss Biodiversity Conservation Programme.
8. **Lake Srébarna.** The ecological character of this site deteriorated as a result of its artificial isolation from the Danube floodwaters (prior to Ramsar designation). A Ramsar Monitoring Procedure (now renamed Management Guidance Procedure) Mission was carried out in April 1992 and, subsequently, significant progress was made with a restoration program using funding from the Government of Bulgaria and USAID. In May 1995, representatives of the Ramsar Bureau visited the site and observed a clear improvement in water supply. In October 1997, a Ramsar Small Grants Fund project for development of a management plan was approved by the Standing Committee. On 23 March 1998 the Ministry of Environment and Water and the Laboratory of General Ecology in Bulgaria entered into a contract for implementation of a management plan for the site. In the framework of a monitoring mission organised by the World Heritage Convention (the World Heritage Committee has included Srebarna on the list of World Heritage Sites in Danger), the Ramsar Bureau visited Lake Srebarna, in October 1998. Although a number of very positive management steps have been taken at the site, the National Report for COP7 notes that "several years will be needed to remove Srebarna from the Montreux Record".

Costa Rica

9. **Palo Verde.** The MGP for this site was carried out in March/April 1998 and submitted to the Government of Costa Rica for their consideration in December 1998. Approval to make its recommendations public was notified in the same month. The National Report for COP7 indicates the Government's optimism to obtain positive changes for the Palo Verde wetlands, especially as a result of regulating activities such as grazing and forest fires.

Croatia

10. **Kopacki Rit.** During the military conflicts in the region, following the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, there were reports of serious damage to the area through deforestation for firewood. It was also reported that there were plans for the construction of a road for military transport across the area. The area is now once again under the control of the Croatian authorities, and a management authority for “Kopacki Rit Nature Park” has been established. The GEF is providing funds for management plan implementation. A representative of the Bureau visited the site in September 1998 and suggested in a follow-up letter to the Administrative Authority that it might be appropriate to consider removal of the site from the Montreux Record in the near future. At the time of preparing this document, there has been no response from the Croatian authorities and a COP7 National Report has yet to be submitted.

Czech Republic

11. **Litovelské Pomoraví.** The site was added to the Montreux Record in 1997 at the request of the then Deputy Minister of Environment of the Czech Republic. A report attached to the Deputy Minister’s letter of February 1997 noted that “Litovelské Pomoraví is endangered by withdrawal of water for water supply systems; empirical information indicates that such withdrawal exceeds the recovery capacity of the natural ecosystem”. As a result of water pumping, groundwater levels have been lowered, and the Cerlinka river has dried up. A Ramsar Bureau visit was made to this site in August 1998 and discussions were held with the staff of the Protected Landscape Area. The Bureau was informed that the ecological character of the site remains under possible threat from water extraction and proposals to build “dry polders” for flood retention. Further discussions with the Czech Administrative Authority concluded that the site should remain on the Montreux Record.
12. **Novozámecký a Brehynský rybník (Novozámecký & Brehynský fishponds).** In March 1997, the Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic requested emergency assistance from the Ramsar Small Grants Fund to renovate the control structure for regulating the water level at Novozámecký fishpond. Because of the dangerous condition of the existing outlet structure, the water level had to be lowered, leading to drying out of the site. Restoration work began in August 1997 after receipt of financial support from the SGF and the Czech Environment Ministry. An official opening of the new outlet structure was held on 31 March 1998. It is now planned to develop a detailed management plan for the site, with the eventual aim of removing Novozámecký fishponds from the Montreux Record. However, at the time of a Bureau visit (August 1998) it was clear that, whilst the emergency situation had been solved successfully, there remained an evident problem of eutrophication. The Czech authorities recommend that the site should be retained in the Montreux Record, at least in the short term. Further measures are planned, and, if successful, the site should be removed from the Montreux Record within two years.
13. **Treboňské rybníky (Trebon fishponds).** A Montreux Record Questionnaire received from the Administration of Třebosko Protected Landscape Area (January 1998), referred to the decline of populations of some species of waterbirds caused by several factors such as high fish stocks and resulting food competition, eutrophication, destruction of littoral zones and

surrounding habitats. Several monitoring programmes and scientific research projects exist at the site. Measures are being implemented in an effort to overcome the problems mentioned above, but the Czech authorities have indicated it is too early to consider removing the site from the Montreux Record. The danger of irreversible ecological changes still exists at this site and its use for commercial fish-farming and hunting has not been solved yet.

Denmark

14. **Ringkøbing Fjord.** An MGP was carried out for this site in September 1996. The site was originally included in the Montreux Record because of serious declines in water quality and submerged vegetation. The MGP report made a series of recommendations, most of which have been implemented, or will be implemented in the near future (for further detail see COP7 National Report). Changes in the operation of the sluices linking the Fjord with the North Sea, together with a major restoration project for the delta of the Skjern river (which flows into the Fjord) and its catchment, are expected to enhance the ecological character of the Ramsar site. The National Report to COP7 concludes that, in the view of the Danish authorities, “sufficient information on the enhancement of the ecological character is available in order to have the site removed from the Montreux Record by the time for COP7”.

Egypt

15. **Lake Bardawil.** An MGP was conducted for this site in October 1991 and a second requested by the Government of Egypt in 1998. The Ramsar Bureau wrote to the Egyptian officials proposing a visit by the Secretary General for May 1998. In their National Report for COP7, Egypt indicates that they would like to remove this site and Lake Burullus (see below) from the Montreux Record but lack the national capacity and resources to address the underlying management problems. The National Report also expresses the hope that through the GEF-Medwet-UNDP-EEAA project *Conservation of Wetland and Coastal Ecosystems in the Mediterranean Region* there will be improvements in the management of both Montreux Record sites in Egypt.
16. **Lake Burullus.** See Lake Bardawil above. In addition, the COP7 National Report indicates that some steps have been taken toward removing this site from the Montreux Record, such as listing it as a Protected Area and developing projects to enhance the status and management of the site. The Government of Egypt advise that they would like to see the proposed MGPs for this and Lake Bardawil proceed.

Germany

17. **Unterer Niederrhein and**
18. **Ostfriesisches Wattenmeer & Dollart.** The COP7 National Report indicated concern that these sites remain in the Montreux Record in spite of several requests by the German Authorities for their removal. The Bureau suggested that, to clarify the situation, Montreux Record Questionnaires be completed for both sites, in line with COP6 Resolution VI.1. A completed Montreux Record Questionnaire was received for Unterer Niederrhein in January

1999, together with a further request to remove the site from the Montreux Record. In line with the procedure set out in Resolution VI.1, the Bureau has removed Unterer Niederrhein from the Montreux Record as of 8 January 1999. However, it is evident from the Montreux Record Questionnaire that the site continues to face multiple pressures, and the Bureau has therefore suggested that the German authorities should continue and enhance the conservation measures being taken at the site. In the case of Ostfriesisches Wattenmeer and Dollart, the National Report states that “The issues . . . have been resolved and an application has been made to have the site removed”. At the time of preparing this document, the Bureau is awaiting receipt of a completed Montreux Record Questionnaire.

Greece

19. **Amvrakikos gulf**
20. **Artificial Lake Kerkini**
21. **Axios, Loudias, Aliakmon delta**
22. **Evros delta**
23. **Kotychi Lagoons**
24. **Lake Mikri Prespa**
25. **Lake Vistonis, Porto Lagos, Lake Mitrikou & adjoining lagoons**
26. **Lakes Volvi & Koronia**
27. **Messolonghi lagoons**
28. **Nestos delta & adjoining lagoons.** Eleven Ramsar sites were designated by Greece at the time of ratification, but no maps were provided until 1987, when provisional maps were submitted. COP4 and COP5 adopted Recommendations calling for official boundary delineation of the 11 sites. With the agreement of the Greek Government, all 11 sites were included in the Montreux Record from its establishment in 1990. At the time of the Brisbane Conference, two sites (“Lake Vistonis & Porto Lagos lagoons” and “Lake Mitrikou & adjoining lagoons”) were combined, so the number of sites was reduced from 11 to 10.

In early 1998, the Greek authorities provided information on the preparation and application of management measures at each of the Ramsar sites, including management studies, information and administration infrastructure, restoration and monitoring. A “Programme for Resolving Environmental Problems” is being carried out in each site. Fully equipped Information Centres and Preliminary Management Schemes are being established in all sites.

In March 1998, a representative of the Ramsar Bureau visited Athens for discussions with the Administrative Authority. As a result, an independent Group of Experts was established to report jointly to the Greek Government and the Ramsar Bureau on which sites might be removed from the Montreux Record. A report on the conservation status of the 10 Greek Ramsar sites and the possible removal of some sites from the Montreux Record was submitted to the Ramsar Bureau as the present document was being finalised. The National Report for COP7 refers specifically to negative changes at Lake Koronia (part of ‘Lakes Volvi and Koronia’ Ramsar site), but notes that a number of positive measures for the conservation and wise use of the site have been undertaken.

Guatemala

29. **Laguna del Tigre.** The site was placed on the Montreux Record in 1993 because of problems caused by activities associated with the oil industry, agriculture and cattle grazing. An MGP was conducted in July/August 1997 and the final report submitted to the Government of Guatemala in February 1998. Approval to make its recommendations public was notified in September 1998. The COP7 National Report indicates that economic valuation techniques are to be applied and incorporated into the formulation of a management plan for the site.

Iceland

30. **Mývatn-Laxá.** Removed from the Montreux Record before COP6 (16 June 1993), following submission of progress reports to COP5.
31. **Thjórsarver .** Removed from the Montreux Record before COP6 (16 June 1993), following submission of progress reports to COP5.

India

The National Report for COP7 provides information on all three sites and reports that efforts are being undertaken to assess the status of these sites with a view to removing them from the Record.

32. **Chilka Lake.** The site was placed on the Record in 1993 because of problems caused by shrinkage, siltation and sedimentation, choking of the mouth, decrease in bird numbers and fishery potential, pollution and weed infestation. A management action plan is currently being implemented by the Chilka Lake Development Authority. Information gathered from a study of the flow and mixing pattern of water has been used to decide measures to restore the salinity regime of the lake and actions needed to de-silt the mouth. A comprehensive catchment area rehabilitation programme is being implemented to control the silt load in the lake. Other actions being taken include bird habitat restoration, establishment of a visitor centre, and the development of guidelines for ecotourism development in the lake area.
33. **Keoladeo National Park (KNP).** The Park was placed on the Montreux Record in 1990 because of management problems associated with water shortage and an unbalanced grazing regime. Management measures undertaken in recent years to address these problems include a water management regime and control of weeds and other aquatic vegetation. In addition, efforts have been undertaken to re-establish and protect the Siberian Crane population through a 1993 Memorandum of Understanding under the Bonn Convention among the five range states of the species. Local community participation in the management of the site is now ensured through their representation on the Keoladeo National Park Development Authority. The primary objective of the society is to develop an integrated land-use strategy for the overall development of the area, to be financed in part by revenue from ecotourism activities.

34. **Loktak Lake.** The site was placed on the Record in 1993 because of problems caused by deforestation in the catchment area, weed infestation and pollution. A Technical Advisory Committee has been set up and tasked to prepare a comprehensive management action plan. Measures taken so far include afforestation of indigenous species, control of silt, catchment area rehabilitation, and the mechanical removal of floating lands (called *phumdis*). Biological control methods have proved so successful in the control of water hyacinth infestation that they are currently being tested in other wetland areas. Focus has been given to generating public awareness about the values and functions of the wetland. A project on “Sustainable Development and Water Resources Management of Loktak Lake” is currently being undertaken to provide sound scientific basis for the management and sustainable development of the lake.

Iran, Islamic Republic of

In April 1997 an MGP mission was undertaken to the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Terms of Reference for the mission were expanded at the request of the government to include a review of the implementation of the Convention in the country. The main recommendations of the mission were that integrated management plans be developed for all Ramsar sites in the country, and that a National Ramsar/Wetland Committee be established to coordinate the development and implementation of such management plans. The National Report to COP7 makes reference to a study being undertaken in connection with the Montreux Record sites, but does not provide further details.

35. **Alagol, Ulmagol & Ajigol Lakes**
36. **Anzali Mordab (Talab) complex.** The main recommendation of the 1997 MGP mission was that an integrated management plan be formulated for the site which takes into account the requirements of all the users of the wetland and includes detailed zonation measures.
37. **Hamoun-e-Puzak, South End**
38. **Hamoun-e-Saberi and Hamoun-e-Helmand**
39. **Neyriz Lakes & Kamjan Marshes.** The 1997 MGP mission advised that an integrated management plan be developed for the site, including the possible restoration of Kamjan Marshes. The Department of Environment is encouraged to inform the Ramsar Bureau of any changes which may have taken place at the site since the 1992 MGP mission.
40. **Shadegan Marshes and Mudflats of Khor-al Amaya and Khor Musa.** The 1997 MGP mission encouraged the Department of Environment to provide the Ramsar Bureau with further information on the proposed drainage of a large area of the Ramsar site for agricultural development and further, recommended that an integrated management plan be developed for the whole site.
41. **Shurgol, Yadegarlu & Dorgeh Sangi Lakes**

Italy

42. **Laguna di Orbetello**
43. **Palude della Diaccia Botrona**
44. **Stagno di Cagliari**
45. **Stagno di Molentargius**
46. **Torre Guaceto.** In November 1998, a Ramsar MGP Mission visited three of the five Italian sites included in the Montreux Record, namely Laguna di Orbetello (Toscana), Palude della Diaccia Botrona (Toscana) and Torre Guaceto (Puglia). Montreux Record Questionnaires for the three sites had previously been submitted by the Italian authorities. The MGP report recommended that all three sites should be removed from the Montreux Record. For the latter two sites, removal from the Record was emphasized as being contingent on implementation and monitoring of planned conservation measures. The Italian Government has indicated that the remaining two sites (Stagno di Cagliari and Stagno di Molentargius, both in Sardegna) should remain on the Montreux Record.

Jordan

47. **Azraq Oasis.** The Azraq site was placed on the Montreux Record at the 4th COP meeting in Montreux, Switzerland (4 July 1990), largely as a result of unsustainable groundwater extraction from the site. The conclusion of the previous MGP report carried out in March 1990 by Bureau staff suggested that the environmental degradation of Azraq was a question of 'when' and not 'if' unless the concept of "safe yield" was not embraced by the managers and policy-makers responsible for Azraq. The Oasis remains a wetland of great ecological, economic, and social value, meeting several of the criteria established under the Ramsar Convention. Currently, there is an ongoing GEF-funded project which aims to rehabilitate the ecology and hydrology of the site as well as improve overall management. The Ramsar Bureau's Regional Coordinator for Asia visited the site and the project in February 1998 and reported that the first phase of the physical rehabilitation was almost complete and the next phase would involve addressing community development/social and economic concerns of the people living in the site vicinity. In the National Report submitted for COP7 Jordan reports positive changes in the ecological character of Azraq Oasis following actions taken to restore open water and marsh communities, redefine the water distribution system, and introduce wastewater recycling.

Mexico

48. **Río Lagartos.** An MGP was undertaken in June 1989, in order to assess the impact of Hurricane Gilbert, with a follow-up mission in September 1991. The ensuing report concluded that adverse impacts had been less serious than originally feared. The site was removed from the Montreux Record on August 1996. The COP7 National Report indicates that Río Lagartos has been twinned with Cuban wetlands as a result of training workshops for management and evaluation of ecosystems and biodiversity in the area.

Netherlands

49. **Dr Groote Peel.** Removed from the Montreux Record before COP6 (16 June 1993).

Poland

50. **Jezioro Siedmiu Wysp**
51. **Slonsk Reserve.** The Polish National Report to COP7 refers to positive developments at these sites, but does not make a recommendation about possible removal from the Montreux Record. At the time of preparing this document, the Bureau is clarifying the sites' status with the Polish authorities.

Senegal

52. **Djoudj.** The COP7 National Report indicates that effective monitoring has been done, and that hydrological features are being taken into account at subregional and national levels. Stakeholders were involved in the development of the delta environmental management plan. The implementation of a programme on "Management of Aquatic Vegetation in the Lower Senegal river" is also under way. As a result the Senegalese government intends to request the removal of this site from the Montreux Record. At the time of preparation of this document, a representative from the Bureau was in Senegal and no further information was available.
53. **Bassin du Ndiael.** The Senegalese COP7 National Report indicates that actions are being taken through a project for the restoration and rehabilitation of this Ramsar site.

South Africa

54. **Saint Lucia System.** Removed from the Montreux Record at COP6 (11 March 1996).
55. **Blesbokspruit.** The COP7 National Report indicates that the "primary cause of the degradation of the Ramsar site, Grootvlei mine, is continuing to discharge polluted water into the wetland. As a result, there has been no improvement in the ecological character of the site, and there is thus no reason to consider the removal of Blesbokspruit from the Montreux Record".
56. **Orange River Mouth.** The National Report for COP7 describes many efforts that are under way to rehabilitate and manage the Orange River Mouth wetland, including the pending proclamation of a protected area at the mouth. However, the Report indicates that "the current ecological character of the site motivates against its removal from the Montreux Record at this time."

Spain

57. **Doñana.** Doñana has been the focus of major long-term conservation efforts and the Spanish authorities invited the Ramsar Bureau and the Scientific and Technical Review Panel to review the status of the site in relation to the Montreux Record. In April 1998 there was an accidental spillage, upstream of the site, of millions of cubic metres of toxic mining waste. Since then the Ramsar Bureau has received a number of official reports from the Spanish authorities. The COP7 National Report summarises the direct and indirect ecological and socio-economic

effects of the spillage, which contaminated a large area with highly acidic waste rich in heavy metals. At the time of preparing this document, a supplement to the National Report, dealing specifically with Doñana, was expected. Other official reports submitted to the Ramsar Bureau note the establishment of a Coordination Commission of the State Administration (i.e. Central Government in Madrid), and the Autonomous Administration of Andalucía, in late April 1998. This Commission has provided the principal framework for the concerned authorities to address the clean-up and restoration work. These reports also refer to the project 'Doñana 2005' prepared by the Spanish Ministry of Environment, which encompasses "a series of strategic actions to restore the traditional hydraulic dynamics [of the site]", with an initial budget in excess of US\$ 100 million. The conservation status of Doñana was reviewed by the World Heritage Committee in December 1998, following a mission by the World Heritage Centre in November. The World Heritage Committee requested Spain to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to organize an international expert conference on a long-term vision for Doñana, and to prepare a financial plan and timetable for 'Doñana 2005'. The Committee also encouraged the Spanish authorities to proceed with great caution in re-opening the mine and to monitor long-term impacts.

58. **Las Tablas de Daimiel.** The National Report for COP7 provides extremely detailed information on the measures being taken to address long-term management problems at this site. These actions are related mainly to water quality and quantity. High rainfall since 1997 has improved the short-term hydrological and ecological situation, and steps are being taken to ensure adequate long-term improvements in the amounts, quality, and seasonal timing of water for the site. This requires restoration of the hydrological functioning of the upper Guadiana, notably the sustainable use of the 'Mancha Occidental' aquifer. To this end, an Expert Commission was established in 1998 by the Central Spanish Government and the Autonomous Government of Castilla-La Mancha. The Ramsar Bureau has been invited to participate in this Commission, which will report in 1999.

Trinidad and Tobago

59. **Nariva Swamp.** An MGP for this site was carried out in April/May 1995 and the report submitted to the Government in February 1996. The threats to this site come from illegal rice cultivation. These practices have resulted in water diversions and drying out of portions of the swamp. Serious fires have occurred in parts of the Ramsar site as a result. Emergency assistance was provided through the Small Grant Fund in 1998 to help address these management problems. No further information is provided in the National Report submitted for COP7.

Tunisia

60. **Ichkeul.** MGPs were carried out for this site in 1988 and 1989. In the framework of a monitoring mission organised by the World Heritage Convention, the Ramsar Bureau visited the site in February 1999. At the time of preparing this document it was not possible to include any details of the conclusions of this mission, as the report was being prepared.

Uganda

61. **Lake George.** The National Report for COP7 indicates that “execution of the MGP mission has been delayed due to insecurity in the region. It is hoped that this will be completed by mid-1999.”

Ukraine

62. **Karkinitzka Bay, 63. Yagorlytska Bay, 64. Tendrivska Bays.** The Bureau is clarifying with Ukraine the present status of the wetlands which were originally included in the Montreux Record as two Ramsar sites designated by the former USSR. Since joining the Convention as an Independent State, however, Ukraine has designated these wetlands as three sites. The COP7 National Report states that “their removing from the Montreux Record needs additional elaboration”.

United Kingdom

65. **Dee Estuary.** The UK National Report for COP7 reports on measures taken for the conservation of the Dee Estuary, which was the subject of a Management Guidance Procedure (then ‘Monitoring Procedure’) report in 1994/95. The Dee Estuary Strategy was launched in 1996 and aims to incorporate the concept of wise use of wetlands into planning policy and land use in the estuary. A number of mitigation measures, including provision and recreation of additional wetland areas, have been agreed in relation to developments on the Welsh shore of the site. In 1997, the UK Government reported on measures being taken in relation to MGP recommendations. A further review, led by the UK’s equivalent of a National Ramsar Committee, is being considered.
66. **Bridgend Flats, Islay.** Removed from the Montreux Record before COP6 (9 November 1991).

United States of America

67. **Everglades.** In their National Report the USA states that they have “*undertaken a massive restoration effort*” of this site. They advise that this restoration work, for an area 96 by 480 kilometres, is the largest of its kind in the USA. The Report further indicates that “*in partnership with the State of Florida and tribal and local governments, the Administration is working to improve water quality, restore natural hydro patterns, and reduce the loss of water for the watershed to meet the needs of the environment and economy.*” No indication is given by the USA of the likely timeframe for removing the Everglades from the Montreux Record.

Uruguay

68. **Bañados del Este y Franja Costera.** This site was included in the Montreux Record at COP4 (Montreux, Switzerland 1990) following concerns over the impact of conversion of wetlands for intensive agricultural use. A first Bureau visit to the site was made in 1988 with a further mission carried out in April 1993. The report was finalized in May 1994 and subsequently approved by the government of Uruguay in October of that year. A variety of

actions have apparently been taken but no details are given in the National Report. There are no indications given in the COP7 National Report of when this site may be considered for removal from the Montreux Record.

Venezuela

69. **Cuare.** The government of Venezuela requested that this site be removed from the Montreux Record in an official letter of 19 May 1995 and in its National Report submitted for COP6 in 1996 . The site was removed from the Montreux Record on 7 August 1996.

Former USSSR sites

70. **Issyk-kul Lake (Republic of Kyrgyzstan)**
71. **Kirov Bay (Republic of Azerbaijan)**
72. **Lakes of the lower Turgay and Irgiz (Republic of Kazakhstan).** There is no recent information on the status of these sites within the former USSR.

Annex 8

Actions taken pursuant to Recommendation 6.17 - *Ramsar sites in the territories of specific Contracting Parties*

Recommendation 6.17

1. **Operative paragraph 5 - Germany - Ostfriesisches Wattenmeer mit Dollart site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
2. **Operative paragraph 6 - Netherlands - Wadden Sea.** Recommendation 6.17 welcomed the response of the Dutch Government to concerns expressed in Recommendation 5.1 over gas exploration in the Wadden Sea, and noted that a letter, describing in detail measures to safeguard the area had been transmitted to the Bureau in 1995. No additional information on the specific issue of gas exploration is contained in the COP7 National Report
3. **Operative paragraph 7 - Venezuela - Cuare site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
4. **Operative paragraph 8 - Poland - Middle Vistula area.** Recommendation 6.17 acknowledged the efforts made by the Polish authorities to designate protected areas in the Middle Vistula and expressed the hope that the area would be designated as a Ramsar site. The National Report to COP7 refers to the recently published ‘Strategy of Wetland Protection in Poland’ which includes the Middle Vistula River Valley amongst wetlands “at the top of the list of the Ramsar Convention”. However, the National Report does not include specific information about progress towards designation of the Middle Vistula.
5. **Operative paragraph 9 - Russian Federation - management plans for Ramsar sites.** Recommendation 6.17 congratulated the Government of the Russian Federation on the designation of 32 Ramsar sites and recommended the development and implementation of management plans for each site. The National Report for COP7 states: “Protection and management of the Ramsar sites is conducted in accordance with individual regulations . . . developed for each site . . . approved by the State Committee on Environmental Protection and adopted by the relevant regional authorities. The regulations determine the regime of protection and resource use within each site”. The report goes on to note that “the formal management plans are a new thing for Russia. In 1998, a project on the development of two management plans, on the Volga Delta and on the two Ramsar sites in the Kuban Delta, has been started, with support from the Ramsar Small Grants Fund”.
6. **Operative paragraph 10 - South Africa - Saint Lucia site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
7. **Operative paragraph 11 - Trinidad and Tobago - Nariva Swamp site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.

8. **Operative paragraph 12 - Vietnam - Mekong Delta and the Red River Estuary.**
Recommendation 6.17 reiterated the call for the Government of Vietnam to designate at least one Ramsar site from within the Mekong Delta and to complete the necessary arrangements for inclusion of the Tien Hai part of the Red River Estuary in the Ramsar List. The National Report from Vietnam makes no specific reference to these issues.
9. **Operative paragraph 13 - Hungary - Tata Öreg-tó and Lake Balaton sites.**
Recommendation 6.17 urged the Hungarian authorities to complete the process for year-round Ramsar designation of Tata Öreg-tó and Lake Balaton as soon as possible (at the time of COP6, the designation of both sites applied only from 1 October to 30 April, annually). Year-round designation for Tata Öreg-tó was announced in April 1997, at the time of the designation of six new Ramsar sites. The National Report to COP7 notes: “although at the Lake Balaton there are a great number of tourism and economic interests, discussions are still going on for achieving the Ramsar status on a year-round basis”.
10. **Operative paragraph 14 - Contracting Parties which indicated during COP6 that they would be designating new Ramsar sites.** The details of these are provided in the respective regional overviews, Ramsar COP7 DOCS. 6-12 inclusive.
11. **Operative paragraph 15 - Chile - Carlos Andwandter site.** Recommendation 6.17 noted the potential for change in the ecological character at the Carlos Andwandter Ramsar site and urged that appropriate actions be taken. The Chilean National Report for COP7 indicated that a student from Austral University developed and proposed management guidelines for the site which are being considered by the National Forestry Corporation.
12. **Operative paragraph 16a - Costa Rica - Palo Verde site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
13. **Operative paragraph 16b - Guatemala - Laguna del Tigre site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
14. **Operative paragraph 17 - South Africa - Langebaan site.** Recommendation 6.17 called on the Government of South Africa to monitor the effects of a steel mill to be constructed near the Langebaan site. The Administrative Authority have indicated: “One of the conditions set by the Western Cape Government for the approval of the Saldana Steel Plant (in the area adjoining the Langebaan Ramsar site) was the establishment of an Environmental Monitoring Committee. This was duly appointed by the provincial Minister of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism prior to any construction activities commencing, and to monitor whether Saldana Steel complied with the conditions set in the rezoning approval. The committee included representatives of the national Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, SA National Parks, and Cape Nature Conservation.”
15. The South African Authority continued: “This committee has met some 16 times since its inception in 1996, and an audit has shown that Saldana Steel has met 28 of the 30 environmental management proposals set by the committee. On the question of groundwater, Saldana Steel has sunk additional boreholes to ensure effective monitoring might be done.

During the operational phase the steel plant will initially be monitored by the EMC, but when the company gets ISO 14001 accreditation (target date end of 1999), the plant will also be monitored by representatives of the International Standards Organization.”

16. **Operative paragraph 18 - Bolivia - Laguna Colorada site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
17. **Operative paragraph 19 - Mexico - Ria Lagartos site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
18. **Operative paragraph 20 - Bolivia and Peru - Lake Titicaca.** The Bolivian and Peruvian governments were called upon to consider the possible designation of Lake Titicaca as a transfrontier Ramsar site. The Peruvian part was designated in January 1997 and the Bolivian part in August 1998. The National Report of Peru advises that bilateral meetings were held to progress the designations, that economic valuation studies have been done for the Lake, and that a management plan is in place and being executed.
19. **Operative paragraph 21 - Austria, Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic - Danube-Elbe-Oder canal.** Recommendation 6.17 called on the Governments of these three States, “in their deliberations on the possible construction of a Danube-Elbe-Oder canal, to give full consideration to the fact that such a canal would cause serious adverse changes to the ecological character of five Ramsar sites”. This issue is not mentioned in either the Czech or Slovak National Reports to COP7. However, it was raised as a factor of continuing concern during a Bureau visit to Czech Ramsar sites in August 1998. Austria’s COP7 National Report mentions this issue in relation to the Montreux Record site Donau-March Auen and states: “As long as the main threat of a Danube-Oder-Elbe shipping channel exists the site cannot be removed from the Montreux Record”.
20. **Operative paragraph 22 - Bangladesh - Sundarbans.** Recommendation 6.17 called on the Government of Bangladesh to adopt mitigation measures to address the impacts of reduced freshwater flow through the Sundarbans. The National Report for COP7 advises that reduced freshwater flow during the dry months of the year continues to have a negative effect on the ecology of the Sundarbans. No specific actions are reported to have been taken in response to this.
21. **Operative paragraph 23 - France, Germany - Rhine transborder site.** Recommendation 6.17 welcomed the proposed new Ramsar site along the upper reaches of the Rhine river, to be designated simultaneously on their respective banks by the French and German authorities. The COP7 National Reports of both France and Germany indicate that progress has been made, and that preparations for designation have reached an advanced stage.
22. **Operative paragraph 24 - USA - Everglades site.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
23. **Recommendation 6.17.1 Greece - all Ramsar sites.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.

24. **Recommendation 6.17.2 - Peru - National Reserve of Paracas.** Recommendation 6.17.2 welcomed the adoption of a master plan for the National Reserve of Paracas and encouraged public and private institutions involved in similar activities in Peru to implement management plans for Ramsar sites and wetlands generally. The National Report of Peru indicates that some economic valuation activities have been undertaken for the Paracas Reserve. Peru also advises that of their seven Ramsar sites management plans are in place and being implemented for four sites and plans are being prepared for the other three.
25. **Recommendation 6.17.3 - Jordan - Azraq Oasis.** Refer to Annexes 6 and 7 - Montreux Record sites and Management Guidance Procedures.
26. **Recommendation 6.17.4 - Australian Ramsar sites.** Recommendation 6.17.4 called on the Australian Government to take a range of actions relating to the allocation of water to inland Ramsar sites, address threats to wetlands from rising groundwater, institute screening procedures for proposed introductions of exotic species into the country, consider the inclusion of sites in the Montreux Record, and consider the designation of peatland sites. On the issue of environmental flows referred to in this Recommendation, Australia's National Report states that: "The Commonwealth is committed to the conservation and protection of inland waterways, aquatic ecosystems, wetlands and water supplies. At the National level, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) has agreed to a range of reforms designed to arrest the widespread degradation of Australia's water resources which are to be fully implemented by 2001 and which are tied to the National Competition Policy Agreement. . . . Critical environmental water issues identified in the Water Reform Framework include: the establishment of environmental flow requirements; strategies for reducing withdrawals in over allocated systems; support for integrated catchment management approaches; sustainability of new water resource developments; improvement in approaches to town water and sewage disposal to sensitive environments; and investigation of the ramifications of greater reuse of wastewater and stormwater."
27. More specifically, the Report advises that for the Macquarie Marshes Ramsar site, "the Macquarie Marshes Water Management Plan (1996) has since been adopted and, together with river flow rules adopted in 1998 on all regulated river systems in NSW, should ensure better provision of water for the maintenance of associated wetlands systems."
28. In terms of peatlands in Australia, the National Report notes that "in support of peat conservation, *The Wetlands Policy of the Commonwealth Government of Australia* directs Commonwealth agencies to consider alternatives to peat harvesting and to "*determine the impacts of the peat harvesting industry in Australia and recommend appropriate steps . . . such as the use of artificial plant propagation media in all Commonwealth-run and funded activities and projects*". Environment Australia sponsored the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service to prepare a document entitled *Sphagnum Moss - Sustainable Use and Management* which provides background information on *Sphagnum* populations in Australia and includes a code of practice for its sustainable harvesting. A National Reserve System Program project, funded under the Natural Heritage Trust, is reviewing the conservation and reservation status of sphagnum peatlands in south-

eastern Australia.” The Australian Report also provides advice on actions being taken with respect to listing peatland sites under the Convention.

29. **6.17.5 - The Lower Danube Basin.** Recommendation 6.17.5 called upon the Contracting Parties concerned to maintain contact with the proposed Danube Basin Ecological Convention. It also reinforced the request of the Conference of Parties for the Ukrainian authorities to continue working closely with the Romanian Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority to avoid potential threats to the complete Danube Delta. The International Convention for the Protection of the Danube River entered into force in 1998, but proposals for an Ecological Convention have not come to fruition. Since COP6, Ukraine has designated a 32,800-hectare Ramsar site in the Ukrainian portion of the Danube Delta. A Biosphere Reserve has been established, and there are close and frequent contacts between the Romanian and Ukrainian Biosphere Reserve management bodies. Negotiations on the idea of establishing a ‘Lower Danube Green Corridor’, including a series of protected areas and priority wetland restoration sites along the stretch of the Danube shared by Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine, have begun at the initiative of the Romanian Ministry of Environment, with support from WWF International.

Annex 9

Question 5 2 of the National Report format - references and summary information for instances where Contracting Parties advised that there “*Has been change in the ecological character at any Ramsar site or this is likely to occur in the near future*”

NOTE - for information relating to sites included in the Montreux Record refer to Annexes 6 and 7

Contracting Party	Site name	Main cause of change in ecological character	Actions taken
Albania	Karavasta Lagoon	Illegal construction activities and uncontrolled fishing	A management plan will be implemented
Argentina	Laguna Blanca	Introduction of exotic fish species	No information provided
	Bahía Samborombón	Unsustainable harvesting of shells, upstream pollution and water deviation	No information provided
	Laguna Llanquanelo	Decrease in water quality and quantity due to water deviation and dam construction	No information provided
	Atlantic Coast of Tierra del Fuego	Port and viaduct construction, extraction of sand for construction materials and oil industry activities	No information provided
Australia	Pittwater-Orielton Lagoon	Possible threat from water abstraction and consequent irrigation	Management Plan being prepared
	Little Waterhouse Lake	Spread of invasive plant species (<i>Typha</i> and <i>Salix</i> spp)	Management Plan being prepared
	Interlaken Lakeside Reserve	Impacts from European carp - and introduced species	Manipulation of water levels in Lake Crescent and adjoining Lake Sorrell
	Macquarie Marshes	Changes associated primarily with changes in water availability	Preparation and implementation of a water management plan
	Towra Point Nature Reserve	Erosion and instability due to altered wave patterns within Botany Bay, invasive species, recreational users	A community-initiated stabilisation programme to control the erosion, and preparation of a revised Management Plan
	Eighty mile Beach	Cattle grazing near springs	Fencing to exclude cattle
	Peel-Yalgurup system	Eutrophication due to input of agro-chemicals	Actions to reduce input of agro-chemicals and the construction of a “flushing” channel to the open sea

	Lake Toolibin	Salinity and water logging in the catchment	Recovery Plan for species diversity and vegetative cover plus a State-wide Salinity Action Plan
	Ten sites in the state of Victoria	Refer to Annex 4 of the Australian National Report as available on the Ramsar Convention's web site	Management plans being prepared for each site
Bangladesh	The Sundarbans	Reduced freshwater flow in dry months causing drying out of mangrove species and increased salinity	No information provided
Belgium	Vlaamse Banken	Illegal sport fishing and recreation impacts	Mitigation of fishing impacts
	De Ijzerbroeken te Diksmuide en Lo-Reninge	Low water level maintained artificially for agriculture (pump and sluice system modernised after 1993/95 flooding, allowing faster evacuation of surface water), agricultural pollution	Progress in waste water treatment
	Zwin	Silting up of mudflats	Investigation under way
Bolivia	Laguna Colorada	Construction of geothermal heating plant	No information provided
	Lago Titicaca	Organic pollution and modification of the hydrological balance caused by use of tributaries	No information provided
Botswana	Okavango Delta System	Fluctuations in flooding patterns	Formulation of a Management Plan which will include integrated catchment management
Brasil	Mato Grosso Pantanal	May be impacted from changes in the maximum flow of water and the alterations to water flows	No information provided
	Ilha do Bananal (National Park of Araguaia)	Large extensions of illegally occupied areas for bovine herd raising, fires during the dry season produce changes in vegetation, rice cultivation uses large amounts of water for irrigation	No information provided
Canada	Queen Maud Gulf and McConnell River Migratory Bird Sanctuary	Impacted by overgrazing from migratory geese	Extent of impact being surveyed, habitat recovery strategies and species control plans under consideration
	Creston Valley Wildlife Management Area	May be impacted by irregular water flows possibly caused by new seasonal water flows from Libby dam in the USA	No information provided

Chile	El Yali	Unsustainable extraction of groundwater, increment of residential uses around the area and unsustainable uses such as unauthorised water sports, alteration of hydrological regimen due to water deviation and dam and other constructions	Made a Protected Area in 1996
Comoros	Lac Dziani Boudouni	Deforestation around the lake	Formulation of a management plan is under way
Czech Republic	Sumavská raseliniste	Major damage by large bark beetle in forested areas of wetland complex	No information provided
Democratic Republic of Congo	Parc National des Mangroves	Human activities such as deforestation	Legislative amendments, institutional reforms, pollution control, private sector involvement and economic valuation
Germany	Hamburgisches Wattenmeer and Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer (2 sites)	Eutrophication, pollution from rivers, recreation, military aviation, oil pollution and transport developments	Pollution abatement, reduced fishing impact and complete suspension of hunting
	Niederelbe, Barnkrug-Otterndorf	Pollution from the Elbe, agricultural intensification, dike construction	Reduced recreational activities, improved water management, pollution abatement and agricultural extensification
	Dümmer	Eutrophication, agricultural intensification, hunting, fishing, recreation, military aviation	Reduced nutrient input and recreational disturbances, termination of intensive agricultural practice in some parts
	Diepholzer Moorniederung	Agricultural intensification, recreation, transport, military aviation, peat extraction, engineering works for water management	Reduced peat extraction, termination of intensive agricultural practice, implementation of water maintenance measures
	Steinhuder Meer	Eutrophication, agricultural intensification, engineering works for water management, peat extraction	Reduced nutrient input; agricultural extensification
	Unterer Inn	Angling, hunting and illegal constructions	Termination of hunting, restrictions to angling and recreational activities, preservation of riparian woodland
	Ismaninger Speichersee & Fischteichhen	Transport development	Improved water quality
	Starnberger See	Recreation, hunting and angling	Restricted water sport and angling

	Ostseeboddengewässer Westrügen-Hiddensee- Zingst	Eutrophication, agricultural intensification, recreation and military aviation	Agricultural extensification, reduced eutrophication, termination of angling and water sports, restricting fishing and hunting
	Krakower Obersee	Eutrophication and intensive fishing	Reduced eutrophication, restricted fishing
	Unteres Odertal, Schwedt	Ecotoxic compounds and planned road construction	Reduced eutrophication, agricultural extensification, termination of water bird hunting, and restricted recreational activities
	Niederung der Untere Havel/Gölper See	Eutrophication, agricultural intensification and drainage	Improved water quality, decline in drainage and agricultural extensification
	Helmestausee Berga- Kelbra	Eutrophication, recreation and hunting	Improved water quality, extensification of fish farming and mitigated eutrophication
	Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg	Salinisation, agricultural intensification, military aviation, fishing and recreational activities	Improved water quality, restriction of angling and hunting, and decrease in salinisation
Guinea	Iles Tristao	Coastal erosion	Formulation of a joint project with Guinea Bissau, consultations for a common approach to a management plan on shared catchment with Guinea Bissau
Honduras	Parque Nacional Jannete Kawas	Changes in land use practices	Definition of land mixed tenure and registrations is ongoing to clarify management responsibilities
Hungary	Béda-Karapanca	Drainage, eutrophication and vegetation succession	No information provided
	Gemenc	Drainage and vegetation succession	No information provided
	Pacsmag Fishponds	Vegetation succession	No information provided
	Szaporca	Vegetation succession and sedimentation	No information provided
	Kis-Balaton	Water quantity and quality problems	Monitoring
Ireland	Clara Bog	Drainage and peat cutting	Drains have been blocked to maintain water levels in protected parts of the site
	Mongan Bog	Drainage and peat cutting	As above
	Raheenmore Bog	Impact of deep drainage in surrounding areas	

	Lough Barra	Overgrazing	This issue will be addressed in the framework of designation and management of the site under the EU Habitats Directive
	Owenduff catchment	Overgrazing	As above
	Easky Bog	Overgrazing	As above
	Lough Derravaragh	Eutrophication	This issue is being addressed within the framework of a major catchment management plan
	Lough Ennell	Eutrophication	As above
	Lough Oughter	Eutrophication	No information provided
	Pollardstown Fen	Proposed road construction would lower water table	Ongoing discussions and research
	Rogerstown Estuary	Impact of landfill leachate	Ongoing monitoring
Japan	Biwa-ko	Increase in number of large fish-eating birds, decrease in the number of small fish-eating birds	No information provided
	Izu-numa and Uchi-numa	Water contamination from waste, decrease in floating and submerged plants due to flood damage, changes in the numbers of some species of waterbirds	Conservation plan, sewage treatment, re-planting of algae and willow trees, treatment and re-use of river water
	Katano-kamoike	Decrease in extent of rice paddies and increasing use of dry farmland area Decline in the number of migratory birds Spread of reeds and accumulation of plant residue	Construction of water channels and collection pools, surveys and rice paddy restoration
	Kushiro-shitsugen	Expansion of the alder forest	Monitoring and rehabilitation of wetland area
	Sakata	Reduction in plant diversity, and increase in floating plants Increase in number of migrating geese and ducks Possible change in water quality from pollution	Surveys and environmental protection plan
	Utonai-ko	Reduction in open water area and decrease in water depth Increased dissolved nitrogen Migration of racoons into the area	Impact assessment of racoon migration
	Yatsu-Higata	Increased sedimentation and salinity Proliferation of surface algae	Impact assessment and monitoring
Lithuania	Zuvintas	Vegetation succession	No information provided
Malta	Is-Simar	Vegetation succession	Physical control

Mexico	All sites	National Report advises there have been changes to the ecological character due to unsustainable human uses No details given	No information provided
Mongolia	Valley of Lakes (Boon Tsagaan Nuur, Taatsiin, Tsagaan Nuur, Adgiin Tsagaan Nuur, Orog Nuur)	Drying up of lakes	Not defined, but situation has reportedly improved
New Zealand	Waituna Lagoon and Whangamarino Wetland	Some changes to the vegetation around the sites	No information provided
	Firth of Thames	Some mangrove loss	No information provided
Nicaragua	Los Guatuzos	Agricultural fires in dry season and expansion of agricultural frontier	No information provided
Pakistan	“most of the Ramsar sites”	Eutrophication and siltation	No information provided
Poland	Jezioro Karas	Vegetation succession	Monitoring
	Jezioro Luknajno	Vegetation succession	Monitoring
	Jezioro Swidwie	Eutrophication	Monitoring
	Slonsk Reserve	Vegetation succession	Monitoring
Portugal	Paúl de Boquilobo	Vegetation succession	No information provided
Peru	Pantanos de Villa	Desiccation, water pollution from mining, agriculture and urban wastes	No information provided
	Manglores de Tumbes	Sedimentation and deforestation	No information provided
	Lago iticaca	Water pollution from mining, agriculture and urban wastes	No information provided
	Lago Junín	Sedimentation, water pollution from mining, agriculture and urban wastes	No information provided
	Pacaya Samiria	Deforestation, introduction of exotic species and hydroelectric activities	No information provided
Sri Lanka	Bundala	Increased drainage from upstream irrigation scheme Increased freshwater causing alteration in bird habitat	Management plan and mitigation measures proposed
The Gambia	Baobolon Wetland Reserve	Human activities such as rice and horticultural cultivation	Ecological assessment of existing and potential Ramsar sites, EIA legislation and elaboration of management plan

Togo	Parc National de la Keran	Human activities such as cultivation	Formulation of a management plan, education and public awareness
United Kingdom	Esthwaite Water	Eutrophication and domestic pollution	Controlled phosphate level and monitoring
	Exe Estuary	Recreational disturbance	Consultation with parties concerned to secure an agreed management plan
	Hamford Water	Coastal erosion	Small experimental saltmarsh creation project, dredged material has been placed to dissipate wave energy
	Llyn Idwal	Overgrazing	Agreement to remove grazing from the site for an initial 10 year period
	Loch Ken and River Dee marshes	Pollution from forestry, agriculture, fish farm and sewage discharges	Adoption of the Forest and Water Guidelines, promoting environmentally friendly farming, monitoring; agreement to control water levels
	Loch Leven	Vegetation succession, eutrophication, erosion and recreation	Scrub cutting, eutrophication is being addressed, preventing further erosion by a gabion reef, monitoring invasive aquatic plants and controlled recreational activities
	Silver Flowe	Habitat burning (fire in 1994) and industrial waste	Monitoring and decrease in sulfur emissions
	Lochs Druidibeg, a 'Machair & Silligarry	Drainage, erosion, overgrazing by rabbits, sheep, red deer, introduction of ferrets and hedgehog	Agreements to cultivate a minimum 15% of machair; management scheme to address overgrazing
	Midland Meres and Mosses Phase1	Eutrophication, agricultural intensification, agricultural and domestic pollution	Closed sewage treatment works, inflows from septic tanks have been intercepted, silt traps have been installed
	Ouse Washes	Vegetation succession (prolonged summer flooding), drainage, eutrophication, water abstraction	Management Strategy and construction of a sluice to alleviate flooding problems
Redgrave and South Lopham Fens	Ground water extraction, abandonment of traditional agriculture and agricultural pollution	Restoration of the hydrology, scrub cleared, flood banks built to prevent flooding, grazing reintroduced, a sluice refurbished to provide improved water control	

Venezuela	Archipelago Los Roques	Fishing rates reduction	Prohibit the use of certain types of fishing nets
Yugoslavia	Skadarsko Jezero	Eutrophication	Monitoring