

Ramsar National Report to COP13

COP13 National Report

Background information

1. The COP13 National Report Format (NRF) has been approved by the Standing Committee 52 for the Ramsar Convention's Contracting Parties to complete as their national reporting to the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties of the Convention (United Arab Emirates, 2018).
2. The Standing Committee through Decision SC52-07 has also agreed that an online National Reporting format could be made available to Parties by keeping the off-line system and requested the Secretariat to present an evaluation for the next COP regarding the use of the on-line system.
3. The National Report Format is being issued by the Secretariat in 2016 to facilitate Contracting Parties' implementation planning and preparations for completing the Report. The deadline for submission of national targets is by 30 November 2016 and the deadline for submission of completed National Reports is January 21st 2018.
4. Following Standing Committee discussions, this COP13 NRF closely follows that of the NRF used for COP12, to permit continuity of reporting and analysis of implementation progress by ensuring that indicator questions are as far as possible consistent with previous NRFs (and especially the COP12 NRF). It is also structured in terms of the Goals and Strategies of the 2016-2024 Ramsar Strategic Plan adopted at COP12 as Resolution XII.2.
5. This COP13 NRF includes 92 indicator questions. In addition, Section 4 is provided as an optional Annex in order to facilitate the task of preparing the Party's National Targets and Actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024 according to Resolution XII.2.
6. As was the case for previous NRF, the COP13 Format includes an optional section (Section 5) to permit a Contracting Party to provide additional information, on indicators relevant to each individual Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar Site) within its territory.
7. Note that, for the purposes of this national reporting to the Ramsar Convention, the scope of the term "wetland" is that of the Convention text, i.e. all inland wetlands (including lakes and rivers), all nearshore coastal wetlands (including tidal marshes, mangroves and coral reefs) and human-made wetlands (e.g. rice paddy and reservoirs), even if a national definition of "wetland" may differ from that adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention.

The purposes and uses of national reporting to the Conference of the Contracting Parties

8. National Reports from Contracting Parties are official documents of the Convention and are made publicly available on the Convention's website.
9. There are seven main purposes for the Convention's National Reports. These are to:
 - i) provide data and information on how, and to what extent, the Convention is being implemented
 - ii) provide tools for countries for their national planning
 - iii) capture lessons and experience to help Parties plan future action;
 - iv) identify emerging issues and implementation challenges faced by Parties that may require further attention from the Conference of the Parties;
 - v) provide a means for Parties to account for their commitments under the Convention;
 - vi) provide each Party with a tool to help it assess and monitor its progress in implementing the Convention, and to plan its future priorities; and
 - vii) provide an opportunity for Parties to draw attention to their achievements during the triennium.
10. The data and information provided by Parties in their National Reports have another valuable purpose as well, since a number of the indicators in the National Reports on Parties' implementation provide key sources of information for the analysis and assessment of the "ecological outcome-oriented indicators of

effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention”.

11. To facilitate the analysis and subsequent use of the data and information provided by Contracting Parties in their National Reports, the Ramsar Secretariat holds in a database all the information it has received and verified. The COP13 reports will be in an online National Reporting system.

12. The Convention’s National Reports are used in a number of ways. These include:

- i) providing an opportunity to compile and analyze information that contracting parties can use to inform their national planning and programming.
- ii) providing the basis for reporting by the Secretariat to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the global, national and regional implementation, and the progress in implementation, of the Convention. This is provided to Parties at the COP as a series of Information Papers, including:
 - * the Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Convention at the global level;
 - * the Report of the Secretary General pursuant to Article 8.2 (b), (c), and (d) concerning the List of Wetlands of International Importance); and
 - * the reports providing regional overviews of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in each Ramsar region;
- iii) providing information on specific implementation issues in support of the provision of advice and decisions by Parties at the COP.
- iv) providing the source data for time-series assessments of progress on specific aspects in the implementation of the Convention included in other Convention products. An example is the summary of progress since COP3 (Regina, 1997) in the development of National Wetland Policies, included as Table 1 in Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 2 (4th edition, 2010); and
- v) providing information for reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on the national implementation of the CBD/Ramsar Joint Work Plan and the Ramsar Convention’s lead implementation role on wetlands for the CBD. In particular, the Ramsar Secretariat and STRP used the COP10 NRF indicators extensively in 2009 to prepare contributions to the in-depth review of the CBD programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems for consideration by CBD SBSTTA14 and COP10 during 2010 (see UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/3). Similar use of COP12 NRF indicators is anticipated for the CBD’s next such in-depth review.

The structure of the COP13 National Report Format

Section 1 provides the institutional information about the Administrative Authority and National Focal Points for the national implementation of the Convention.

Section 2 is a ‘free-text’ section in which the Party is invited to provide a summary of various aspects of national implementation progress and recommendations for the future.

Section 3 provides the 92 implementation indicator questions, grouped under each Convention implementation Goals and Targets in the Strategic Plan 2016-2024, and with an optional ‘free-text’ section under each indicator question in which the Contracting Party may, if it wishes, add further information on national implementation of that activity.

Section 4 is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that has developed national targets to provide information on the targets and actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024.

In line with Resolution XII.2, which encourages Contracting Parties “to develop and submit to the Secretariat on or before December 2016, and according to their national priorities, capabilities and resources, their own quantifiable and time-bound national and regional targets in line with the targets set in the Strategic Plan”, all Parties are encouraged to consider using this comprehensive national planning tool as soon as possible, in order to identify the areas of highest priority for action and the relevant national targets and actions for each target.

The planning of national targets offers, for each of them, the possibility of indicating the national priority for that area of activity as well as the level of resourcing available, or that could be made available during the triennium, for its implementation. In addition, there are specific boxes to indicate the National Targets for implementation by 2018 and the planned national activities that are designed to deliver these targets. Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024 shows the synergies between CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Ramsar Targets. Therefore, the NRF provide an opportunity that Contracting Parties indicate as appropriate how the actions they undertake for the implementation of the Ramsar Convention contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets according to paragraph 51 of Resolution XII.3.

Section 5 is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that so wishes to provide additional information regarding any or all of its Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites).

General guidance for completing and submitting the COP13 National Report Format

All Sections of the COP13 NRF should be completed in one of the Convention's official languages (English, French, Spanish).

The deadline for submission of the completed NRF is January 21st **2018**. It will not be possible to include information from National Reports received after that date in the analysis and reporting on Convention implementation to COP13.

The deadline for submission of national targets is by 30 November 2016

To help Contracting Parties refer to relevant information they provided in their National Report to COP12, for each appropriate indicator a cross-reference is provided to the equivalent indicator(s) in the COP12 NRF or previous NRF, shown thus: {x.x.x}

For follow up and where appropriate, a cross-reference is also provided to the relevant Key Result Area (KRA) relating to Contracting Parties implementation in the Strategic Plan 2009-2015.

Only Strategic Plan 2016-2024 Targets for which there are implementation actions for Contracting Parties are included in this reporting format; those targets of the Strategic Plan that do not refer directly to Parties are omitted (e.g. targets 6 and 14).

For each indicator question you can choose only one answer. If you wish to provide further information or clarification, do so in the additional information box below the relevant indicator question. Please be as concise as possible (**maximum of 500 words** in each free-text box).

The NRF should ideally be completed by the principal compiler in consultation with relevant colleagues in their agency and others within the government and, as appropriate, with NGOs and other stakeholders who might have fuller knowledge of aspects of the Party's overall implementation of the Convention. The principal compiler can save the document at any point and return to it later to continue or to amend answers. Compilers should refer back to the National Report submitted for COP12 to ensure the continuity and consistency of information provided.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact the Ramsar Secretariat for advice (nationalreports@ramsar.org).

Section 1: Institutional Information

Important note: the responses below will be considered by the Ramsar Secretariat as the definitive list of your focal points, and will be used to update the information it holds. The Secretariat's current information about your focal points is available at <http://www.ramsar.org/search-contact>.

Name of Contracting Party

The completed National Report **must be accompanied by a letter** in the name of the Head of Administrative Authority, confirming that this is the Contracting Party's official submission of its COP13 National Report. It can be attached to this question using the "Manage documents" function (blue symbol below)

> Belgium

Designated Ramsar Administrative Authority

Name of Administrative Authority

> Walloon Region: European Policy and International Agreements Department, DGO3, SPW; Flemish Region: Agency for Nature & Forests, Ministry of Environment, Flemish Government; Brussels Region: Division for Nature, Water and Forests, Brussels Instituut for environmental management; Federal authorities: FOD Public Health, Food Safety and Environment , DG Environment

Head of Administrative Authority - name and title

> Walloon Region : Ir. Luc Hennuy, European Policy and International Agreements Department Flemish region: Mr. Jeroen Nachtergaele, int. Head of Policy Division Brussels Region: Dr. Machteld Gryseels, Head of Division for Nature Water and Forest Federal: R. Moreau, General Director for Environnement

Mailing address

> Walloon Region: Avenue Prince de Liège 15, 5100 Jambes, BELGIUM
Flemish Region: Herman Teirlinckgebouw, site Thurn & Taxis - 10de verd.Havenlaan 88 bus 75, 1000 Brussel , BELGIUM
Brussels Region: Gulledele 100, 1200 Brussels, Belgium
Federal: Place Victor Horta 40/10 , 1060 Brussels, Belgium

Telephone/Fax

> Walloon Region: Tel: +32 81 335804, Fax: +32 81 335822 Flemish Region: Tel: +32 2 553 76 83, Fax: +32 2 553 76 85 Brussels Region: Tel: +32 2 7757561 Federal: Tel: +32 2 5249675, Fax: +32 2 5249643

Email

> luc.hennuy@spw.wallonie.be jeroen.nachtergaele@lne.vlaanderen.be mgr@ibgebim.be roland.moureau@health.fgov.be

Designated National Focal Point for Ramsar Convention Matters

Name and title

> Walloon Region : Ir. Catherine Debruyne; Flemish region: Dr. Els Martens

Mailing address

> Walloon Region: Avenue Prince de Liège 15, 5100 Jambes, BELGIUM
Flemish Region: Herman Teirlinckgebouw, site Thurn & Taxis - 10de verd. Havenlaan 88 bus 75, 1000 Brussel

Telephone/Fax

> +32 81 335804

Email

> Catherine.DEBRUYNE@spw.wallonie.be ; els.martens@lne.vlaanderen.be mgr@ibgebim.be geert.raeymaekers@milieu.belgie.be

Designated National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP)

Name and title

> /

Name of organisation

>

Mailing address

>

Telephone/Fax

>

Email

>

Designated Government National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Programme on Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA)

Name and title

> /

Name of organisation

>

Mailing address

>

Telephone/Fax

>

Email

>

Designated Non-Government National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Programme on Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA)

Name and title

> /

Name of organisation

>

Mailing address

>

Telephone/Fax

>

Email

>

Section 2: General summary of national implementation progress and challenges

In your country, in the past triennium (i.e., since COP12 reporting)

A. What have been the five most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention?

1)

> Continued efforts for the implementation of the Water Framework Directive and the Birds and Habitats Directives (the official adoption of the designation arrest for all Natura 2000 sites in the Walloon Region (240 sites, 220 000ha, which corresponds to approximately 13.1% of the Walloon territory), the adoption of the Vlaamse Banken at the federal level- which includes the RAMSAR site 'Westelijk Kurtbanken'; for Flanders formal adoption of the designation acts and conservation objectives for all 38 Habitat sites and overlapping Bird sites June 2014 including the 4 Ramsar sites) and the adoption of the Marine Spatial Plan in 2014.

2)

> Finalize the second version of the River Basin Management Plans in all River Basin Districts : In Wallonia, they have been adopted in April 2016 for the Meuse, Scheldt, Rhine and Seine. Second version is in preparation with public consultations in Flanders starting in 2014.

3)

> RW: le Schéma régional des ressources en eau[1] (SRRE(a)) a été approuvé par le Gouvernement wallon (GW) en 2015[2]. Cet outil de planification et de réglementation de l'exploitation des ressources en eau s'articule autour de plusieurs axes : environnemental (maîtrise des pressions anthropiques, prise en compte de l'impact des changements climatiques), qualité de l'eau (mise en place de plans de gestion de la sécurité sanitaire de l'eau du risque[3], protection effective des captages) et économique (outils financiers à mettre en œuvre, maîtrise du coût-vérité de l'eau...). Les objectifs poursuivis sont entre autres : la régulation des prélèvements publics et privés (agricoles, industriels et domestiques), la sécurité d'approvisionnement du territoire wallon (taux de sécurisation de 30 %)[4], l'accès à l'eau solidaire (mutualisation des coûts de production), la maîtrise du prix de l'eau (synergies entre les opérateurs afin de limiter les coûts d'investissement et d'exploitation), l'application du principe de récupération des coûts ainsi que la cohérence avec les autres politiques régionales (comme l'aménagement du territoire ou l'exploitation des ressources minérales).

4)

> In 2012 the Walloon authorities have drawn up a pesticide reduction programme (PWRP) including measures involving professionals having to gain a licence to use Phyto Pharmaceutical Products (PPP), a ban on the use of PPPs in public spaces by 2019, the creation of buffer zones to protect aquatic habitats or the promotion of integrated pest management and alternative methods. <http://www.wallonie-reductionpesticides.be/fr>
FL: adoption of Decree for sustainable use of pesticides on 8 February 2013 and the action plan for implementation on 8 March 2013 including certification of professional users, codes of good practices, integrated protection measures for agro-cultural production, buffer zones for nature protection sites: <http://www.lne.be/themas/beleid/actieplanpesticiden>

5)

> In Wallonia, we have installed waste water treatment for all cities above 10 000 inhabitants according to the Directive 91/71 concerning urban waste water treatment.
Flanders: The Flemish Environment Agency starts actions for water management from an integrated vision concerning water. The ambitious objective of the European Water Framework Directive - a good general status of the surface water and ground water in Flanders - serves as a guiding principle. The agency measures and controls the quantity and the quality of surface water, groundwater and sediments and reports about the results, follow up of urban water treatment reports. Through their recommendations concerning the granting of environmental permits, they try to prevent surface water pollution as much as possible and to manage the groundwater supplies. <http://en.vmm.be/water/an-integrated-look-at-water>

B. What have been the five greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention?

1)

> RW: Pour la période 2010 - 2015, 41 % (146/354) des Masse d'Eau de surface (MESU) étaient en bon ou très bon état écologique alors que l'objectif 2015 était de 51 % (182/354). Pour la période 2009 - 2013, 61 % (20/33) des ME souterraine (MESO) étaient en bon état alors que l'objectif 2015 était de 70 % (23/33). À côté de ces résultats, des reports d'échéance pour 2021 ont été octroyés à la Wallonie. Pour l'état écologique des MESU, 149 dérogations (soit 42 % des MESU) ont été accordées. Pour les MESO, des objectifs presque inchangés par rapport à ceux de 2015 ont été fixés, puisque seules 2 MESO supplémentaires (soit 22/33) devront atteindre le bon état d'ici 2021. Ces reports importants et ces objectifs minimalistes pour 2021

compromettent l'atteinte de l'objectif de bon état des masses d'eau à l'échéance ultime de 2027 et des mesures plus contraignantes devront vraisemblablement être mise en œuvre dans le troisième cycle des Plan de gestion par district hydrographique.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%2021.html?thematic=4545095f-adac-4330-b43e-5ce772af4daa>

2)

> RW: Malgré les importants investissements réalisés ces quinze dernières années (> 2,9 milliards d'euros), la Wallonie est en situation de contentieux vis-à-vis de la Commission européenne concernant le respect de la directive relative au traitement des eaux urbaines résiduaires. Selon la Commission européenne, sur un total de 143 agglomérations de 2 000 à 9 999 EH, 20 agglomérations ne sont pas conformes au regard du droit européen. Elles sont au nombre de 14 selon les chiffres wallons actualisés. Dans les années futures, la SPGE devra poursuivre trois grands chantiers : terminer la mise en conformité des agglomérations de 2 000 à 9 999 EH, poursuivre le traitement des eaux usées urbaines des agglomérations de moins de 2 000 EH (environ 400 stations d'épuration à construire) et développer l'épuration autonome.

3)

> Federal: in the marine environment the complex decision process resulting from the division of competences between regions and federal state.

4)

> RW: integrating biodiversity concerns in hydroelectricity plants that don't require a environmental permit (small plants); In the water code revision, it is proposed impose minimum stream flows to ensure that the stream or river not its biodiversity is impacted. This is not implemented yet.

5)

> Having the adequate financial resources to ensure full Wise use and restoration of all wetlands;

C. What are the five priorities for future implementation of the Convention?

1)

> RW/FL: the second cycle River Basin Management Plans for all River Basin Districts should be ready by december 2015, according to the European Water framework directive.

Flood management plans should be ready by 2015 according to the Flood Directive. RF?

2)

> RW: implement priority restoration measures foreseen by the water framwork directive and the flood directive;

3)

> FL: Implementation of nitrogen reduction programme in cooperation with agriculture sector to restore and enhance the water quality especially in and with impact on Natura 2000 sites.

4)

> The new Directive on Industrial Emissions, integrated pollution prevention and control, which has been transposed recently has now to be implemented.

5)

> Federal: the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (in particular the programme of measures) and the further implementation of the Marine Spatial Planning.

D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?

> None

E. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Convention's International Organisation Partners (IOPs)? (including ongoing partnerships and partnerships to develop)

> Further info and communication on work plans and mandates of IOPs could be stimulating for networking between Parties and IOPs

F. How can national implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with implementation of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), especially those in the 'biodiversity cluster' (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), World Heritage Convention (WHC), and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change (UNFCCC)?

> Stronger cooperation between focal points of the MEAs - as priority action of overall biodiversity planning, integrated and collaborative implementation programmes between the MEAs established by the cooperating secretariats and communicated throughout;

In Belgium, the environmental policy competences are shared between the federal government and the regions. The regions have jurisdiction for land-use planning, nature protection and conservation, and the protection of the environment. The latter is extremely wide and includes the protection of soil, water and air and the fight against noise pollution. Policy on waste management, water production and the provision and control of industrial activities also falls under the jurisdiction of the regions. The federal government has control over product standardisation policy, protection against ionising radiation, including radioactive waste, the transit of waste, animal welfare, the import/export and transit of non-indigenous plant and animal species and their remains, and the protection of the marine environment. All these authorities ensure that international environmental agreements in their areas of jurisdiction are implemented. Therefore, they must all be closely involved in the preparation of Belgian position points with respect to international policy. Although competences for environmental policy in Belgium are shared between the federal and regional levels, Belgium should nevertheless speak with one voice when negotiations take place in international organisations or the European Union. In order to achieve this and to ensure all parties are equally participating, four important cooperation agreements are used in the field of the environment. Three of these agreements apply to all policy domains; the fourth specifically concerns the environment. the Coordination Committee for International Environmental Policy (CCIEP) exists since 1995 and ensures that Belgium brings well-argued opinions on environmental policy to the international scene. These coordinated standpoints require a preceding debate both at technical and political level.
<http://www.sante.belgique.be/eportal/Environment/Inspectionandenvironmentalrigh/international/CCPIE/10972455?ie2Term=CCIM&ie2section=83&&fodnlang=en>

G. How can implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with the implementation of water policy/strategy and other strategies in the country (e.g., on sustainable development, energy, extractive industries, poverty reduction, sanitation, food security, biodiversity)?

> Enhance to integrate overall objectives of Ramsar implementation into overall biodiversity objectives covered in the Belgian National Biodiversity Strategy (updated in November 2013).

H. Do you (AA) have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention?

> None

I. Please list the names of the organisations which have been consulted on or have contributed to the information provided in this report

> FL: Institute for Nature & Forest Research, reports of Flemish Environment Agency
RW: SPW DGO3

Section 3: Indicator questions and further implementation information

Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation

Target 1

Wetland benefits are featured in national/ local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level.

1.1 Have wetland issues/benefits been incorporated into other national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i

Please select only one per square.

a) National Policy or strategy for wetland management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
b) Poverty eradication strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
c) Water resource management and water efficiency plans	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
d) Coastal and marine resource management plans	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
e) Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
f) National forest programmes	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
g) National policies or measures on agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
h) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
i) National policies on energy and mining	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant

j) National policies on tourism	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
k) National policies on urban development	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
l) National policies on infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
m) National policies on industry	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
n) National policies on aquaculture and fisheries {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
o) National plans of actions (NPAs) for pollution control and management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
p) National policies on wastewater management and water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant

1.1 Additional information

> RW:

- The Walloon social fund for water is a financial mechanism to help consumers that encounter financial difficulties to pay their water invoices. <http://www.spge.be/fr/fonds-social-de-l-eau.html?IDC=2039>

- Wetlands protection and conservation measures are included in the Water Code, in the Forest Code, in agricultural cross compliance, in agri environmental measures,...

- The third version of the Sustainable Management Programme for Nitrogen in Agriculture (or PGDA) has been adopted in 2014 and. It aims to reduce water pollution due to agricultural practices and to enhance a sustainable use of nitrogen and humus in agriculture. <http://www.nitrawal.be/agriculteurs/legislations/PGDA>

-NAPAN (Nationaal Actie Plan d'Action National, National action plan implementing 2009/128/CE Directive on pesticide use)

- In 2012 the Walloon authorities have drawn up a pesticide reduction programme (PWRP) including measures such as the protection of aquatic habitats and drinking water from phyto pharmaceutical products; a ban on the use of PPPs in public spaces by 2019, the creation of buffer zones to protect aquatic habitats; the promotion of integrated pest management and alternative methods. <http://www.wallonie-reductionpesticides.be/fr>
 BCR: The Brussels project RBSAP also foresees the protection and improvement of the condition of Brussels wetlands, essentially through the consolidation of the regional ecological network. See :

<http://documentation.bruxellesenvironnement.be/documents/ProjetNAPLAN-fr.PDF?langtype=2060>

FL: Wetlands protection and conservation measures are included in the Integral Water Policy Decree, nature management plans, in agricultural cross compliance, and in agri environmental measures with focus on Natura 2000 sites that include wetlands.

Target 2

Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone

2.1 Has the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands been assessed to support the implementation of the Guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands (Resolution VIII.1, VIII.2) ? 1.24.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

2.1 Additional Information

>

2.2 Have assessments of environmental flow been undertaken in relation to mitigation of impacts on the ecological character of wetlands (Action r3.4.iv)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

2.2 Additional Information

>

2.3 Have Ramsar Sites improved the sustainability of water use in the context of ecosystem requirements?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- O=No Change
- X=Unknown

2.3 Additional Information

>

2.4 Have the Guidelines for allocation and management of water for maintaining ecological functions of wetlands (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12) been used/applied in decision-making processes. (Action 3.4.6.)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

2.4 Additional Information

> As the principles of the Nature Directives and the water Framework directives

2.5 Have projects that promote and demonstrate good practice in water allocation and management for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands been developed (Action r3.4.ix.)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

2.5 Additional Information

>

2.6 How many household/municipalities are linked to sewage system? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (households/municipalities)

- >
- F=Less than (households/municipalities)
- >
- G=More than (households/municipalities)
- >
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.6 Additional Information

> RW: Collecte et traitement des eaux usées urbaines

La mise en place de la Société publique de gestion de l'eau (SPGE) (1999) a permis de mieux organiser et coordonner les efforts des organismes d'assainissement agréés (OAA) et des communes nécessaires pour atteindre les objectifs de la directive 91/271/ CEE. Les OAA sont chargés de la construction et de l'exploitation des stations d'épuration, tandis que la responsabilité de l'égouttage incombe aux communes. Entre 2003 et 2015, d'importants investissements (2 900 M€) ont été réalisés pour finaliser et rénover les réseaux de collecte et traiter les eaux usées urbaines afin d'atteindre les niveaux de conformité exigés. Cependant, la Wallonie n'a pas respecté les échéances de la directive, ce qui a généré divers contentieux avec la Commission européenne.

Des efforts à poursuivre : Fin 2013, les 38 grandes agglomérations wallonnes (de 10 000 EH et plus) affichaient des taux de collecte et de traitement des eaux usées urbaines conformes aux exigences européennes. Fin 2016, la Commission relevait que sur les 143 agglomérations de plus petite taille (2 000 à 9 999 EH), 20 n'étaient toujours pas conformes. La Wallonie a cependant fait état d'une amélioration de la situation, 14 agglomérations restant à mettre en conformité. Cette situation devrait se normaliser, la plupart des infrastructures requises étant soit en construction, soit adjugées. Fin 2015, les infrastructures de collecte et d'épuration mises en place ont permis de traiter 93 % des charges polluantes émises par les agglomérations de 2 000 EH et plus. Pour les agglomérations de petites tailles (< 2 000 EH), 39 % de la charge polluante est collectée et traitée. La crise économique de 2009 a réduit les moyens financiers disponibles, et la complexité des procédures pèse sur la finalisation des dossiers liés aux travaux.

Terminer l'épuration des agglomérations: Dans les années futures, la SPGE devra poursuivre trois grands chantiers : terminer la mise en conformité des agglomérations de 2 000 à 9 999 EH, poursuivre le traitement des eaux usées urbaines des agglomérations de moins de 2 000 EH (environ 400 stations d'épuration à construire) et développer l'épuration autonome.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%2018.html?thematic=b1275a06-3531-44d0-a8d4-42d3d9ddb93c>

2.7 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (percentage)
- >
- F=Less than (percentage)
- >
- G=More than (percentage)
- >
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.7 Additional Information

> RW: Depuis 1999, la Wallonie a confié à la Société publique de gestion de l'eau (SPGE) la coordination et le financement du secteur de l'eau, dont notamment l'assainissement des eaux usées urbaines. Les programmes d'investissements actuels de la SPGE sont financés grâce à l'application du coût-vérité à l'assainissement (CVA) et à des emprunts auprès de la banque européenne d'investissements (BEI).

Le nombre de stations d'épuration augmente: Selon la SPGE, au 31/12/2015, la Wallonie comptait 424 stations d'épuration collectives (STEP) capables de traiter une charge polluante de 4 011 995 équivalents-habitants (EH), ce qui représentait un taux d'équipement de 91 %. Ces STEP étaient réparties en 227 stations de petite capacité (< 2 000 EH), 127 stations de moyenne capacité (2 000 - 9 999 EH) et 70 stations de grande capacité (≥ 10 000 EH). Entre 2010 et 2015, environ 550 000 EH de capacité de traitement supplémentaire ont été installés, avec la construction de 51 STEP. En 2015[3], 12 STEP ont été mises en service, pour un total de 22 766 EH.

Depuis 2013, le taux d'équipement des agglomérations de capacité ≥ à 10 000 EH est de 100 %. Fin 2015, le solde des capacités épuratoires à installer en zone d'assainissement collectif ne représentait plus que 7,5 % de l'objectif à atteindre (4 415 160 EH). L'épuration des agglomérations de 2 000 EH à 9 999 EH, dont le taux d'équipement était de 90 %, est en bonne voie d'achèvement, avec une capacité résiduelle à installer de 69 350 EH. L'épuration des agglomérations < 2 000 EH, dont le taux d'équipement était estimé à 35 %, constitue l'effort principal à fournir pour les prochaines années, avec une capacité supplémentaire à installer de 333

815 EH, ce qui correspond à environ 400 STEP à construire.

Malgré les importants investissements réalisés ces quinze dernières années (> 2,9 milliards d'euros), la Wallonie est en situation de contentieux vis-à-vis de la Commission européenne concernant le respect de la directive[4] relative au traitement des eaux urbaines résiduaires q. Selon la Commission européenne[5], sur un total de 143 agglomérations de 2 000 à 9 999 EH, 20 agglomérations ne sont pas conformes au regard du droit européen. Elles sont au nombre de 14 selon les chiffres wallons actualisés.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%2019.html?thematic=b1275a06-3531-44d0-a8d4-42d3d9ddb93c>

2.8 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

E=Exact number (percentage)

>

F=Less than (percentage)

>

G=More than (percentage)

>

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

2.8 Additional Information

> RW: Dans les zones faiblement peuplées, la construction d'un réseau de collecte des eaux usées domestiques est parfois jugée trop onéreuse ou techniquement difficile à réaliser. Dans ce cas, l'assainissement des eaux usées nécessite l'installation d'un système d'épuration individuelle (SEI) qui peut faire l'objet de certains avantages financiers octroyés par la Wallonie.

12 % des Wallons sont potentiellement concernés

Selon les Plans d'assainissement par sous-bassin hydrographique (PASH), environ 160 000 habitations sont situées en zone d'assainissement autonome (ZAA), dont deux tiers environ en zone urbanisable aux plans de secteur.

Zones prioritaires

En ZAA, les nouvelles habitations doivent être équipées d'un SEI. Pour les habitations construites avant la date d'approbation ou de modification du Plan communal général d'égouttage ou du PASH, cette disposition ne s'applique pas. Toutefois, dans les zones prioritaires (Natura 2000, zones amont de baignade, zones de protection des captages, masses d'eau dont la qualité n'est pas satisfaisante ou qui risquent de ne pas atteindre certains objectifs environnementaux[1]), des études de zones sont réalisées afin de déterminer :

- le mode de traitement des eaux usées le plus adéquat ;
- les habitations qui seront dans l'obligation d'installer un SEI ;
- les délais de mise en conformité.

Les études de zones sont réalisées par les organismes d'assainissement agréés (OAA). En 2015, 27 études de zones(a) ont été approuvées par arrêté ministériel.

Stabilité des demandes de prime et des demandes d'exemption du CVA entre 2010 et 2015

L'installation d'un SEI peut faire l'objet, sous certaines conditions[2], d'une prime octroyée par la Wallonie (dont le montant est majoré pour les habitations situées en zones prioritaires), ainsi que d'une exemption du coût-vérité à l'assainissement (CVA)[3]. Le nombre total de primes accordées entre 1998 et 2015 était de 11 374 pour un montant total de 31 millions d'euros. Après une croissance régulière jusqu'en 2005, suivie d'une diminution, environ 600 demandes/an ont été traitées en moyenne sur la période 2010 - 2015[4]. Le nombre total d'exemption du CVA accordées entre 2005 et 2015 était d'environ 14 000. La capacité maximale d'épuration des SEI concernés, cumulée sur la période 2007 - 2015[4], s'élevait à près de 66 000 EH. Entre 2007 et 2015, l'exemption du CVA a fait l'objet d'environ 1 140 demandes/an. À noter que le nombre total d'habitations équipées d'un SEI est difficile à évaluer, toutes les installations ne faisant pas l'objet d'une demande de prime ou d'exemption du CVA.

Transfert de la gestion de l'assainissement autonome

Une large réforme q de l'assainissement autonome (AA) a été mise en place fin 2016. Son objectif est de garantir un niveau de protection de l'environnement équivalent quelque soit le régime d'assainissement (autonome ou collectif) auquel une habitation est soumise. à partir du 01/01/2018, à côté de l'octroi de primes pour l'installation de SEI (dont les montants seront adaptés), la SPGE, à qui est désormais confiée la gestion publique de l'AA, participera à la prise en charge des entretiens périodiques des SEI et à la vidange des boues excédentaires, et ce moyennant la suppression de l'exemption du CVA.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%2020.html?thematic=b1275a06-3531-44d0-a8d4-42d3d9ddb93c>

2.9 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

A=Yes

- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.9 Additional Information

> RW: see 2.8.

2.10 How do the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology perform? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Not Functioning
- C=Functioning
- Q=Obsolete
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.10 Additional Information

>

2.11 How many centralised wastewater treatment plants exist at national level? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (plants)

>

- F=Less than (plants)

>

- G=More than (plants)

>

- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.11 Additional Information

> RW: Selon la SPGE, au 31/12/2015, la Wallonie comptait 424 stations d'épuration collectives (STEP) capables de traiter une charge polluante de 4 011 995 équivalents-habitants (EH), ce qui représentait un taux d'équipement de 91 %. Ces STEP étaient réparties en 227 stations de petite capacité (< 2 000 EH), 127 stations de moyenne capacité (2 000 - 9 999 EH) et 70 stations de grande capacité (≥ 10 000 EH). Entre 2010 et 2015, environ 550 000 EH de capacité de traitement supplémentaire ont été installés, avec la construction de 51 STEP. En 2015[3], 12 STEP ont été mises en service, pour un total de 22 766 EH.

2.12 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Not functioning
- C=Functioning
- Q=Obsolete
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.12 Additional Information

>

2.13 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Not Functioning
- C=Functioning
- Q=Obsolete

- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.13 Additional Information

>

2.14 Is there a wastewater reuse system? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.14 Additional Information

>

2.15 What Is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system? SDG Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option

- R=Agriculture
- S=Landscape
- T=Industrial
- U=Drinking
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

2.15 Additional Information

Please indicate if the wastewater reuse system is for free or taxed or add any additional information.

>

Target 3

Public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands. {1.10}

3.1 Is the private sector encouraged to apply the Ramsar wise use principle and guidance (Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1}

KRA 1.10.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

3.1 Additional Information

>

3.2 Has the private sector undertaken activities or actions for the conservation, wise use and management of {1.10.2} KRA 1.10.ii

Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Sites	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant
b) Wetlands in general	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned <input type="checkbox"/> X=Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Y=Not Relevant

3.2 Additional information

>

3.3 Have actions been taken to implement incentive measures which encourage the conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.1} KRA 1.11.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

3.3 Additional information

>

3.4 Have actions been taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.2} KRA 1.11.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned
- Z=Not Applicable

3.4 Additional Information

>

Target 4

Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment.

4.1 Does your country have a comprehensive national inventory of invasive alien species that currently or potentially impact the ecological character of wetlands? {1.9.1} KRA 1.9.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

4.1 Additional information

> Informations supplémentaires à attendre dans le cadre du projet BELSPO TRIAS
www.belspo.be/belspo/brain-be/projects/TriAS_fr.pdf

4.2 Have national policies or guidelines on invasive species control and management been established or reviewed for wetlands? {1.9.2} KRA 1.9.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

4.2 Additional information

> Pas de manière spécifique dans les zones humides, mais nombreuses espèces du Règlement UE sur EEE (1143/2014) sont des espèces dulcaquicoles.

4.3 How many invasive species are being controlled through management actions.

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (species)

>

- F=Less than (species)

>

- G=More than (species)

>

- C=Partially
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

4.3 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the year of assessment and the source of the information

> Quelques exemples d'espèces gérées : Branta canadensis, Lagarosiphon major, Lithobates catesbeiana, Ludwigia spp., Lysichiton americanus, Hydrocotyle ranunculoides, Ondatra zibethicus

4.4 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

4.4 Additional information

> Rapportage obligatoire du Règlement UE en 2019

Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network

Target 5

The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}

5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

5.1 Additional information

>

5.2 Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its tools being used in national identification of further Ramsar Sites to designate? {2.2.1} KRA 2.2.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.2 Additional information

> not in the last triennium

5.3 How many Ramsar Sites have an effective, implemented management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (sites)

> 8

- F=Less than (sites)

>

- G=More than (sites)
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

5.4 For how many of the Ramsar Sites with a management plan is the plan being implemented? {2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (sites)

> 8

- F=Less than (sites)

>

- G=More than (sites)

>

- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

5.5 For how many Ramsar Sites is effective management planning currently being implemented (outside of formal management plans ? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i

Please select only one option

E=Exact number (sites)

>

F=Less than (sites)

>

G=More than (sites)

>

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

5.3 - 5.5 Additional information

> RW: Management plan for all 4 Ramsar Sites.

FL: there will be no Ramsar-specific management plan - alle Ramsar sites are included in Natura 2000 - the specific conservation requirements for the wetland characteristics will be included in the respective Natura 2000 site management plan.

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (through formal management plans where they exist or otherwise through existing actions for appropriate wetland management ? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii

Please select only one option

A=Yes

B=No

C=Partially

D=Planned

5.6 Additional information

> for most sites

5.7 How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv

Please select only one option

E=Exact number (sites)

> RW: all except the "grotte des émotions" as it is not accessible.

FL: all 4 Ramsar sites through the Natura 2000 site management in which they are located.

F=Less than (sites)

>

G=More than (sites)

>

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

5.7 Additional information

If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites

>

5.8 For how many Ramsar Sites has an ecological character description been prepared (see Resolution X.15)? {2.4.5}{2.4.7} KRA 2.4.v

Please select only one option

E=Exact number (sites)

>

F=Less than (sites)

>

G=More than (sites)

>

C=Partially

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

5.8 Additional information

If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites

>

5.9 Have any assessments of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management been made? {2.5.1} KRA 2.5.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Some Sites

5.9 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Some sites', please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15, and the source of the information

> this is a continuous exercise

Target 7

Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}.

7.1 Are mechanisms in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of negative human-induced changes or likely changes in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.1} KRA 2.6.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Some Sites
- D=Planned

7.1 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Some sites', please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established

>

7.2 Have all cases of negative human-induced change or likely change in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites been reported to the Ramsar Secretariat, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.2} KRA 2.6.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Some Cases
- O=No Negative Change

7.2 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Some cases', please indicate for which Ramsar Sites the Administrative Authority has made Article 3.2 reports to the Secretariat, and for which sites such reports of change or likely change have not yet been made

>

7.3 If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, including requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- Z=Not Applicable

7.3 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the actions taken

> For the Ramsar Site of "les marais d'Harchies", the project that might induce a change in the ecological status of the site is in France. The project is in stand by for the moment.

Goal 3. Wisely Using All Wetlands

Target 8

National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i

8.1 Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No

- C=In Progress
- D=Planned

8.1 Additional information

> RW:

- Walloon Natura 2000 sites are categorized by habitats, which include wetlands.
- Wetlands of biological interest are one of the strict nature conservation protected area in the Walloon Region. Their listing is kept up to date.
- The Walloon Region has registered all "protected areas" according to the Water framework Directive. This register includes : natura 2000 sites, areas designated for the abstraction of water intended for human consumption; recreational waters; nutrient-sensitive areas;

RBC :

<http://geoportal.ibgebim.be/webgis/eau.phtml?langtype=2060>

http://documentation.bruxellesenvironnement.be/documents/NARABRU_20120910_FR_150dpi.pdf?langtype=2060

Federal - all protected areas are indicated in the annexes of the Royal Decree of Marine Spatial Planning (20 March 2014); see www.environnement.belgique.be > milieu marin > aménagement des espaces marins.

FL: For Flanders, detailed ecological mapping exists at scale 1/25000 with indication of habitat types including wetlands; additional inventories exist on ad hoc basis or as contribution to specific plans (restoration, management of nature reserves etc.) Maps are accessible on <http://geo-vlaanderen.agiv.be/geo-vlaanderen>. There is also a habitat monitoring as part of the Water Framework Directive and of Habitats and Birds Directives for which a Natura 2000 habitat monitoring has been started up. The information sheets of each Ramsar site are being updated based on the 2013 reports for Natura 2000.

8.2 Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=In Progress
- C1=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

8.2 Additional information

> Yes for Natura 2000 sites through Article 17 report of the Habitats Directive assessed the implementation of this Directive.

Yes through Water Framework Directive reporting.

In RW: environmental Outlook publications on a regular basis <http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/> RBC : see 1.1.1

Fl: Every two years the Environment Report gives an update on the ecological and qualitative state of water courses : <http://en.vmm.be/>

8.3 Is wetland inventory data and information maintained? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

8.3 Additional information

> RW:

Information on habitats is available on the walloon internet site on biodiversity.

<http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=6>

Information on the Natura 2000 sites have been collected and are available through the Natura 2000 website.

Article 17 report of the Habitats Directive assessed the implementation of this Directive. As many Natura 2000 sites are wetlands, they have been assessed through this report.

(<http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=6>). A page on static and flowing water habitat types is available : <http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/plans-et-cours-d-eau-c.html?IDC=813>

Information on the state of water courses: <http://spw.wallonie.be/dce/spip.php?rubrique4>

The atlas of all Walloon water courses is available online <http://environnement.wallonie.be/cartosig/atlasenn/>.

Every year, the Environmental Outlook for Wallonia (EOW) provides an update on Wallonia's environmental situation, based on a collection of environmental, social, health and other indicators which may be able to shed some light on the pressure put on the different elements of the environment (air, water, soils, fauna, flora, natural habitats, etc.) and their impact. By looking at the responses that have already been implemented, it also is a valuable part of an evaluation of environmental policies. A more detailed report is

produced every five years (the "Rapport analytique sur l'état de l'environnement wallon", last edition: 2006-2007), which provides a more comprehensive and details analysis of environmental issues.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/> Through this EOW, the ecological and morphological characters of watercourses are monitored on a regular basis and the results are available through the dashboard of the wallon environment. Other components the wetlands state are also monitored such as : main water flows, pollution released, organic pollution, eutrophication, sediments, micro-pollutants, nitrate and pesticides in groundwater, collective and individual treatment of wastewater...

assessment of the physical and chemical quality of surface water bodies:

<http://aquaphyc.environnement.wallonie.be>

Assesment of the biological quality of watercourses has been persued by the diversity of macroinvertebrates, macrophytes, diatomea and fishes.

Four data collecting stations have been selected to be included in an european network of stations on waterway's biological quality.

RBC : see above

Federal: relevant 'wetland data' for marine RAMSAR and other protected areas are stored in the Belgian Marine Data Centre (<http://www.mumm.ac.be/datacentre/>) - see also www.vliz.be for additional marine data.

FL:

Yearly updates of biodiversity indicators, including data on wetland habitats and species:

www.natuurindicatoren.be

Every two years the Environment Report gives an update on the ecological and qualitative state of water courses : <http://en.vmm.be/>

Reports on bird populations in certain specific Natura 2000 sites, coast area and river basins:

http://www.inbo.be/content/page.asp?pid=EN_PUBLICATIONS_startnew

8.4 Is wetland inventory data and information made accessible to all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii

Please select only one option

A=Yes

B=No

C=Partially

D=Planned

8.4 Additional information

> RW:

Information on habitats is available on the wallon internet site on biodiversity.

<http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=6>

Information on the Natura 2000 sites have been collected and are available through the Natura 2000 website.

Article 17 report of the Habitats Directive assessed the implementation of this Directive. As many Natura 2000 sites are wetlands, they have been assest through this report.

(<http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=6>). A page on static and flowing water habitat types is available : <http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/plans-et-cours-d-eau-c.html?IDC=813>

Information on the state of water courses: <http://spw.wallonie.be/dce/spip.php?rubrique4>

The atlas of all Walloon water courses is available online <http://environnement.wallonie.be/cartosig/atlasenn/>.

Every year, the Environmental Outlook for Wallonia (EOW) provides an update on Wallonia's environmental situation, based on a collection of environmental, social, health and other indicators which may be able to shed some light on the pressure put on the different elements of the environment (air, water, soils, fauna, flora, natural habitats, etc.) and their impact. By looking at the responses that have already been implemented, it also is a valuable part of an evaluation of environmental policies. A more detailed report is produced every five years (the "Rapport analytique sur l'état de l'environnement wallon", last edition: 2006-2007), which provides a more comprehensive and details analysis of environmental issues.

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/> Through this EOW, the ecological and morphological characters of watercourses are monitored on a regular basis and the results are available through the dashboard of the wallon environment. Other components the wetlands state are also monitored such as : main water flows, pollution released, organic pollution, eutrophication, sediments, micro-pollutants, nitrate and pesticides in groundwater, collective and individual treatment of wastewater...

assessment of the physical and chemical quality of surface water bodies:

<http://aquaphyc.environnement.wallonie.be>

Assesment of the biological quality of watercourses has been persued by the diversity of macroinvertebrates, macrophytes, diatomea and fishes.

Four data collecting stations have been selected to be included in an european network of stations on waterway's biological quality. A special tool is dedicated to river quality (aquabio):

<http://geoportail.wallonie.be/catalogue/265605dc-64db-460e-96da-d6cd14b4c950.html>

RBC : see 1.1.1

Federal: relevant 'wetland data' for marine RAMSAR and other protected areas are stored in the Belgian Marine Data Centre (<http://www.mumm.ac.be/datacentre/>) - see also www.vliz.be for additional marine data.

FL:

Yearly updates of biodiversity indicators, including data on wetland habitats and species:

Every two years the Environment Report gives an update on the ecological and qualitative state of water courses : <http://en.vmm.be/>

Reports on bird populations in certain specific Natura 2000 sites, coast area and river basins:
http://www.inbo.be/content/page.asp?pid=EN_PUBLICATIONS_startnew

8.5 Has the condition* of wetlands in your country, overall, changed during the last triennium? {1.1.3}

Please describe on the sources of the information on which your answer is based in the free- text box below. If there is a difference between inland and coastal wetland situations, please describe. If you are able to, please describe the principal driver(s) of the change(s).

* 'Condition' corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention

Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Sites	<input type="checkbox"/> N=Status Deteriorated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O=No Change <input type="checkbox"/> P=Status Improved
b) Wetlands generally	<input type="checkbox"/> N=Status Deteriorated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O=No Change <input type="checkbox"/> P=Status Improved

8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b)

> RW: La directive-cadre sur l'eau (DCE) 2000/60/CE q exige que les masses d'eau de surface et souterraine conservent ou atteignent un bon état ou un bon potentiel pour fin 2015 avec un report possible de la date limite en 2021 ou 2027. L'atteinte de cet objectif nécessite la mise en application de mesures définies dans les Plans de gestion des districts hydrographiques (PGDH) qui sont révisés tous les 6 ans.

Objectifs 2015 non atteints en Wallonie

Les évaluations réalisées pour la période 2010 - 2015 sur les ME de surface indiquent que 41 % de ces ME (146/354) sont en bon ou très bon état écologique. En ce qui concerne l'état chimique, des changements de méthodologie ne permettent pas de tirer des conclusions à ce stade de l'évaluation[4]. Les problèmes se situent principalement dans le district hydrographique de l'Escaut et dans quelques sous-bassins mosans (Sambre, Meuse amont, Meuse aval et Vesdre) où les pressions anthropiques sont plus fortes. Les facteurs qui expliquent le mauvais état des ME sont essentiellement liés aux activités domestiques et de services (assainissement insuffisant des eaux usées), aux activités agricoles (nitrate, pesticides) et aux activités industrielles.

Environ 61 % des ME souterraine (20/33) évaluées sur la période 2009 - 2013 sont en bon état, même si 45 % d'entre elles (9/20) présentent des altérations locales(a). Le mauvais état résulte de pollutions par le nitrate et/ou les pesticides (11 ME)[5] et par d'autres macropolluants (ammonium, phosphore) (2 ME). L'agriculture constitue donc la principale source de pressions diffuses s'exerçant sur les eaux souterraines en Wallonie bien que d'autres sources ne soient pas à négliger (ménages et services et, dans une moindre mesure, industries et pollutions historiques[6]).

Les objectifs fixés dans les premiers PGDH[7] n'ont donc pas été atteints. Compte tenu du programme de mesures, le deuxième cycle de PGDH[8] prévoit de nouveaux objectifs pour 2021 : 58 % (205/354) des ME de surface en bon état écologique et des éléments justifiant un report d'échéances pour 42 % (149/354) des ME pour l'état écologique et pour 95 % (335/354) des ME pour l'état chimique (pour des raisons techniques, économiques ou d'ordre naturel[9]); 67 % (22/33) des ME souterraine en bon état chimique et report d'échéance pour 33 % (11/33) des ME souterraine. Il subsiste un écart important entre les objectifs fixés par la DCE à l'échéance ultime de 2027 et l'état actuel des masses d'eau en Wallonie.

<http://jahia7.spw.test.wallonie.be/sites/eew/contents/indicatorssheets/EAU%201.html>

BCR: In 2013, none of the sampling points reached the general Good Ecological Potential. The water bodies in the BCR however show variable overall ecological assessment (from bad to moderate EQR) and variable evolutions in this assesment. The ponds for example have shown a temporary good response to biomaniipulation while rare birds and dragonflies have been observed in the restored swamp of Ganshoren.

Federal: See the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC) "Initial Assessment" report of Belgium: www.de-Noordzee.be or www.lamerdunord.be

FL: Of the 499 monitored water bodies (measurments 2010-2012) 54 % are in a bad ecological status, 30 % scored insufficient and 16 % moderate status. None of the water bodies complied with all criteria for a goed or very good ecological status. Looking at the biological quality criteria a good status was shown in 43% of the water bodies for fytoplankton, in 26% for macro-invertebrates, in 7% for fish and 5% for macrofytes.

Especially nitrogen and phosphor impact from agricultural land use, improvement of public water treatment systems and improvement of hydromorphological quality need more attention.

<http://www.milieurapport.be/en/facts-figures/environmental-themes/surface-water-quality/>

8.6 Based upon the National Wetland Inventory if available please provide a baseline figure in square kilometres for the extent of wetlands (according to the Ramsar definition) for the year 2017. SDG Target

6.6

Please select only one option

E=Exact Number (km2)

>

F=Less than (km2)

>

G=More than (km2)

>

A=Yes

B=No

C=Partially

D=Planned

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

8.6 Additional information

If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years.

>

Target 9

The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone {1.3.}.

9.1 Is a Wetland Policy (or equivalent instrument) that promotes the wise use of wetlands in place? {1.3.1}
KRA 1.3.i

If 'Yes', please give the title and date of the policy in the green text box

Please select only one option

A=Yes

B=No

C=In Preparation

D=Planned

9.1 Additional information

> RW: the Walloon Water Code (code de l'eau) aims to orient water management by hydrological basins in a coherent way. 15 sub-basin have been identified and are considered as the management units to define quality objectives, waterways schemes (contrat de Rivière), fisheries management, water treatment. Other action plans have also been developed on floodings and on sustainable management of nitrogen in agriculture. Afin d'assurer la pérennité et la diversité des ressources hydriques ainsi que la sécurité d'approvisionnement du territoire, la Wallonie s'est dotée d'un outil de planification et de réglementation de l'exploitation des ressources en eau. Il implique la coordination des actions et des investissements des différents opérateurs du domaine de l'eau.

<http://jahia7.spw.test.wallonie.be/sites/eew/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%20Focus%202.html?thematic=a523cbad-8a95-438a-9e5b-a1f39f004268>

BCR: Ord. NAT

An Ordinance was issued on October 19th 2006 that transposes the WFD (Water Framework Directive) and reorganizes the water sector in Brussels, aiming to reach a better environmental quality and more efficient management of the water cycle. It includes aspects of wetland management.

The Directive 2009/128 of the Parliament and the Council of 21 October 2009, establishing a framework for community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticide has been transposed in the Brussels-Capital Region by the Order of 20 June 2013 on pesticide management compatible with sustainable development. In addition to the development of an action plan, this legal framework includes among other measures related to the protection of high-risk areas, among which protected areas and catchment areas.

Federal: as far as the marine environment policy is concerned, the 'Good Environmental Status' and the related objectives as part of the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive are the basis of the "wetland policy". With respect to the protected areas, the Habitats and Birds Directive form the basis for policy setting.

FL: Through the decree for Integral Water Policy- managed by the Flemish Environment Agency that includes the Water Division - many programmes have been set up to develop water management plans, improve water quality and quantity and the biological status. Via the Integrated Water Policy Coordination Commission the Agency coordinates the consultation on the integrated water policy between all the parties concerned at Flemish level: <http://en.vmm.be/water/an-integrated-look-at-water>.

9.2 Have any amendments to existing legislation been made to reflect Ramsar commitments?
{1.3.5}{1.3.6}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=In Progress
 D=Planned

9.2 Additional information

> RW: There has been a revision of the Water Code to include watercourses restoration obligations from the Water Framework Directive and priority actions for the free circulation of fishes in watercourses;

9.3 Do your country's water governance and management systems treat wetlands as natural water infrastructure integral to water resource management at the scale of river basins? {1.7.1} {1.7.2} KRA 1.7.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

9.3 Additional information

> RW:

La directive-cadre sur l'eau 2000/60/CE q impose une gestion intégrée des eaux par district hydrographique afin de permettre à l'ensemble des masses d'eau d'atteindre le bon état (ou le bon potentiel) à l'horizon 2015, avec un report possible en 2021 ou 2027. L'atteinte de cet objectif repose majoritairement sur la mise en œuvre de Plans de gestion des districts hydrographiques (PGDH). Ceux-ci contiennent notamment un catalogue de mesures à appliquer pour améliorer la qualité de l'eau.

Deuxième cycle des Plans de gestion

La Wallonie a élaboré les premiers PGDH 2009 - 2015 q en juin 2013 et les deuxièmes PGDH 2016 - 2021 q en avril 2016. Ces outils essentiels de planification sont établis à l'échelle des districts hydrographiques (DH)[1]. Leur objet est de définir l'ensemble des mesures dont l'objectif direct est l'amélioration de la qualité des eaux de surface et souterraines. Les demandes de dérogations éventuelles en cas de non-atteinte des objectifs environnementaux doivent être dûment justifiées auprès de la Commission européenne.

Programme de mesures

Le catalogue de mesures des PGDH 2016 - 2021 propose 50 actions dont le coût total de mise en œuvre avoisine 1,2 milliard d'euros. Près de 90 % est destiné à l'assainissement des eaux usées et à la valorisation des ressources stratégiques[2]. La majorité des coûts de ce programme sera supportée par les consommateurs d'eau (hors secteurs industriel, agricole et SPW). Les coûts évalués pour le secteur agricole, considérés comme disproportionnés, ne seront pas retenus à sa charge. Près de 46 % des mesures proposées sont déjà inscrites dans la législation en vigueur ("mesures de base"). Le solde est constitué de mesures complémentaires qui devront être appliquées aux masses d'eau (ME) à risque, c'est-à-dire celles pour lesquelles les mesures de base risquent de ne pas être suffisantes pour atteindre le bon état ou le bon potentiel. Bien qu'il existe des mesures ciblées comme p. ex. la conclusion de contrats de captage sur les zones à risque, certaines mesures apparaissent insuffisamment ciblées pour atténuer de manière efficiente les pressions qui s'exercent sur les ME. D'autres part, certaines mesures agricoles reposent sur une base volontaire[3] et ne sont pas applicables obligatoirement aux ME à risque.

Des objectifs environnementaux peu ambitieux

Pour la période 2010 - 2015, 41 % (146/354) des ME de surface (MESU) étaient en bon ou très bon état écologique alors que l'objectif 2015 était de 51 % (182/354). Pour la période 2009 - 2013, 61 % (20/33) des ME souterraine (MESO) étaient en bon état alors que l'objectif 2015 était de 70 % (23/33). À côté de ces résultats, des reports d'échéance pour 2021 ont été octroyés à la Wallonie. Pour l'état écologique des MESU, 149 dérogations[4] [5] (soit 42 % des MESU) ont été accordées. Pour les MESO, des objectifs presque inchangés par rapport à ceux de 2015 ont été fixés, puisque seules 2 MESO supplémentaires (soit 22/33) devront atteindre le bon état d'ici 2021. Ces reports importants et ces objectifs minimalistes pour 2021 compromettent l'atteinte de l'objectif de bon état des masses d'eau à l'échéance ultime de 2027 et des mesures plus contraignantes devront vraisemblablement être mise en œuvre dans le troisième cycle des PGDH.

<http://jahia7.spw.test.wallonie.be/sites/eew/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%2021.html?thematic=a523cbad-8a95-438a-9e5b-a1f39f004268>

9.4 Have Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) expertise and tools been incorporated into catchment/river basin planning and management (see Resolution X.19)? {1.7.2} {1.7.3}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

9.4 Additional information

> RW: technical committees have been established by river basin in order to ensure flood risk management plans implementation. these committees include local authorities and stakeholders;

9.5 Has your country established policies or guidelines for enhancing the role of wetlands in mitigating or adapting to climate change? {1.7.3} {1.7.5} KRA 1.7.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

9.5 Additional information

> RW: the Regional adaptation strategy has a special focus on water management and biodiversity.
- An action plan Air Climate and Energy 2016-2022 contains a measure on peatland conservation and restoration and a measure on soil erosion. Besides these measures, Water is considered as a transversal theme in adaptation. <http://www.awac.be/index.php/thematiques/politiques-actions/plan-pace>
- The Walloon Rain Plan aims to reduce the risks due to floods :
http://environnement.wallonie.be/de/dcenn/plan_pluies/
- Le Schéma régional des ressources en eau (SRRE) est un outil de planification et de réglementation de l'exploitation des ressources en eau qui s'articule autour de plusieurs axes : environnemental (maîtrise des pressions anthropiques, prise en compte de l'impact des changements climatiques), qualité de l'eau (mise en place de plans de gestion de la sécurité sanitaire de l'eau du risque[2], protection effective des captages) et économique (outils financiers à mettre en œuvre, maîtrise du coût-vérité de l'eau...)
BCR : The importance of the preservation of wetlands for the mitigation and adaptation to climate change is recognized in the draft of the new regional integrated plan for air, climate and energy. Action 108 forsee the reinforcement of the integration of this theme when revising the regional plan for water management.
FL: Regional adaptation strategy has been adopted in 2013 and gives special focus on water management and biodiversity.
For the Schelde river system strategies have been established related to the flooding control and are being implemented on site specific project basis.

9.6 Has your country formulated plans or projects to sustain and enhance the role of wetlands in supporting and maintaining viable farming systems? {1.7.4} {1.7.6} KRA 1.7.v

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

9.6 Additional information

> FL: Will be considered when developing the Natura 2000 management plans. Knowledge basis is being enhanced through studies on ecosystem services related to wetlands to highlight their importance for agricultural practices.

RW:

La préservation des ressources en eau est, de plus en plus, considérée comme un défi environnemental. Encore mal connue, la consommation d'eau du secteur agricole en Wallonie vient de faire l'objet d'une étude visant à évaluer l'eau consommée au sein d'exploitations de bovins viandeux et laitiers et d'exploitations agricoles de grandes cultures.

Premiers résultats

L'empreinte eau des bovins viandeux est estimée à 41 l éq H₂O/kg éq carcasse tandis que celle des bovins laitiers est évaluée à 3,7 l éq H₂O/l de lait. En moyenne, pour les bovins, 54 % de cette eau correspond aux besoins métaboliques de l'animal. Pour les bovins viandeux, le reste de l'eau consommée est attribué, à parts quasi égales, aux aliments autoproduits (22 %) et aux aliments achetés (23 %), une part minime (1 %) allant à la production d'énergie. Pour les bovins laitiers, en plus de l'eau pour les besoins métaboliques, de l'eau nécessaire à la fabrication des aliments autoproduits (16 %) et de l'eau nécessaire à la fabrication des aliments achetés (14 %), il faut ajouter l'eau de nettoyage des installations de traite et de stockage du lait (14 %) ainsi que l'eau nécessaire à la production d'énergie (2 %). L'empreinte eau des grandes cultures est estimée en moyenne à 2 415 l éq H₂O/ha. En moyenne, 52 % de cette eau est utilisée pour la production d'engrais minéraux et 39 % pour la mécanisation. Le reste de l'eau consommée est attribué à la production de produits phytopharmaceutiques (4 %) et à leur pulvérisation (4 %), ainsi qu'à la production d'énergie (1 %).

Préserver les ressources

Outre les préoccupations quant à la qualité de l'eau, la gestion quantitative de la ressource est un défi de taille. À l'heure actuelle, il n'existe pas suffisamment d'études pour établir des comparaisons avec les premiers résultats obtenus en Wallonie. La réalisation d'études supplémentaires devrait permettre la généralisation de l'utilisation de l'indicateur "empreinte eau" des spéculations agricoles à l'ensemble de la

9.7 Has research to inform wetland policies and plans been undertaken in your country on:

{1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i

Please select only one per square.

a) agriculture-wetland interactions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
b) climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
c) valuation of ecosystem services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned

9.7 Additional information

>

9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

9.8 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate How many request have been submitted

>

Target 10

The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels.

10.1 Have the guiding principles for taking into account the cultural values of wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19) been used or applied?.(Action 6.1.2/ 6.1.6)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=In Preparation
 C1=Partially
 D=Planned
 X=Unknown
 Y=Not Relevant

10.1 Additional information

> RW: not at national level, but communication material is available on the cultural values of some wetlands (for ex Ramsar site Haute Sûre).

FL: for the Zwin area in coastal wetlands, and the Schelde river system

10.2 Have case studies, participation in projects or successful experiences on cultural aspects of wetlands been compiled. Resolution VIII.19 and Resolution IX.21? (Action 6.1.6)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=In Preparation
 D=Planned

10.2 Additional information

If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands

>

10.3 Have the guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities' and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands been used or applied. (Resolution VII. 8) (Action 6.1.5)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=In Preparation
- D=Planned

10.3 Additional information

If the answer is "yes" please indicate the use or application of the guidelines

>

10.4 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their application encouraged (Action 6.1.2)

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=In Preparation
- D=Planned

10.4 Additional information

> RW: Some cultural heritage related to water management or use are being protected or restored, such as :

- the "historical center canal", the "Strépy-Thieu Funicular Lift", the "sloping lock of Ronquières" see:

<http://voiesdeau.hainaut.be/>;

- Several water mills have been restored, either for flour or for sewing eg "moulin de Hollange"

<http://www.moulindehollange.be>,

Target 11

Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.}

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.1} KRA 1.4.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=In Preparation
- C1=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

11.1 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, how many Ramsar Sites and their names

> Ecosystem services in general, no special focus on wetlands.

BE:

The Belgium Ecosystem Services (BEES) Community is an open and flexible network that will interface between different societal actors. The BEES Community has the following aims:

- Develop ecosystem services concepts, tools and practices that help to adapt human activity and clarify ecosystem thresholds in order to preserve the actual and potential well-being of present and future generations; and to stop ecosystem and biodiversity degradation, and improve their status.
- Develop mainstreaming & policy tools to promote the integration of ecosystem services concepts in policy and management, business and society.
- Facilitate capacity building, exchange of expertise and experience: including methodologies and transfer of knowledge on Belgian ecosystem services to policy and share the needs from policy makers on this issue, to enable involvement of Belgian actors in national and international initiatives and build the capacity to conduct assessments of ecosystem services.
- Provide overviews of state of the art knowledge and best practices

RW:

- For most Ramsar sites: leisure value recognized but not quantified.

FL:

- The website <http://www.natuurwaardeverkenner.be>, called the "nature value explorer", is a calculation tool to value ecosystem services and can help everyone who wants to map the socio-economic importance of ecosystems. The calculated figures inform policy makers of the gain or loss of welfare resulting from the impact of a project or policy on the delivery of ecosystem services, including services delivered by wetlands.

- The Flemish Institute for Technological Research and the universities of Antwerp and Ghent investigated the value of the Natura 2000-network in Flanders. They found out that the 166,000 hectares of protected areas in Flanders had among others the following benefits: more than 34 million tons of CO₂ stored each year, 4,000 to 8,000 tons of fine dust eliminated from the air each year, 16 million m³ of water purified each year and a gain of 2100 healthy life years (for about 1.8 million people), between 26 and 43 million visitors yearly. The experts concluded that the Natura 2000-areas in Flanders have a total value of 800 million to 1.2 billion euro for society. And this is still an underestimation given the fact that only 11 of the known 36 ecosystem services were taken into account. The report (in Dutch) is available at: http://www.natuurenbos.be/nl-BE/Natuurbeleid/Natuur%20en%20Natura%202000/Natura_2000/Waarom/Voordelen.aspx. For the summary in English: <http://www.natuurenbos.be/~media/Files/Themas/Natuur/Natura%202000/abstract%20estimate%20benefits%20Natura%202000%20-%20EN.pdf>.

Federal: no such assessment made for the marine Ramsar site.

11.2 Have wetland programmes or projects that contribute to poverty alleviation objectives or food and water security plans been implemented? {1.4.2} KRA 1.4.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned
 X=Unknown
 Y=Not Relevant

11.2 Additional information

> At the end of 2012, Wallonia had 4 surveillance zones and 205 prevention zones, nearly all of which (96%) are aimed at protecting water intended for the public water supply. The 408 protected water intakes account for +/- 40% of all drinking water abstracted from groundwater each year. This coverage rate is expected to grow considerably over the next few years. Moreover, budgets earmarked for protecting abstraction sites are constantly increasing, in particular those for compliance measures targeting activities causing point-source or diffuse pollution. The SPGE 2010-2019 protection programme foresees to complete the delimitation of prevention zones and to implement actions within them. The work will give priority to water intakes showing nitrate and/or pesticide problems, with a view to enabling the water bodies concerned to achieve the good status required by the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).

Le Schéma régional des ressources en eau (SRRE(a)) est un outil de planification et de réglementation de l'exploitation des ressources en eau qui s'articule autour de plusieurs axes : environnemental (maîtrise des pressions anthropiques, prise en compte de l'impact des changements climatiques), qualité de l'eau (mise en place de plans de gestion de la sécurité sanitaire de l'eau du risque[3], protection effective des captages) et économique (outils financiers à mettre en œuvre, maîtrise du coût-vérité de l'eau...). Les objectifs poursuivis sont entre autres : la régulation des prélèvements publics et privés (agricoles, industriels et domestiques), la sécurité d'approvisionnement du territoire wallon (taux de sécurisation de 30 %), l'accès à l'eau solidaire (mutualisation des coûts de production), la maîtrise du prix de l'eau (synergies entre les opérateurs afin de limiter les coûts d'investissement et d'exploitation), l'application du principe de récupération des coûts ainsi que la cohérence avec les autres politiques régionales (comme l'aménagement du territoire ou l'exploitation des ressources minérales).

<http://etat.environnement.wallonie.be/contents/indicator sheets/EAU%20Focus%202.html?thematic=4545095f-adac-4330-b43e-5ce772af4daa>

FL: Sigma plan in de Schelde basin includes goals: flood protection, accessibility for boats, and nature development and recreational possibilities and infrastructure.

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

11.3 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names

>

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.4 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names

> For the Ramsar sites "la vallée de la Haute Sure" and "Zwin"

Target 12

Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation. {1.8.}

12.1 Have priority sites for wetland restoration been identified? {1.8.1} KRA 1.8.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

12.1 Additional information

> - restoration of 15% of degraded ecosystems is part of the EU biodiversity strategy as well as part of the Belgian biodiversity strategy. In this regard, the Walloon region is reflecting on how to prioritize restoration in order to best implement these objectives.

- 2 main objectives of the water framework directives are the non degradation and the restoration of water bodies. In this regard, the Water code is under revision to include river restoration and priority actions for the free circulation of fishes;

Federal: fishery measures to protect the benthic fauna have been adopted - the programme of measures for the MSFD is currently being prepared - draft proposal of programme of measure foreseen to be made public by in 04/2015.

BCR: In the BCR, the Blue Network of the IBGE-BIM has more than 10 years of experience with regard to the restoration and management of unnavigable watercourses. It also works on wetland restoration which is executed with priority in Natura 2000 sites. Indeed, most of the wetlands are part of the Natura 2000 network.

FL: priority sites coincide with Natura 2000 areas for which restoration programmes are being developed.

RW: Prioritized hydromorphological restoration measures according to the Water and Flooding Directives;

12.2 Have wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes, plans or projects been effectively implemented? {1.8.2} KRA 1.8.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

12.2 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored

> RW:

Restoration measures are part of the management plans for all Natura 2000 sites.

Many restoration actions such as spawning grounds, meanders and river limbs, ripisylve;

Many project funded both by the Walloon region and the European maritime and fisheries fund intend to restore biodiversity, see <https://agriculture.wallonie.be/operations-cofinancees-par-le-feamp>

Creation of temporary immersion area in the event of floodings are encouraged to be designed to favor biodiversity;

BCR: The Ganshoren swamp, lots of ponds and segments of unnavigable watercourses have been restored withing the framework of the Blue Network.

FL: Restoration measures are being carried out through LIFE and Interreg projects for the Zwin site, Scheldt river, coastal zone, Nete river, and some sites along river Maas.

Target 13

Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods

13.1 Have actions been taken to enhance sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

13.1. Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the actions taken

> RW:

- Wetlands protection and conservation measures are included in the Water Code, in the Forest Code, in agricultural cross compliance, in agri environmental measures,...

- The Sustainable Management Programme for Nitrogen in Agriculture (or PGDA) has been revised in 2013. It aims to reduce water pollution due to agricultural practices and to enhance a sustainable use of nitrogen and humus in agriculture. <http://www.nitrawal.be/agriculteurs/legislations/PGDA>

- In 2012 the Walloon authorities have drawn up a pesticide reduction programme (PWRP) including measures involving professionals having to gain a licence to use Phyto Pharmaceutical Products (PPP), a ban on the use of PPPs in public spaces by 2019, the creation of buffer zones to protect aquatic habitats or the promotion of integrated pest management and alternative methods. <http://www.wallonie-reductionpesticides.be/fr>

BCR: The Brussels project RBSAP also foresees the protection and improvement of the condition of Brussels wetlands, essentially through the consolidation of the regional ecological network. See : <http://documentation.bruxellesenvironnement.be/documents/ProjetNAPLAN-fr.PDF?langtype=2060>

FL: Wetlands protection and conservation measures are included in the Integral Water Policy Decree, nature management plans, in agricultural cross compliance, and in agri environmental measures with focus on Natura 2000 sites that include wetlands.

13.2 Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? {1.3.3} {1.3.4} KRA 1.3.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

13.2 Additional information

> RW: Environmental assessments of plans and programs are included in the Walloon environmental code.

BCR: European directive 2001/42/CE of 27 June 2001 ensure that plans and programmes likely to have significant effects on the environment are made subject to an environmental assessment, prior to their approval or authorisation. Consultation with the public is a key feature of environmental assessment procedures. This directive has been transposed in the BCR in the order of 18 March 2004.

FL: Environmental assessment of plans and programs is foreseen by the environmental assessment decree in the Flemish law.

13.3 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands?

{1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Some Cases

13.3 Additional information

> The European Union has established a mix of mandatory and discretionary procedures to assess environmental impacts. European Union Directive on Environmental Impact Assessments (known as the EIA Directive) has been codified in Directive 2011/92/EU of 13 December 2011. Under the EU directive, an EIA must provide certain information to comply. This Directive has been transposed in Regional policy, and is applied through the environmental and the urbanistic permit procedures.

Assessment of the plans and projects in relation to NATURA 2000 sites is provision of the European Habitats

Directive (92/43/EEC), in particular its article 6(3) and 6(4). The aim of these articles is to reveal negative impacts of plans and projects to coherence of NATURA 2000 network through appropriate assessment (AA) of their possible effects on integrity of the NATURA 2000 sites and in particular in regards to their effect on species and habitats that are sites target features. If impacts are detected such plans and projects have to be either avoided or amended, or if imperative reasons of overriding public interest are proved compensatory measures in favour of NATURA 2000 have to be taken to ensure overall coherence of the NATURA 2000 network.

RW / FL: EIA are required under the Environmental code or regional decree (environment and urban permits required).

BCR: Transposed in the order of 1st March 2012, this principle of the directive has been extended in the BCR to the nature and forest reserves.

Goal 4. Enhancing implementation

Target 15

Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}

15.1 Have you (AA) been involved in the development and implementation of a Regional Initiative under the framework of the Convention? {3.2.1} KRA 3.2.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

15.1 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Planned', please indicate the regional initiative(s) and the collaborating countries of each initiative
>

15.2 Has your country supported or participated in the development of other regional (i.e., covering more than one country) wetland training and research centres? {3.2.2}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

15.2 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the name(s) of the centre(s)
>

Target 16

Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}

16.1 Has an action plan (or plans) for wetland CEPA been established? {4.1.1} KRA 4.1.i

Even if no CEPA plans have been developed, if broad CEPA objectives for CEPA actions have been established, please indicate this in the Additional information section below

Please select only one per square.

a) At the national level	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
b) Sub national level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
c) Catchment/basin level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned

d) Local/site level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
---------------------	--

16.1 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'In progress' to one or more of the four questions above, for each please describe the mechanism, who is responsible and identify if it has involved CEPA NFPs

> RW: No new ones since 2014 which were:

11 regional center for environmental education (CRIE), several of them are oriented on wetlands such as the one of Harchies: <http://www.crie.be/CRIE-d-Harchies.html>

Centre Nature de Botrange <http://www.botrange.be/naccueil/fr/>,

Natural parcs have their information centers, several of them have a section on wetlands like for the Haute Sûre : <http://www.parcnaturel.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=339> ; <http://www.fpnw.be/>

Virelles Nature and its aquascope: <http://www.aquascope.be/>

16.2a How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii

a) at Ramsar Sites

Please select only one option

E=Exact Number (centres)

>

F=Less than (centres)

>

G=More than (centres)

> 4

C=Partially

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

16.2b How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii

b) at other wetlands

Please select only one option

E=Exact Number (centres)

>

F=Less than (centres)

>

G=More than (centres)

> 6

C=Partially

X=Unknown

Y=Not Relevant

16.2 Additional information

If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks

> see 16.1.

Information centers in 3 of the 4 Walloon Ramsar Sites, in XX of the Flemish sites

16.3 Does the Contracting Party {4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii

Please select only one per square.

a) promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management?	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned

16.3 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved
 > - Participation in decision-making to wetland management through the Natura 2000 committees and processes.
 - new Ramsar sites are not being planned at this moment
 - public consultation through the Integrated Water Policy Committee action and processes

16.4 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

16.4 Additional information

If 'Yes', indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP12; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has

> he Ramsar national committee is taken by the Coordination Committee for International Environmental Policy (CCIEP) Working group on Nature which ensures that Belgium brings well-argued opinions on environmental policy to the international scene. These coordinated standpoints require a preceding debate both at technical and political level. Representatives from all Régions and the federal for all international or european nature related agreements (CMS (and its daughter agreements), CITES, Ramsar, CBD, ...) and other stakeholders are represented.

<http://www.sante.belgique.be/eportal/Environment/Inspectionandenvironmentalrigh/international/CCPIE/10972455?ie2Term=CCIM&ie2section=83&&fodnlang=en>

16.5 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral body equivalent to a National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

16.5 Additional information

If 'Yes', indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP12; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has

>

16.6 Are other communication mechanisms (apart from a national committee) in place to share Ramsar implementation guidelines and other information between the Administrative Authority and a), b) or c) below? {4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi:

Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Site managers	<input type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
b) other MEA national focal points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned
c) other ministries, departments and agencies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A=Yes <input type="checkbox"/> B=No <input type="checkbox"/> C=Partially <input type="checkbox"/> D=Planned

16.6 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please describe what mechanisms are in place

> see 16.4

16.7 Have Ramsar-branded World Wetlands Day activities (whether on 2 February or at another time of year), either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out in the country since COP12? {4.1.8}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No

16.7 Additional information

> Each year in the Ramsar Site "la vallée de la Haute-Sûre", and in some other Ramsar sites

16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP12 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned

16.8 Additional information

If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this

>

Target 17

Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}

17.1a Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2015, 2016 and 2017? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 Z=Not Applicable

17.1b If 'No' in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment

>

17.2 Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to non-core funded Convention activities? {4.2.2} KRA 4.2.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No

17.2 Additional information

If 'Yes' please state the amounts, and for which activities

>

17.3 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only ('donor countries')]: Has the agency provided funding to support wetland conservation and management in other countries? {3.3.1} KRA 3.3.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 Z=Not Applicable

17.3 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the countries supported since COP12

>

17.4 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only ('donor countries')]: Have environmental safeguards and assessments been included in development proposals proposed by the agency? {3.3.2} KRA 3.3.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No

- C=Partially
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant
- Z=Not Applicable

17.4 Additional information

>

17.5 [For Contracting Parties that have received development assistance only ('recipient countries')]: Has funding support been received from development assistance agencies specifically for in-country wetland conservation and management? {3.3.3}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- Z=Not Applicable

17.5 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate from which countries/agencies since COP12

>

17.6 Has any financial support been provided by your country to the implementation of the Strategic Plan?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- Z=Not Applicable

17.6 Additional information

If "Yes" please state the amounts, and for which activities

>

Target 18

International cooperation is strengthened at all levels {3.1}

18.1 Are the national focal points of other MEAs invited to participate in the National Ramsar/Wetland Committee? {3.1.1} {3.1.2} KRAs 3.1.i & 3.1.iv

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

18.1 Additional information

> The role of "Ramsar national committee" is taken up by the Coordination Committee for International Environmental Policy (CCIEP) Working group on Nature which ensures that Belgium brings well-argued opinions on environmental policy to the international scene. These coordinated standpoints require a preceding debate both at technical and political level. Representatives from all Régions and the federal for all international or european nature related agreements are present (CMS (and its daughter agreements), CITES, Ramsar, CBD, ...)

<http://www.sante.belgique.be/eportal/Environment/Inspectionandenvironmentalrigh/international/CCPIE/10972455?ie2Term=CCIM&ie2section=83&&fodnlang=en>

18.2 Are mechanisms in place at the national level for collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO)? {3.1.2} {3.1.3} KRA 3.1.iv

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

18.2 Additional information

> he Ramsar national committee is taken by the Coordination Committee for International Environmental Policy (CCIEP) Working group on Nature which ensures that Belgium brings well-argued opinions on environmental policy to the international scene. These coordinated standpoints require a preceding debate both at technical and political level. Representatives from all Régions and the federal for all international or

European nature related agreements are present (CMS (and its daughter agreements), CITES, Ramsar, CBD, ...)
<http://www.sante.belgique.be/eportal/Environment/Inspectionandenvironmentalrigh/international/CCPIE/10972455?ie2Term=CCIM&ie2section=83&&fodnlang=en>

18.3 Has your country received assistance from one or more UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO) or the Convention's IOPs in its implementation of the Convention? {4.4.1} KRA 4.4.ii.

The IOPs are: BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), Wetlands International, WWF and Wildfowl & Wetland Trust (WWT).

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

18.3 Additional information

If 'Yes' please name the agency (es) or IOP (s) and the type of assistance received

>

18.4 Have networks, including twinning arrangements, been established, nationally or internationally, for knowledge sharing and training for wetlands that share common features? {3.4.1}

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

18.4 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate the networks and wetlands involved

> The Maas, the Rhine and the Schelde International Commissions are international agreements which were signed in 2002. They aim to meet the effective obligation to multilaterally coordinate at the river basin scale, as stipulated by the European Water Framework Directive; this included knowledge sharing.

Sharing of experiences for wetlands issues in Natura 2000 sites, and Natural parks also occurs at the national level and at the European level.

18.5 Has information about your country's wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites and their status been made public (e.g., through publications or a website)? {3.4.2} KRA 3.4.iv

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

18.5 Additional information

> RW: nothing new since 2014 (see previous report)

Other information is available on several websites such as

<http://biodiversite.wallonie.be/fr/accueil.html?IDC=6>

Federal: see brochures and reports made available on the website www.de-noordzee.be and www.lamerdunord.be

FL: site specific websites, various publications:

<https://www.mercator.vlaanderen.be/zoekdienstenmercatorpubliek/srv/nl/metadata.show?currTab=simple&id=155>

- Scheldt river: <http://www.natuurenbos.be/nl-BE/over-ons/projecten/scheldeproject>

<http://www.marinerregions.org/gazetteer.php?p=details&id=30667&from=rss>

http://www.inbo.be/content/page.asp?pid=MON_waaslandhaven

<http://scheldeschorren.be/cms/vroeger-en-nu/beschermingen-en-statuut>

http://www.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=*ECOBE&n=76397

http://www.gs-esf.be/mailler/mailler-GSNB-58/NL/GSNB58_T6.htm

- Zwin: http://www.natuurenbos.be/nl-BE/domeinen/west-vlaanderen/zwin/eigendom_situatie

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3867

http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/vj7kxh1am4t8/mede_mogelijk_gemaakt_door_de_eu_28

- Kalmthout: www.kalmthout.be/125827.fil

http://www.natuurpunt.be/nl/vereniging/campagnes-en-acties/biodiversiteit_1618.aspx
<http://www.grensparkzk.nl/>
- IJzerbroeken; http://www.natuurenbos.be/nl-BE/Domeinen/West-Vlaanderen/IJzer_en_Handzamevallei.aspx
http://www.natuurpunt.be/natuurgebied-de-blankaart_42.aspx
http://www.vlm.be/SiteCollectionDocuments/OO/081001_blankaart/RAPP_BLA_Projectuitvoeringsplan%20fase%201.pdf

18.6 Has information about your country's wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites been transmitted to the Ramsar Secretariat for dissemination? {3.4.3} KRA 3.4.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

18.6 Additional Information

>

18.7 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned
 Z=Not Applicable

18.7 Additional information

> Yes , according to the Water framework Directive, we work on international hydrological district basis.

18.8 Is effective cooperative management in place for shared wetland systems (for example, in shared river basins and coastal zones)? {3.5.2} KRA 3.5.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned
 Y=Not Relevant

18.8 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place

>

18.9 Does your country participate in regional networks or initiatives for wetland-dependent migratory species? {3.5.3} KRA 3.5.iii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 D=Planned
 Z=Not Applicable

18.9 Additional information

> Belgium is a Party to the CMS convention and its agreements such as AEWA.

Target 19

Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced.

19.1 Has an assessment of national and local training needs for the implementation of the Convention been made? {4.1.4} KRAs 4.1.iv & 4.1.viii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
 B=No
 C=Partially
 D=Planned

19.1 Additional information

>

19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

19.2 Additional information

If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials

>

19.3a How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP12?

{4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv

a) at Ramsar Sites

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (opportunities)

>

- F=Less than (opportunities)

>

- G=More than (opportunities)

>

- C=Partially
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

19.3b How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP12?

{4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv

b) at other wetlands

Please select only one option

- E=Exact number (Opportunities)

>

- F=Less than (Opportunities)

>

- G=More than (Opportunities)
- C=Partially
- X=Unknown
- Y=Not Relevant

19.3 Additional information

including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training

> RW: trainings, information sessions etc have been organised on restoration measures for river managers;

19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned
- Z=Not Applicable

19.4 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring

>

Section 4. Optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that has developed national targets to provide information on those

Goal 1

Target 1: Wetland benefits

Wetland benefits are featured in national / local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level. Contributes to Aichi Target 2

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 1: Wetland benefits - National Targets

>

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Planned activity

>

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 2: Water Use

Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone. Contributes to Aichi Targets 7 and 8 and Sustainable Development Goal 6.3.1

Target 2: Water Use - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 2: Water Use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 2: Water Use - National Targets

>

Target 2: Water Use - Planned activity

>

Target 2: Water Use - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 3: Public and private sectors

Public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands. {1.10}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 3, 4, 7 and 8.

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 3: Public and private sectors - National Targets

>

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Planned activity

>

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 4: Invasive alien species

Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment. Contributes to Aichi Target 9.

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 4: Invasive alien species - National Targets

>

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Planned activity

>

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Goal 2

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites

The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}. Contributes to Aichi Target 6,11, 12.

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - National Targets

>

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Planned activity

>

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 7: Sites at risk

Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11, 12.

Target 7: Sites at risk - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 7: Sites at risk - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 7: Sites at risk - National Targets

>

Target 7: Sites at risk - Planned activity

>

Target 7: Sites at risk - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Goal 3

Target 8: National wetland inventories

National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i. Contributes to Aichi Targets 12, 14, 18, 19.

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 8: National wetland inventories - National Targets

>

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Planned activity

>

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 9: Wise Use

The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone {1.3.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7.

Target 9: Wise Use - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 9: Wise Use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 9: Wise Use - National Targets

>

Target 9: Wise Use - Planned activity

>

Target 9: Wise Use - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge

The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels. Contributes to Aichi Target 18.

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - National Targets

>

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Planned activity

>

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 11: Wetland functions

Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4}.
Contributes to Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 14.

Target 11: Wetland functions - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 11: Wetland functions - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 11: Wetland functions - National Targets

>

Target 11: Wetland functions - Planned activity

>

Target 11: Wetland functions - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 12: Restoration

Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation. {1.8.}.
Contributes to Aichi Targets 14 and 15.

Target 12: Restoration - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 12: Restoration - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 12: Restoration - National Targets

>

Target 12: Restoration - Planned activity

>

Target 12: Restoration - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability

Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods. Contributes to Aichi Targets 6 and 7.

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - National Targets

>

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Planned activity

>

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Goal 4

Target 15: Regional Initiatives

Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - National Targets

>

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Planned activity

>

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use

Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}. Contributes to Aichi Target 1 and 18.

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - National Targets

>

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Planned activity

>

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 17: Financial and other resources

Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 - 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}. Contributes to Aichi Target 20.

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 17: Financial and other resources - National Targets

>

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Planned activity

>

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 18: International cooperation

International cooperation is strengthened at all levels {3.1}

Target 18: International cooperation - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 18: International cooperation - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 18: International cooperation - National Targets

>

Target 18: International cooperation - Planned activity

>

Target 18: International cooperation - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Target 19: Capacity Building

Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced. Contributes to Aichi Targets 1 and 17.

Target 19: Capacity Building - Priority

Please select only one option

- A=High
- B=Medium
- C=Low
- D=Not relevant
- E=No answer

Target 19: Capacity Building - Resourcing

Please select only one option

- A=Good
- B=Adequate
- C=Limiting
- D=Severely limiting
- E=No answer

Target 19: Capacity Building - National Targets

>

Target 19: Capacity Building - Planned activity

>

Target 19: Capacity Building - Outcomes achieved by 2018

Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018

>

Section 5: Optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that so wishes to provide additional information regarding any of all of its designated Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites)

Guidance for filling in this section

1. Contracting Parties can provide additional information specific to any or all of their designated Ramsar Sites, given that the situation and status of individual Ramsar Sites can differ greatly within the territory of a Contracting Party.
 2. The only indicator questions included in this section are those from Section 3 of the COP13 NRF which directly concern Ramsar Sites.
 3. In some cases, to make them meaningful in the context of reporting on each Ramsar Site separately, some of these indicator questions and/or their answer options have been adjusted from their formulation in Section 3 of the COP13 NRF.
 4. Please include information on only one site in each row. In the appropriate columns please add the name and official site number (from the Ramsar Sites Information Service).
 5. For each 'indicator question', please select one answer from the legend.
 6. A final column of this Annex is provided as a 'free text' box for the inclusion of any additional information concerning the Ramsar Site.
- A final column of this Annex is provided as a 'free text' box for the inclusion of any additional information concerning the Ramsar Site.

Belgium

De Ijzerbroeken te Diksmuide en Lo-Reninge (329)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Grotte des Emotions (1406)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

> ce site est un site souterrain non accessible au public; Il n'est qu'occasionnellement visité par des spéléologues.

Kalmthoutse Heide (330)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Les Hautes Fagnes (1405)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Marais d'Harchies (331)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes

- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Schorren van de Beneden Schelde (327)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Vallée de la Haute-Sûre (1407)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes

- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Vlaamse Banken (326)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>

Zwin (328)

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- C=Partially
- Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

Please select only one option

- A=Yes
- B=No
- D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

>