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)

> Netherlands

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

roesta 2018-02-12 15-14 49314.pdf

Designated Ramsar Administrative Authority

Name of Administrative Authority
> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Head of Administrative Authority - name and title > Drs. R. Feringa,

Mailing address

Director of the Department Nature and Biodiversity, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality. P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands

Telephone/Fax

> +31 70 3785004

Email

> r.feringa@minez.nl

Designated National Focal Point for Ramsar Convention Matters

Name and title

> A.J. Pel, Policy Officer

Mailing address

> P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands

Telephone/Fax

> 06-467 146 94

Email

> a.j.pel@minez.nl

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

Name and title

> vacant

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 > A.J. Pel, Policy Officer

Name of organisation

> Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Mailing address

> P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands

Telephone/Fax

> 06-467 146 94

Email

> a.j.pel@minez.nl

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

Name and title

> vacant

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)

> One of the most succesfull aspects past years (past triennium and before) has been the large-scale transition of (agricultural) land into natural riverine areas and the restoration of natural processes along the large Dutch rivers Rhine, Meuse, Scheldt and Ems. The projects not only aimed to create more storage capacity for (climate change induced) peak water events, but also to restore natural processes to improve the quality of the immediate surroundings for human and nature.

The Dutch Room for the River Programme (2007-2017) was run by Rijkswaterstaat (Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment) and was carried out at 34 locations. Other programs are running as well like NURG (Nadere Uitwerking Rivierengebied) by nature conservation organisation Staatsbosbeheer and Rijkswaterstaat (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management).

Wetland monitoring programmes confirmed the positive response of a number of wetland species, among which iconic ones like White-tailed Sea Eagle, Osprey, Great Egret, Beaver and Otter. The results have among others been published in a Dutch and English language book called 'Room for the river – Safe and Attractive landscapes' (December 2017).

- 2)
- > In 2014, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment launched the 'Nature Ambition Large Waters' (Natuurambitie Grote Wateren). The implementation towards this ambition has been started by initiating a comprehensive participatory stakeholder-approach, aiming to define objectives and directions for restoration and development of the five large, internationally important wetland systems. This approach takes into account all economic interests and includes all involved levels of government. Importantly, nature-inclusive solutions are sought to safeguard objectives for flood security and fresh water provision. NGO's actively participate in this process, amongst other through the Climate Buffer Coalition. This coalition consists of eight Dutch nature organisations, co-funded by the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment. The first programme ended by the end of 2014 wich resulted in 20 so-called climate buffers. Nature-based solutions should become mainstream and the coalition continued after 2014, among others early 2017 as partner of LIFE IP Delta Nature.
- 3)
- > Currently Europe's largest nature restoration project is carried out in Ramsar site Markermeer & IJmeer (700 km² fresh water lake). Some 85 years ago the area was still a shallow tidal marine area but it was dammed from the sea in 1932. The area transformed into a stagnant fresh water lake having barely any natural shores. Its waters are often extremely turbid as wind and waves churn up the accumulated sediments from the shallow lake floor (2-4 m deep). As a result, fish and bird populations declined dramatically, especially past 20 years. It was clear that major measures had to be taken in order to develop and restore the values of the Markermeer & IJmeer, especially for the benefit of nature and recreation.
- In 2012 the Vereniging Natuurmonumenten (Dutch Society for Nature Conservation) presented a 'Building with Nature' restoration project aiming to create an archipelago of some 10.000 hectares of islands, marshes and mud flats from the lakes sediments. This archipelago is called the Marker Wadden. On May 11th 2016 the first island emerged and in 2017 already some 2000 breeding birds were observed, mainly terns, gulls and plovers also threatened ones. Thousands of migratory birds already use the Marker Wadden as a stopover site

This 75 million project, which runs until 2020, is a successful example of a public-private partnership with many partners like: Natuurmonumenten, the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, the provinces of Flevoland and Noord-Holland, Vogelbescherming Nederland (BirdLife in The Netherlands), ANWB (The Royal Dutch Touring Club), VNO-NCW (the Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers), the National postcode lottery, WWF, Sportvisserij Nederland (Sport Fishing Netherlands), Arcadis, Boskalis, Royal Haskoning DHV, the Adessium Foundation and the ING Bank.

In addition, financial support by the Ministry of Economic Affairs to Vogelbescherming Nederland to develop a project proposal for the restoration of Lake IJsselmeer, helped secure funding for pilot projects but also provided a boost for the aforementioned stakeholder process in IJsselmeer (Gebiedsagenda 2050), which is now an example for the remaining four major wetlands.

- 4)
- > More than 21% of the total area of the Netherlands is designated as a Ramsar site. The new 'National Water Plan 2016-2021' provides the broad outlines, principles and direction of the national water policy for the 2016-2021 planning period, with a preview towards 2050. It is the Cabinet's next step towards a robust and future oriented design of the Dutch water system, aimed at effective protection against floods, at the prevention of

pluvial flooding and drought, and at achieving good water quality and a healthy ecosystem as the basis for welfare and prosperity. The Cabinet aims to adopt a comprehensive approach, by developing nature, shipping, agriculture, energy, housing, recreation, cultural heritage and the economy (including earning potential), as much as possible in conjunction with water tasking. The ambition is that - by 2021 - government authorities, businesses and citizens are made more aware of the opportunities and threats of water in their own immediate environment. Everyone will take their own responsibilities in bringing about together a water-robust spatial design, limiting pluvial flooding and disasters, and acting wisely in extreme situations.

> Eutrofication of surface waters with Nitrogen (N) is one of the main threats to aquatic biodiversity in the Netherlands. The Dutch Programmatic Approach to Nitrogen (PAN 2015-2021) has been adopted on 1 July 2015 in Dutch parliament and is to be seen as one of the most ambitious regulatory efforts in this regard. This integrated approach to N seeks to achieve the EU biodiversity goals in the context of elevated levels of N deposition without fundamentally compromising the room for future economic (agricultural) development. The PAN is based on principles such as adaptability and flexibility, aiming at achieving a fair balance between the adoption of preventative and restoration measures, on the one hand, and allowing sufficient room for further economic development, on the other hand. Though the implementation can be regarded a success, future evaluation studies will need to assess the (positive) impact om biodiversity.

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

- 1)
- > The statutory basis for nature conservation in Natura 2000 sites (all Ramsar sites are also designated Natura 2000-sites), has given nature a stronger position in these areas. This among others, has delayed the multistakeholderprocesses for the revision of management plans, because the consequences of economic use of wetlands become clear only at the stage of defining and programming implementation of these plans. The progress in addressing the very considerable pressures of especially agriculture and fisheries on (wetland) nature has been limited. This continues to negatively affect both wetland resilience and the ecological carrying capacity of economic use of wetlands. Notably, with water quality improving, water quantity especially the lack of natural water level fluctuations is limiting the conservation of biodiversity in wetlands.
- Management of inasive species: new water connections and international transport and trade cause the introduction of new species in the Netherlands. The Danube-Rhine canal for instance connected the Danube and Rhine flora and fauna. Nowadays, alien species outnumber the native species in the large Dutch rivers. Native species still occur though, and it is not clear yet to what extent alien species are invasive and replace native ones. Climate change is one of the factors which enable foreign species to settle in the Netherlands.
- 3)
 > The progress on the defragmentation of habitat through the construction of ecological corridors and mitigation of obstacles advances slowly. The Netherlands defragmentation program runs until 2018, and the expectation is that finally 78% of bottlenecks (terrestrial and aquatic) will be solved. The other 22% are robust corridors, which were cancelled by government. Many waters, rivers and streams in the Netherlands will
- therefore remain isolated for migratory fish (though on the positive side also for invasive species).

 4)

 > Decreasing environmental pressures: substantial efforts to decrease environmental pressures past decades, like atmospheric nitrogen deposition, acidification and desiccation, have made a significant contribution to slowing down the rate of biodiversity loss in the Netherlands.
- However, a further decrease is needed in order to be able to stop biodiversity loss on land and in the water. The level for sustainable nature conservation has not yet been reached. Though (inter)national environmental measures have substantially improved the river water quality, especially for nutrients (see http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl0249-vermesting-in-grote-rivieren?ond=20900), the quality does still not meet the required EU Water Framework Directive standards (see http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1438-kwaliteit-oppervlaktewater-krw).
- 5)
 > The monitoring of the desiccation of nature has stopped in 2004. Also the support point on desiccation was abolished per 1-1-2012. It's unclear now what the status and trend is on the desiccation of nature in the Netherlands.

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

- 1)
- >) Implementation of the National Water Plan 2016-2021 (https://www.government.nl/documents/policynotes/2015/12/14/national-water-plan-2016-2021).

- 2)
- > Implementation of the 'Natuurambitie grote wateren: 2050 en verder' (Nature Ambition Great Waters: 2050 and beyond). (https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2016/01/19/natuurambitie-grote-wateren-2050-en-verder). Most of the 'great waters' are Ramsar sites (except the North Sea and big Rivers). Giving room to natural processes is the core of this policy document. This will lead to resilient and robust nature, which not only conserves biodiversity but which is also beneficial to many other ecosystem services like: protection against flooding (climate change induced sea level rise and increasing varying rainfall patterns are threatening the Netherlands, 2/3 of which lies below sea level), recreational use, agriculture etc. Plausible scenarios are: more room for the large rivers to be able to manage increasing peak rainfall patterns; restoration of tidal systems and fresh water-salt water gradients in the Southwestern Delta, dynamic coastal management and gradual transition zones from land to water in the IJsselmeer area, restore fish connectivity. Realisation of these ambitions is expected to give a boost to the biodiversity values of many Ramsar sites concerned, as well as securing ecosystem services for the future.
- 3)
- > Decreasing pollution: The environmental conditions in the Netherlands have substantially improved since the 1990's. However, pollution by agricultural nutrients is still above critical levels and is detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity. The further implementation of the action program concerning the Nitrates Directive (https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2014/12/02/5e-nederlandse-apbetreffende-de-nitraatrichtlijn-2014-2017) and implementation of the Programmatic Approach to Nitrogen (http://pas.natura2000.nl/pages/home.aspxare) are among the main priorities to decrease pollution.
- 4)
- > Defragmentation of wetland ares: The National Nature Network (NNN), which includes all Ramsar sites, is the cornerstone of biodiversity conservation in the Netherlands. The development of the NNN began in 1990 and it is still increasing in size.
- 5)
- Restoration of migration routes between fresh and marine waters, especially for migratory fish species. One of the major projects is the so-called Kierbesluit which concerns the opening of the Haringvlietdam in 2018, which blocks the North Sea from the fresh water of the Ramsar site Haringvliet (https://www.rijkswaterstaat.nl/water/projectenoverzicht/haringvliet-haringvlietsluizen-op-een-kier/index.aspx). Another major project, still in its early phase, concerns the Fish Migration River https://www.theafsluitdijk.com/projecten/fish-migration-river/ between the Ramsar sites Wadden Sea and Ilsselmeer.
- D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?
- > Not particularly.
- 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) > Not particularly. There is already a good cooperation with Wetlands International and Birdlife International. There is a close cooperation with the Dutch Birdlife partner Vogelbescherming Nederland, e.g. as a member of the National Ramsar Committee.
- 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)?
- > Better linking of MEAs and increasing the efficiency can among others be achieved through making sure that:
- the different MEAs apply to equal delineated sites, meaning that the data collected per site are applicable to all other MEAs.
- the questionnaires coming with all MEAs are better coordinated, meaning that the information provided to an MEA is also equally applicable to other MEAs. If possible, digital questionaires should be merged and timing of national reports should be close to each other allowing that the MEAs can be updated using same data. In anticipation thereof, the Netherlands adjusted the borders of the Ramsar sites to the respective Natura 2000 sites. All Natura 2000-measures, like management plans and monitoring of species, now also apply to Ramsar and other MEAs like CMS and AEWA. This will substantially increase the efficiency and savings on budget (see Ramsar-news of January 2017 on acceptance of updated Ramsar Information Sheets https://www.ramsar.org/news/netherlands-completes-updating-of-ramsar-sites).

Common grounds between the different MEA's should be found. Where can we strengthen each other and

help to reach common goals. So not working in each others scope but working closely on the same goals within your own specialism.

- 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)?
- > The Ramsar obligations are generally well integrated in national, regional and local policies and strategies, like the implementation of Natura 2000, the Water Framework Directive, the National Nature Network or the work of the Water Boards (Waterschappen) which combine water quality and water quantity management. The impacts of climate change request safety measures as laid down in the Delta Program 2018 (https://deltaprogramma2018.deltacommissaris.nl/viewer/publication/1/2-deltaprogramma-), to protect the Netherlands from flooding by the the sea or rivers. Besides technical measures. This can also be measures to 'build with nature' making use of natural processes, like sedimentation. The policy document 'Nature Ambition Great Waters 2050 and beyond' is an elaboration on this and is in line with the Ramsar goals.
- H. Do you (AA) have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention?

 The Ramsar obligations are generally well integrated in policies and strategies (see G). The Ramsar sites in the Netherlands, are well protected sites, designated under Natura 2000 and part of the National Nature Network. The impact of all these measures on the condition of wetlands can generally however not be observed within a triennium or three years period. This requests long-term monitoring. The Netherlands currently concentrate on wetlands of international importance abroad, especially wetlands within the AEWA flyway and Wetlands in the Dutch Caribbean.
- I. Please list the names of the organisations which have been consulted on or have contributed to the information provided in this report
- > Staatsbosbeheer, Vogelbescherming (VBN; Netherlands society for the protection of birds), Wereldnatuurfonds (WWF).

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	☐ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☐ Y=Not Relevant
b) Poverty eradication strategies	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown ☑ Y=Not Relevant
c) Water resource management and water efficiency plans	☐ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☐ Y=Not Relevant
d) Coastal and marine resource management plans	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
e) Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
f) National forest programmes	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
g) National policies or measures on agriculture	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
h) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD	☐ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☐ Y=Not Relevant
i) National policies on energy and mining	☑ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant

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

1.1 Additional information

> The Netherlands does not have a poverty reduction strategy (not applicable). On the other hand, poverty alleviation has been at the heart of Dutch international development policies, including its biodiversity component, for many years.

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

	4	Α	=	Y	29
ı	ı∡⊔	м	_	15	=:

□ B=No

☐ C=Partially

□ D=Planned

2.1 Additional Information

> The Netherlands, like all other EU Member States, has the obligation to implement the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). The WFD establishes a legal framework to protect and restore clean water across Europe and ensure its long-term, sustainable use. The directive establishes an innovative approach for water management based on river basins, the natural geographical and hydrological units and sets specific deadlines for Member States to protect aquatic ecosystems. The directive addresses inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwater.

Several indicators are available on the quality and quantity of water, like:

 Species trends of fresh waters: http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1577-trend-zoetwater-faunaliving-planet-index Biological quality of surface waters: http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1420-krw-biologische-kwaliteit-oppervlaktewater Measures for migratory fish: http://www.clo.nl/en/indicators/en1350-measures-for-migratory-fish Area of Mussel and Oister Banks in the Wadden Sea: http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1559-arealen-mossel-en-oesterbanken-in-de-waddenzee
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
> The Netherlands put lots of efforts in the decline and mitigation of environmentally harmfull substances. Long-term monitoring is carried out to assess the impact of this policy. Results to date reveal that the environmental quality and water quality have improved in natural areas since 1990 (reference year). The environmental pressure from eutrophication, acidification, desiccation and poor water quality is decreasing. However, the environmental pressure is still considered too high to ensure an optimum quality of habitat for many species.
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 > Allocation and management of water for maintaining ecological functions of wetlands is an integral part of the decision-making process in the Netherlands, also without the Ramsar Guidelines.
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 > The quantity and quality of water available to and required by wetlands, has for decades been an integral part of individual wetland management plans. Maximizing the ecological values is not always the main function. Management plans illustrate a balance between ecology and other functions.

The large area of the IJsselmeer Ramsar Site for instance plays a crucial role in the provision of fresh water in the Northern half of the Netherlands as well as it has a crucial water storage function for periods with peak river discharges. This is why this wetland is managed with (unnatural) high water levels during the summer months (to safeguard fresh water supply for dry periods) and an (unnatural) low winter level to safeguard storage capacity during peak water events. This however limits the conservation of critical habitats for birds and fish, for example breeding island, reed marshes, riparian shallows and flooded grasslands. The aim is to address this in creating simulated floodlands behind dykes ('achteroevers'), which are connected to the main lake.

The ecological conditions of most (protected) wetlands depends on the water quality of external sources, like rivers. This is still a concern. Though (inter)national environmental measures have substantially improved the river water quality, especially for nutrients (see http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl0249-vermesting-in-grote-rivieren?ond=20900), the quality does still not meet the required EU Water Framework Directive standards (see http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1438-kwaliteit-oppervlaktewater-krw).

Nevertheless has the ecological condition of wetlands generally improved. The 1990 Nature Policy Plan introduced the National Nature Network which is still the corner stone of nature policy in The Netherlands. The network includes nature conservation areas (like all Ramsar sites), nature development areas and ecological corridors. To date a wide range of smaller and larger wetland development projects have emerged as part of larger programs known as e.g. 'Building with nature', 'Room for the River' and the 'Nature Ambition Great Waters 2050 and beyond'. These programs not only result in restoration of ecosystem services but often also demonstrate the comeback of iconic wetland species like Beaver, Otter, White-tailed Sea Eagle, Osprey, Common Crane and many others.

Common Crane and many others.
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)
> 99,6% households /100% municipality's □ F=Less than (households/municipalities)
→ □ G=More than (households/municipalities)
> □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
2.6 Additional Information All municipalities and more than 99.6% of all households in the Netherlands are linked to the sewage system. Less than 29.000 households living at more or less remote isolated locations are not connected (equivalent to 65.000 people or 0.4%; source Stichting RioNed Riool in Cijfers 2009 - 2010). These households all have an individual sewage treatment system, like a septic tank. Some improvements are still to be made in the (recreational) shipping sector, see: http://zeilen.watersporters.nl/bootmateriaal/afvalwater/ and http://www.emissieregistratie.nl/erpubliek/documenten/Water/Factsheets/Nederlands/Huishoudelijk%20afvalw ater%20scheepvaart.pdf
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)
> 100 □ F=Less than (percentage)
→ □ G=More than (percentage)
> □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
2.7 Additional Information > 100% as all sewage water is treated.
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)
> < 0.4

☐ F=Less than (percentage)

\square G=More than (percentage)
> □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
2.8 Additional InformationNot exactly clear but less than 0.4% (source Stichting RioNed, Riool in Cijfers 2009 - 2010).
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> Helophyte filters are occasionally used to treat (pre-treated) sewage water before drain off in surface waters.
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) > 353 □ F=Less than (plants)
> □ G=More than (plants)
> □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant
2.11 Additional Information >/
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 > The vision on wastewater management by The Association of Netherlands Municipalities and the Association of Regional Water Authorities has been presented in a brochure (in 2013) titled: Wastewater management roadmap towards 2030. A sustainable approach to the collection and treatment of wastewater in the Netherlands.
Wastewater management will fundamentally change in coming years. In 2030, the wastewater management partners are convinced they will contribute substantially to the sustainability of Dutch society. Regional water authorities and municipalities will be converting waste into clean raw materials, clean energy and clean water The vision is compatible with the commitments of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities and the Association of Regional Water Authorities on partnership in wastewater management and the Administrative Agreement on Water, and reflects the shared goals of municipalities and regional water authorities: increasing effectiveness, quality and reliability. Developments in the urban environment, between 2015-2020 for instance include: Production of raw materials in part directly from separated collections of wastewater Closing of cycles in municipalities of > 100,000 Optimization and integration of waste collection Full utilization of chemical potential Recovering of heat from shower water in existing construction Energy production is integrated link in optimal energy utilization Integrated heating and cooling total concepts with role for wastewater Pilot projects with local treatment See the vision brochure for developments in the industrial area, the land-based industry and the rural area. 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. > RSTU The foreseeen fundamental change in waste water management towards 2030 will affect the whole country. It

The foreseen fundamental change in waste water management towards 2030 will affect the whole country. It is an elaboration of the national policy to realize a circular economy by 2050 (see policy document (Nederland circulair in 2050: Rijksbreed programma Circulaire Economie).

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

KRA 1.10.i Please select only one of A=Yes B=No C=Partially D=Planned	ption
an integral part of th	mation e principles and guidance as such are probably not actively applied. However, they are policy concerning the use of wetlands and are translated into instruments like Codes of mental Impact Assments.
3.2 Has the private of {1.10.2} KRA 1. Please select only one p	
a) Ramsar Sites	
b) Wetlands in general	 ☑ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☐ Y=Not Relevant
• A (challenging) pro • The Dutch Angler C waters and improver See also: http://www • Worth mentioning a accessible way for th interest groups to wo barriers in order to h possible. Central Gov response to societal summarized in the b content/uploads/201	mation be been undertaken, like: cess towards sustainable fisheries in Lake IJsselmeer. rganisation (Sportvisserij Nederland) aims for a good ecological condition of surface nent of fish migration. The sector develops fish stock and fisheries management plans. clo.nl/indicatoren/nl1275-omvang-van-de-nederlandse-sportvisserij us well is the Green Deal approach (http://www.greendeals.nl/english/). This is an e private sector, other stakeholder organizations, local and regional government and rk with Central Government on green growth and social issues. The aim is to remove elep sustainable initiatives get off the ground and to accelerate this process where ernment plays a key role in this area. Initiatives often start from the bottom up, in dynamics. Some tangible examples among others for wise use of wetlands, are ochure: Doing Business with an eye to the future (http://www.natuurlijkkapitaal.com/wp- 6/11/Brochure-Natural-Capital-ENG-finaal.pdf). een taken to implement incentive measures which encourage the conservation and
	ds? {1.11.1} KRA 1.11.i
This will eliminate, plincentives are development of the could abolish certain	mation res a high priority to greening of the EU common policies on agriculture and fisheries. res a high priority to greening of the EU common policies on agriculture and fisheries. rese out or reform perverse incentive measures harmful to biodiversity, while positive ped and applied. Large environmentally harmful subsidies are especially found in the d diesel) and agricultural sectors (low VAT on meat and dairy). The Dutch Government environmentally harmful subsidies at a national level, but for competition reasons this nents at a European or global scale.
	een taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and dis? {1.11.2} KRA 1.11.i

handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1}

Please select only one option

✓ A=Yes□ B=No

□ D=Planned □ Z=Not Applicable
3.4 Additional Information > The Netherlands gives a high priority to greening of the EU common policies on agriculture and fisheries. This will eliminate, phase out or reform perverse incentives measures harmful to biodiversity, while positive incentives are developed and applied. Large environmentally harmful subsidies are especially found in the energy, transport (red diesel) and agricultural sectors (low VAT on meat and dairy). The Dutch Government could abolish certain environmentally harmful subsidies at a national level, but for competition reasons this would require agreements at a European or global scale.
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 Invasive alien species can easily migrate across borders. This is why the EU has adopted a law - the IAS Regulation(2) - to tackle the problem in a coordinated, joint effort across all Member States. The IAS Regulation is fairly young: it entered into force in January 2015. It also implements the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 which sets a specific target to combat the threat of invasive alien species in order to halt the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. At the core of the IAS Regulation is a list of invasive alien species of Union concern (the Union list: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/list/index_en.htm), including some of those species that cause the most damage to native biodiversity, and for which concerted measures are required across the EU. The IAS Regulation imposes restrictions on the keeping, importing, selling, breeding and growing of the listed species. Member States are also required to take measures for their early detection and rapid eradication, and to manage populations that are already widely spread in their territory. Prevention is the priority because established populations can be expensive to manage and difficult or impossible to eradicate. As new information and evidence become available, the Union list gets updated at regular intervals. The first Union list entered into force on 3 August 2016 while the first update entered into force on 2 August 2017. The second update is under preparation. Risk assessments for eleven species are currently reviewed. The deadline to submit risk assessments for the 3rd update of the Union list is 10 February 2018. The Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality requested The Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) to advise on the Dutch approach per Union listed species. This advice has been laid down in the document Substantiation strategy Union list species (Onderbouwing strategie Uniellijstsoorten; September 2016). The NVWA also advised the ministry of sp
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 > Yes, wetlands are part of the policies and guidelines on invasive alien species as elaborated under 4.1
4.3 How many invasive species are being controlled through management actions. Please select only one option ☑ E=Exact number (species) > 26
□ F=Less than (species)

\Box 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

> The policy document Substantiation strategy Union list species (Onderbouwing strategie Unielijstsoorten; September 2016) describes the management actions (if any) per Union-list species that has been observed in the Netherlands. The Union list is dynamic and new species were added on August 2nd 2017 (https://www.nvwa.nl/onderwerpen/invasieve-exoten/unielijst-invasieve-exoten).

The Union list does not cover all harmful exotic species within the EU, as species will only be listed after a risk assessment based on EU criteria. The third edition of the Netherlands field guide on invasive aquatic plants lists for instance 42 species with management recommendations

(file:///M:/My%20Documents/Zonnepanelen%20e.d/veldgids-invasieve-waterplanten-nvwa-oktober-2016%20(1).pdf), while only 9 of these are listed on the Union list (see below).

Some Union list species do exist in the Netherlands, but are not managed (yet) as present climatic conditions prevent reproduction like Water hyacinth (Waterhyacint; Eichhornia crassipes) and the fresh water turtles Redeared slider (Roodwangschildpad; Trachemys scripta elegans), Yellow-bellied slider (Geelbuikschildpad; T. scripta scripta) and Cumberland slider (Geelwangschildpad; T. scripta troostii).

Since August 2nd 2017, the following 26 Union list species do exist in the Netherlands and are actively controlled through management actions.

Fresh water plants:

- 1. Floating primrose-willow (Kleine waterteunisbloem; Ludwigia peploides): early signalling and elimination;
- 2. American skunk cabbage (Moeraslantaarn; Lysichiton americanus): early signalling and elimination;
- 3. Fanwort (Waterwaaier; Cabomba caroliniana): damage control, early signalling and elimination;
- 4. Floating pennywort (Grote waternavel; Hydrocotyle ranunculoides): damage control, early signalling and elimination;
- 5. Curly waterweed (Verspreidbladige waterpest; Lagarosiphon major): early signalling and elimination or effective management;
- 6. Nuttalls waterweed (Smalle waterpest; Elodea nuttallii): early signalling and elimination or effective management:
- 7. Water-primrose (Waterteunisbloem; Ludwigia grandiflora): elimination of small populations; research on biological pest control;
- 8. Parrot's feather (Parelvederkruid; Myriophyllum aquaticum): damage control, early signalling and elimination.
- 9. Broadleaf watermilfoil (Ongelijkbladig vederkruid; Myriophyllum heterophyllum): damage control, early signalling and elimination.

Terrestrial plants:

- 10. Himalayan balsam (Reuzenbalsemien; Impatiens glandulifera): elimination and/or management;
- 11. Giant hogweed (Reuzenberenklauw; Heracleum mantegazzianum) early signalling and elimination or effective management;
- 12. Common milkweed (Zijdeplant; Asclepias syriaca); early signalling and elimination or effective management;

Mammals:

- 13. Coypu (Beverrat; Myocastor coypus): elimination influx from Germany and individual specimen elsewhere.
- 14. Muskrat (Muskusrat; Ondatra zibethicus): damage control through elimination of specimen (management costs approx. 35 million euro per year).

Birds:

- 15. Sacred ibis (Heilige ibis; Threskiornis aethiopicus): early signalling and elimination in case of population forming;
- 16. Rudy duck (Rosse stekelstaart; Oxyura jamaicensis): early signalling and elimination.
- 17. Egyptian goose (Nijlgans; Alopochen aegyptiaca); elimination and/or population control; Amphibians:
- 18. American bullfrog (Amerikaanse stierkikker; Rana catesbeiana): early signalling and elimination. Fish:
- 19. Amur sleeper (Amoergrondel; Percottus glenii): elimination in isolated waters;
- 20. Stone moroko (Blauwband; Pseudorasbora parva): elimination in isolated waters. Freshwater invertebrates:

On 8 July 2016 commercial fisheries on all crustacean species below became legalised (see Vrijstellingsregeling bevissing Chinese wolhandkrab en uitheemse rivierkreeften).

21. Chinese mittencrab (Chinese wolhandkrab; Eriocheir sinensis): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries.

 22. Spiny-cheek crayfish (Gevlekte Amerikaanse rivierkreeft; Orconectus limosus): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries. 23. Virile crayfish (Geknobbelde Amerikaanse rivierkreeft; O. virilis): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries. 24. Signal crayfish (Californische rivierkreeft; Pacifastacus leniusculus): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries. 25. Red swamp crayfish (Rode Amerikaanse rivierkreeft; Procambarus clarkii): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries. 26. Marbled crayfish (Marmerkreeft; Procambarus fallax f. virginalis): elimination not possible, management through commercial fisheries.
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 informationSurveillance of invasive alien species is one of the actions being carried out for most of these species, like through monitoring within the National Ecological Monitoring framework.
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 > All wetlands of international importance in the Netherlands, among which 43 Ramsar sites, have been designated as Natura 2000-sites under the EU Bird and Habitat Directives. Naming and delineation of the Ramsar sites is exactly the same as for Natura 2000 (except for the site 'Zoommeer' which is slightly larger as a Ramsar site if compared to the Natura 2000 designation). Present strategy and priority lies on the identification and designation of Ramsar sites in the Dutch Caribbean. To date 11 Ramsar sites have been designated here, with the most recent designation of Muller Pond on the island of St. Maarten on October 13th 2016.
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 > No further identification of potential Ramsar sites has been carried out in The Netherlands. All wetlands of international importance have already been designated as EU Natura 2000 sites. All Ramsar sites to date are also Natura 2000-site. The delineation naming of these existing sites has been adapted to the Natura 2000 delineation and naming, as was reported in the latest national report.
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) > 43
□ 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)
> 43 □ 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 All 43 Ramsar sites have a management plan which is being implemented. Its Natura 2000 designation requests a revision of management plans aimed at achieving specifiek Natura 2000-goals. For some of these management plans the revision process is still ongoing.
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 > All Ramsar sites are also designated as EU Natura 2000-sites. A Natura 2000-management plan has a validity of six years. During these six years, the effects of the measures on the realization of conservation goals are monitored. By the end of this period, the management plan will be evaluated by the competent authority and it will be evaluated whether the conservation goals have been achieved. Depending on the outcome of the evaluation, the validity of the management plan may be extended for another six years or a new management plan with new measures will be drawn up.
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** **Display="block">Display
> □ 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

> Sites do not have a cross-sectoral management committee as such, but stakeholder participation is an important aspect in the whole management planning process. When drafting the management plan, consultations are held with land owners, province(s), municipalities, water boards, organizations in agriculture, nature and recreation and other stakeholders. The General Administrative Law Act (Algemene wet Bestuursrecht) obliges a consultation procedure on the draft management plan. Each Ramsar (or Natura 2000) site has a communication plan which focusses on key messages per stakeholder group.

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.∨ Please select only one option ☑ E=Exact number (sites)
> 43 □ 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 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 All management plans are validated every six years. During these six years, the effects of the measures on the realization of conservation goals are monitored. By the end of this period, the management plan will be evaluated by the competent authority and it will be evaluated whether the conservation goals have been achieved. Depending on the outcome of the evaluation, the validity of the management plan may be extended by another six years or a new management plan with new measures will be drawn up.
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} KR/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

> Monitoring does not only concern habitats and species but also likely (human-induced) causes of changes in the ecological character of Ramsar sites. Monitoring data are analysed and reported by scientific bodies like the Wageningen University and Research Centre (Wageningen UR), University of Groningen (RUG), The Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), the Dutch Centre for Field Ornithology (SOVON) and others.

 ☑ 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 > All 43 Ramsar Information Sheets of Ramsar sites in the Netherlands have recently been updated. Any change in the ecological character, whether human-induced or not, has been reported in these sheets.
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 > Sites in Germany (Otsfriesisches Wattenmeer & Dollart) and Belgium (Schorren van de Beneden Schelde), which border with sites in the Netherlands are listed on the Montreux Record. However, none of the sites in the Netherlands, nor any of the Dutch oversees sites in the Carribbean are listed on the Montreux Record.
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 > The wetlands inventory for the Netherlands is complete, but this is not the case for the oversees Caribbean sites. This will be described in the separate report for the Caribbean.
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 > All wetlands of (inter)national importance have already been designated as a Ramsar site and/or a EU Natura 2000-site before last decade. All ecological characteristics, descriptions and data are updated, as described in the former national report. All data are available through the Ramsar and Natura 2000 databases. The information on designation and update of the Caribbena sites is in progress and will be communicated in a separate report for the Caribbean.
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

> In the Netherlands vast amounts of data on the whereabouts of species over the last century, also in wetlands, have been gathered and stored. These data were scattered among different organizations, in different formats and not always digitally available. Therefore the National Database Flora and Fauna (NDFF) has been built to make distribution data of (flora and fauna) species available through one National Data Warehouse. Its main components are: data entry portal(s), a central archive, validation service and data export portal(s).

Data on species and habitats are among others collected, maintained and analysed by ten specialised private data managing organisations (PGOs), like SOVON, Dutch Centre for Field Ornithology. SOVON maintains the data on water birds in all Ramsar sites and can report on status and trends. SOVON data (and data from other PGOs) are used to update the Ramsar Information Sheets.

8.4 Is wetland inventional Please select only one of ☐ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned	ntory data and information made accessible to option	all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii
8.4 Additional inform The National Databa	nation se Flora and Fauna (NDFF) a.o. is accessible to all st	rakeholders.
8.5 Has the condition	n* of wetlands in your country, overall, change	ed during the last triennium? {1.1.3}
a difference between i principal driver(s) of tl	nds to ecological character, as defined by the Conve	be. If you are able to, please describe the
		1
a) Ramsar Sites	□ N=Status Deteriorated □ O=No Change ☑ P=Status Improved	
b) Wetlands generally	□ N=Status Deteriorated □ O=No Change ☑ P=Status Improved	
8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b) The overall decrease in environmental pressures, the substantial nature development initiatives and the restoration of natural processes leads, overall, to an improved condition of wetlands in the Netherlands. Illustrative is the increase of iconic wetland species numbers like White-tailed Sea Eagles (https://www.sovon.nl/nl/soort/2430), Ospreys (http://www.vogelatlas.nl/atlas/soorten/soort/3010), Beavers (https://www.verspreidingsatlas.nl/8496057), Otters (http://www.zoogdiervereniging.nl/otterinnederland) and Common cranes (https://www.sovon.nl/nl/soort/4330). The overall improvement of water quality, the substantial nature development initiatives and locally the restoration of natural processes leads, overall, to an improved condition of wetlands in the Netherlands. Illustrative is the increase of iconic wetland species numbers like Sea eagles, Ospreys, Beavers, Otters and Common cranes. However, especially in coastal sites, breeding birds continue to decline as a result of low breeding success. In addition, water pollution by new generation-pesticides negatively affects insects and birds that feed on them, a process operating at a large scale. Sources: https://www.sovon.nl/sites/default/files/doc/Vogelbalans_2014LR.pdf http://www.nature.com/articles/nature13531#ref-link-43		
> □ F=Less than (km2)		
□ 1 = Less triair (Kiriz)		
☐ G=More than (km2)		
> 8993		

is

□ 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. > The figure of 8993 Km2 concerns the total area of all 43 Ramsar sites in the Netherlands, which covers the major wetlands. This is more than 21% of the total area of the Netherlands (which measures 41.543 Km2). The figure exludes any other wetland areas in the Netherlands, as well as the current 63 Km2 of Ramsar sites in the Dutch Caribbean.
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 > No specific Wetland Policy, but wise use is an integral part of nature policy in the Netherlands. This is a.o. translated into wetland management plans, fishery policy, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and codes of conduct, like for waterrecreation in the Ramsarsites of the IJsselmeergebied (https://assets.vogelbescherming.nl/docs/bd8fd199-0639-4c9b-aa8d-f76b730fae5a.pdf).
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 > /
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 > The Netherlands lies in the delta of four major rivers: the Rhine, Meuse, Scheldt and Ems. The Netherlands participates in international commissions on the management of these river basins: Rhine (https://www.iksr.org/), Meuse (http://www.meuse-maas.be/Accueil.aspx), Scheldt (http://www.isc-cie.org/) and Ems (http://www.ems-eems.de/).
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

> For detailed information see the Helpdesk Water of the national government: https://www.helpdeskwater.nl/onderwerpen/wetgeving-beleid/internationaal/. 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 \square B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned 9.5 Additional information > The Netherlands have adopted a proactive approach to develop its extensive coastal and river works called 'building with nature'. The idea is to make use of the dynamics of the natural environment and provide opportunities for natural processes. The goal of the Dutch Room for the River Program for instance is to achieve a safer and more attractive river landscape. Rivers are given more room at 34 locations to be able to manage higher (climate change induced) water levels. The measures are designed in such a way that they improve the quality of the immediate surroundings. The website https://www.ruimtevoorderivier.nl/english/ gives the state of the art of the program as well as information on the innovative projects that have been This philosphy is now also becoming a part of the Deltaprogramme in conjunction with the Nature Ambition for Great Wetlands, although governance challenges remain. 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 \square B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned 9.6 Additional information > The role of wetlands in supporting viable farming systems mainly lies in the storage of water during wet periods and the delivery of fresh water for irrigation during dry periods. Mainly the larger fresh water wetlands/Ramsar sites have a role in this. The 22 water boards in the Netherlands are responsible for the management of surface waters. A national script decides about the delivery of fresh water during periods of water scarcity (https://www.helpdeskwater.nl/onderwerpen/waterveiligheid/management/landelijk-draaiboek-0/). This function however also creates unnatural water level fluctuations which puts pressure on the ecological values of wetlands. 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 □ B=No ☐ D=Planned b) climate change ☑ A=Yes □ B=No □ D=Planned ☑ A=Yes c) valuation of ecoystem services \square B=No □ D=Planned

9.7 Additional information

- > See information available at the websites:
- Ad. a: http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl0014-watergebruik-landbouw http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/cap position paper v6 final.pdf;

http://www.birdine.org/sites/default/mes/2/4/10/10/10/20/_bostion_paper_vo_imai.pd

http://science.sciencemag.org/content/344/6188/1090?siteid=sci

- Ad. b: https://www.ruimtevoorderivier.nl/english/: http://edepot.wur.nl/315807
- Ad. c: http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/pbl-2017-the%20application%20of%20natural%20capital%20accounting-2559.pdf
- 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 Management of natural and cultural heritage is an integral part of wetland management plans. Local stakeholders have a role in the management planning process and can also take part in the implementation of (cultural) activities.
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 > information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands). Many books exist on the natural and cultural heritage of the Netherlands. One of the more recent books 'Natuur in Nederland' (Nature in the Netherlands - http://www.natuurinnederland.nl/index.html), describes the 10 different landscapes (including wetlands) of the Netherlands and its natural and cultural values.
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 "ves" please indicate the use or aplication of the guidelines

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

> Not relevant.

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 Not relevant.
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 The assessment (2014) has not been attributed to the individual Ramsar sites, but to the Netherlands as a whole (see http://themasites.pbl.nl/balansvandeleefomgeving/jaargang-2014/natuurlijk-kapitaal/ecosysteemdiensten).
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 > /
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 > All values are taken into account in the management planning proces.
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
TO A A LIVE LEG LEG

11.4 Additional information

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

Page 27 of 101

> Cultural values, if any, are an integral part of all wetland management plans. 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 \square B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☑ Y=Not Relevant 12.1 Additional information > Priority is given to the larger wetlands which provide valuable ecosystem services in terms of water management (like coastal protection, water storage, fresh water stock), fisheries, recreation and tourism etc. The Netherlands need to protect itself against climate change induced sea level rise and increasing river discharges. Programs like 'Building with nature' aim to restore natural processes that allow wetlands to 'grow' with rising sea levels. Programs like 'Room for the river' (https://www.ruimtevoorderivier.nl/english/) aim to restore the water storage function of river basins, meanwhile creating an attractive landscape for recreation and tourism. The policy document 'Nature ambition Great Waters 2050 and beyond' describes the priorities for these wetlands (Wadden Sea, Lake Ilsselmeer, large Rivers, Southwestern Delta, Ems Estuary, North Sea). most of which are Ramsar sites, in more detail. Important for instance is the restoration of migration routes between fresh and marine waters, especially for migratory fish species. One of the major projects is the socalled Kierbesluit which concerns the opening of the Haringvlietdam in 2018, which blocks the North Sea from the fresh water of the Ramsar site Haringvliet (https://www.rijkswaterstaat.nl/water/projectenoverzicht/haringvliet-haringvlietsluizen-op-een-kier/index.aspx). Another major project, still in its early phase, concerns the Fish Migration River https://www.theafsluitdijk.com/projecten/fish-migration-river/ between the Ramsar sites Wadden Sea and Besides these issues, all wetlands have a management plan which may includes restoration measures. 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 \square B=No ☐ C=Partially \square D=Planned ☐ X=Unknown ☐ Y=Not Relevant 12.2 Additional information If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored > Websites like Room for the river (https://www.ruimtevoorderivier.nl/english/), the Sand Motor, http://www.dezandmotor.nl/en/ and the Marker Wadden (https://www.natuurmonumenten.nl/markerwadden/englishshow) show the implementation of these restoration/rehabilitation projects. News items on these websites illustrate the sometimes spectacular results like high numbers of breeding bird among which iconic species like Sea Eagles and Osprey. 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 \square B=No

□ D=Planned

13.1. Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the actions taken

> All these sectors are bound to regulations like permits, quota, EIAs, codes of conduct, mitigation and/or compensation measures etc. However, the pressures of these economic interests on wetlands remain high and challenges remain to enhance sustainability of especially agriculture, fisheries and energy.

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 > An environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) provides the information needed to allow full consideration of environmental interests likely to have significant environmental impact. The EIA report shows how proposals will affect the environment and whether other alternatives would achieve the goals in a more sustainable way. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) focuses on consideration of environmental consequences in plans and programmes, with specific emphasis on the environment in the strategic phase. The Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) prepares mandatory and voluntary advisory reports for government (national, provincial and local) on the scope and quality of environmental assessments (EA). In addition to EIA and SEA the Netherlands also distinguish two procedures in the Dutch Environmental Act:
 EIA for (relatively) simple permit procedure: the simplified procedure. EIA for complex decisions and SEA for plans and programmes: the full procedure. Note that 'simplified' does not necessarily mean 'easy'. For EIA the type of permit determines whether the simplified or the full procedure applies. For example a permit procedure for a nuclear power plant will be classed as a simplified procedure. The permit itself is far from 'simple', but the simplified procedure suffices. EIA for complex decisions, all projects that require an appropriate assessment on the basis of the Dutch Nature Conservation Act and all projects in which a government body is proponent (e.g. expansion airport, projects concerning infrastructure, housing programmes) the full procedure is required.
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, urba 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 > See the information provided under 13.2
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

15.1 Additional information

☑ B=No□ D=Planned

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	
\square D=Planned	

15.2 Additional information

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

> No new initiatives, but continuation of existing ones. Like for instance the Trilateral Monitoring and Assessment Program (TMAP) carried out by the Wadden Sea countries of the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark, which report to the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat (www.waddensea-secretariat.org) in Wilhemshaven, Germany.

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	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=In Progress □ D=Planned
b) Sub national level	□ A=Yes ☑ B=No □ C=In Progress □ D=Planned
c) Catchement/basin level	□ A=Yes ☑ B=No □ C=In Progress □ D=Planned
d) Local/site level	☑ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=In Progress □ 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

> Though there are no specific action plans for wetland CEPA on national, sub-national or catchment level, there are still many on-going or initiated CEPA activities in the Netherlands. Government increasingly delegates the responsibility for awareness raising to NGOs, private parties and businesses. See for instance the Leaders for Nature initiative, which was initiated in 2005 by the IUCN NL

(https://www.iucn.nl/actueel/terugblik-10-jaar-leaders-for-nature). In addition, the Platform on Business, Ecosystems and Economy (Platform BEE) founded by IUCN and the Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers (VNO-NCW) implemented an awareness raising program to stimulate businesses to take action. This resulted in 2016 in the The Hague Business Agreement on Natural Capital

(https://www.iucn.nl/files/publicaties/den_haag_business_akkoord_voor_natuurlijk_kapitaal.pdf), which also marked the end of Platform BEE.

Nature Conservation NGOs (like www.natuurmonumenten.nl, www.staatsbosbeheer.nl or www.delandschappen.nl) have their own CEPA programs also on site level. Special initiative is the Wadden Academy (https://www.waddenacademie.nl/nl/), an independent network organisation. The Wadden Academy connects knowledge about the Wadden Sea area with regard to geoscience, ecology, cultural history, economy, climate and water, making it accessible and applicable. The Waddenvereniging (https://www.waddenvereniging.nl/) should also be mentioned in this respect.

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)		
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)		
> □ C=Partially □ X=Unknown □ Y=Not Relevant		
16.2 Additional information		
If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks > Visitor, interpretation and education centres focussing on nature and the environment are found in all/most municipalities. Some are small and mainly managed by volunteers, others are large and professionally managed. The total number of centres is not exactly known. Some 18 education centres are located at Ramsar sites: Oosterschelde (2), Wieden, Weerribben, Westerschelde and Saeftinghe, Biesbosch (3), Alde Feanen, Lauwersmeer, Groote Peel, Grevelingen, Oostvaardersplassen and the Wadden islands of Texel, Vlieland, Terschelling, Ameland and Schiermonnikoog (which not only provide information on the island dunes but also on the Wadden Sea and adjacent Noordzee kustzone).		
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 □ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned		
b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management? □ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned		
16.3 Additional information		
If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved > The Natura 2000 management plans have to be developed in close cooperation with the stakeholders. This is not developed especially for Ramsar, but will support the Ramsar objectives. Many nature managers work with volunteers to carry out nature management measures. To a certain extent they even depend on it.		
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

- > In the Netherlands the National Ramsar Committee includes delegates from different NGO's, the scientific community and observers from the government.
- The frequency of meetings differs from 1 yearly meeting, or more depending the need.
- The subjects in the meeting discussed include the National Ramsar Report, the SC and CoP -agenda and World Wetlands Day.

16.5 Do you have an opera	tional cross-sectoral	body equivalent to a	National Ramsar/Wetlands
Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4	.3.v		
DI I I I I'			

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

> In 2008 the Regiebureau Natura 2000 (Direction Agency Natura 2000) founded the Platform Maatschappelijke Organisaties (Platform Civil Society Organisations). Main goal of the PMO is to raise support among important civil society organisations for the implementation of the Natura 2000 program (all Ramsar sites are also designated as Natura 2000 sites).

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	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned
b) other MEA national focal points	□ A=Yes □ B=No □ C=Partially □ D=Planned
c) other ministries, departments and agencies	☐ A=Yes ☐ B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned

16.6 Additional information

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

> Within the Natura 2000 implementation process extensive communication and sharing of information amongst relevant ministries, departments and agencies and other stakeholders on wetland issues takes place. For Ramsar issues the Dutch National Ramsar Committee was established for this purpose.

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

> Not specifically Ramsar-branded but other initiatives have been carried out like the yearly Fish Migration Day at the end of May (The world fish migration foundation is based in Groningen, the Netherlands https://www.worldfishmigrationfoundation.com/about-us

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 \square A=Yes \square B=No \square D=Planned
16.8 Additional information
If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this Projects or programs that illustrate the importance of wetlands for people and nature: Room for the river (https://www.ruimtevoorderivier.nl/english/); Building with Nature (e.g. the Sand Motor, http://www.dezandmotor.nl/en/); Marker Wadden (www.natuurmonumenten.nl/marker-wadden/englishshow); the Campaign to protect the coast against urbanisation (https://www.natuurmonumenten.nl/over-natuurmonumenten/standpunten-en-beleid/bescherm-de-kust). Wetland caretaker network (Vogelbescherming Nederland) – a network of volunteers following and reporting developments in important wetlands since 1995. https://www.vogelbescherming.nl/bescherming/wat-wij-doen/natuurgebieden/wetlandwachten/netwerk-wetlandwachten The Europe wide campaign to maintain the EU Bird- and Habitat Directives unchanged (2016).
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 ${}^{\flat}$ N.A
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 No, though considerable project support has been given to IOP activities on wetlands.
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 A.o. support by the Netherlands Society for the Protection of Birds in Guinea-Bissau, Morocco, Tunisia, Sahel-countries and Indonesia (see https://www.jaarverslagvogelbescherming.nl/internationaal?_ga=1.120409615.686172058.1490009133).
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 > Such assessments have been included in development cooperation for about 30 years.
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 > This is not necessary, because most focal points work in the same department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality; one in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs-CBD- and one in the Ministry of Infrastructure & Environment - UNFCCC) and therefore have regular contacts.
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 > Yes, to a certain extent, depending on the nature of the issues at stake (e.g. with permanent representation with FAO on the GAWI (Guidelines on Agriculture and Wetlands Interactions) and GIAHS projects (Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems); ITTO issues are coordinated in the same department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality.
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

The IOPs are: BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), IUCN (International Union for

Convention? {4.4.1} KRA 4.4.ii.

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 • Outside Europe several projects have been implemented by Wetlands International with financial support from the Dutch ministry of Foreign Affairs. • Birdlife Partner 'Vogelbescherming Nederland' assists international conservation activities to partners abroad, like in West Africa and the Dutch Caribbean (http://www.vogelbescherming.nl/vogels_beschermen/internationaal) • The Migratory Birds for People programme consists of more than 16 partner wetland visitor centres across Europe and West Africa, forming a network that follows the flight path of many migratory wetland birds species. These centres are working together to share best practice and develop new approaches to delivering waterbird and wetland messages to their visitors. The lead group consists of the Dutch Staatsbosbeheer, Wetland Link International, and Wetlands International (https://wli.wwt.org.uk/regions/europe/europe-regional-initiatives/migratory-birds-for-people-programme/). A number of Ramsar sites were/are twinned (see www.eurosite.org): • On 30 November - 1 December 2016 Eurosite and its member organisation Natuurmonumenten, ELO and ECNC organised a workshop in the Netherlands on twinning, as part of the Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process. • In 2017 Natuurmonumenten (the Netherlands) and Odra Delta Nature Park (Poland) have renewed their twinning which has originally started in 2010. This new phase of the twinning is structured around the development of a Natura 2000 Management Plan for the Odra Delta, attempting to integrate the concept of ecosystem services. The exercise will benefit both twinning partners as this aspect is lacking in most of the existing Natura 2000 management plans across the European Union.
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 • Information about the Ramsar sites are collected in the EU Natura 2000-database. • Organisation BIJ12 (http://www.bij12.nl/) manages the National Databank on Flora and Fauna which to date contains some 70 million data (see 1.1.2). • The Dutch Species Catalogue provides a current and comprehensive overview of Dutch biodiversity. It is based on the data gathered by experts in various aspects of flora and fauna (http://www.nederlandsesoorten.nl/node/374). • For protected areas, among which wetlands, another website is available http://www.synbiosys.alterra.nl/natura2000/gebiedendatabase.aspx • The Environmental Data Compendium (www.compendiumvoordeleefomgeving.nl) provides many indicators on the actual quality of our living environment, among which wetlands. • The Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality is also working with a system called "Wettelijke Onderzoeks Taken Informatievoorziening Naturu" (Legal Research Tasks Information provision Nature under

development) to carry out the obligations within the framework of national and international legislation and requirements. 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 \square B=No ☐ C=Partially ☐ D=Planned 18.6 Additional Information > All updated Ramsar Information Sheets have been accepted by the Ramsar Secretariat and are available for dissemination. 18.7 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i Please select only one option ☑ A=Yes \square B=No □ D=Planned ☐ Z=Not Applicable 18.7 Additional information > Four Ramsar sites: Westerschelde (Scheldt estuary), Wadden Sea (including Eems-Dollard), North Sea Coastal Zone, Bargerveen. Furthermore the rivers Rijn (Gelderse Poort), Meuse (Grensmaas) and other smaller rivers and streams. 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 \square 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 > Examples are: Cooperation with Belgium on the 2000 ha Grensmaas project https://www.grensmaas.nl/ • Cooperation with Germany on the so-called Het project Gelderse Poort, een samenwerking tussen Nederland en Duitsland, is een schoolvoorbeeld van natuurontwikkeling. Cooperation with Germany on the international nature park Veenland-Bargerveen http://www.natuurparkveenland.nl/nl/naturpark/ Cooperation with Germany and Denmark on the Wadden Sea (see hereafter) 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 \square B=No ☐ D=Planned ☐ Z=Not Applicable 18.9 Additional information > • In 2014 UNESCO placed the whole international Wadden Sea of Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands on the World Heritage List recognizing the crucial importance of the site for the survival of migratory birds on

- In 2014 UNESCO placed the whole international Wadden Sea of Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands on the World Heritage List recognizing the crucial importance of the site for the survival of migratory birds on a global scale. The three Wadden Sea countries have now an enhanced responsibility to strengthen cooperation with other countries for the conservation of migratory birds, especially along the East Atlantic Flyway.
- In 2012 the Wadden Sea Flyway Initiative (WSFI) launched two projects with focus on monitoring and capacity building in close cooperation with the Conservation of Migratory Birds (CMB) project. Monitoring activities are safeguarded until 2018.
- The Netherlands are also partner in the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and its African –Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (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 This is considered not relevant in the Netherlands.
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 > Educational programmes on Forest and Nature Conservation (including wetland conservation and wise-use related issues) are offered at all educational levels: Secondary Vocational Education, Universities of Applied Sciences and Scientific Universities.
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 \Box 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 \Box 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 All management teams of nature conservation areas consist of well-educated employees. Additional training is part of the job. The type of training needed will be agreed between the employee and his/her manager. An

19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the

overview is not available.

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 1: Wetland benefits - Additional Information

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 □ R=Modium
□ 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 2019
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 2: Water Use - Additional Information

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 3: Public and private sectors - Additional Information

Page 41 of 101

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 >
Target 4: Invasive alien species - Additional Information

larget 4: Invasive alien species - Additional Information

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 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Additional Information

Page 43 of 101

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 >
Target 7: Sites at risk - Additional Information

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. Contrubutes 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 8: National wetland inventories - Additional Information

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 9: Wise Use - Additional Information

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 10: Traditional Knowledge - Additional Information

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 11: Wetland functions - Additional Information

o

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 12: Restoration - Additional Information
larget 12. Nestoration - Additional information

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 >
Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Additional Information

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 15: Regional Initiatives - Additional Information

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 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Additional Information

Page 52 of 101

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 17: Financial and other resources - Additional Information

Target 18: International cooperationInternational 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 18: International cooperation - Additional Information

Target 19: Capacity BuildingCapacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced. Contributes to Aichi Targets 1 and 17.

arget 19: Capacity Building - Priority ease select only one option A=High B=Medium C=Low
D=Not relevant E=No answer
arget 19: Capacity Building - Resourcing ease select only one option A=Good B=Adequate C=Limiting D=Severely limiting E=No answer
arget 19: Capacity Building - National Targets
arget 19: Capacity Building - Planned activity
arget 19: Capacity Building - Outcomes achieved by 2018
utcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainab evelopment Goals ote: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018
arget 19: Capacity Building - Additional Information

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.

Netherlands

Alde Feanen (578)

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
Bargerveen (581)
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
Biesbosch (197)
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
Broekvelden/Vettenbroek (1240)
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

year of 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
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
De Slagbaai (203)
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
11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes

☐ 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 >
De Wieden (1241)
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
Deelen (579)
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
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
Deurnsche Peel & Mariapeel (580)
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

Duinen Ameland (2212) 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square B=No ☐ D=Planned Any additional comments/information about the site **Duinen en Lage Land Texel (2213)** 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square 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

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
Duinen Schiermonnikoog (2214)
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
Duinen Terschelling (2215)
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 \Box 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
Duinen Vlieland (2216)
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
Engbertsdijksvenen (428)
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
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

Grevelingen (1272)

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
Groote Peel (192)
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 \Box 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 ,
Haringvliet (1244)
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
Het Gotomeer (202)
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
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
Het Lac (199)
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
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
Het Pekelmeer (200)
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
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

Het Spaans Lagoen (198)

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
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
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
Hollands Diep (1273)
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
IJmeer (1245)
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=N0 □ 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
IJsselmeer (1246)
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
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
Ketelmeer en Vossemeer (1274)
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
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
Klein Bonaire Island and adjacent sea (201)
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
Any additional comments/information about the site
Krammer-Volkerak (747)
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
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
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
> Lauren and (2047)
Lauwersmeer (1247) 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
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
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
Leekstermeergebied (1248)
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
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
Malpais/Sint Michiel (2117)
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
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
Markiezaat (2211)
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
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

Muizenberg (2118) 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square 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 \square A=Yes \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square B=No ☐ D=Planned Any additional comments/information about the site Naardermeer (194) 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square B=No □ D=Planned

5.9 If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the

Any additional comments/information about the site

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
North Sea Coastal Area (1252)
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
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
Northwest Curação (2119)
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
Oostelijke Vechtplassen (1275)
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
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
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
Oosterschelde (354)
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

Oostvaardersplassen (427) 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square 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 \square B=No ☐ D=Planned Any additional comments/information about the site Oudegaasterbrekken, Fluessen en omgeving (1243) 5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site? Please select only one option □ A=Yes \square 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

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
Rif Sint Marie (2120)
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
Rottige Meenthe en Brandemeer (1277)
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
Sneekermeergebied (1250)
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
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
Veerse Meer (1251)
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** \[\B = \text{No} \] \[\B = \text{No} \] \[\D = \text{Planned} \]
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

Veluwerandmeren (1242)

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
Voordelta (1279)
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 \Box 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
Voornes Duin (1280)
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
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
Wadden Sea (289)
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
Weerribben (193)
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
Westerschelde & Saeftinghe (748)
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
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

Zoommeer (1253)

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
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
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
Zuidlaardermeergebied (1282)
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**

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
Zwanenwater (400)
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
Zwarte Meer (749)
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
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
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
Mullet Pond (2270)
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
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