



**NATIONAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE RAMSAR CONVENTION ON WETLANDS**

**National Reports to be submitted to the 14th Meeting
of the Conference of the Contracting Parties,
Wuhan, China, 2021**

National Report to Ramsar COP14

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 <https://www.ramsar.org/search?f%5B0%5D=type%3Aperson#search-contacts>.

Name of Contracting Party: **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Designated Ramsar Administrative Authority

Name of Administrative Authority: Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, U.S. Department of State
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

Mr. Jonathan Moore
Senior Bureau Official for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
U.S. Department of State
HST Room 3880
2201 C St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20520

Head of Administrative Authority - name and title: Martha Williams
Principal Deputy Director
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
312 MIB
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

Mailing address:

Telephone/Fax:

Email:

Designated National Focal Point for Ramsar Convention Matters

Name and title: Ms. Barbara M. De Rosa-Joynt, Division Chief for Biodiversity Office of Conservation and Water, OES/ECW

Mailing address: U.S. Department of State
HST Room 2658
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20520

Telephone/Fax: Phone: [+1] 202-647-4511
Fax: [+1] 202-647-1636

Email: derosabm@state.gov

Name and title: Mr. Brendan Tate, International Affairs Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mailing address: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
MS: IA
5275 Leesburg Pike

	Falls Church, VA 22041-3803
Telephone/Fax:	[+1] 703-358-2105
Email:	Brendan_Tate@fws.gov

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

Name and title:	Brendan Tate, International Affairs Specialist
Name of organisation:	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mailing address:	MS: IA 5275 Leesburg Pike Falls Church, VA 22041-3803
Telephone/Fax:	[+1] 703-358-2105
Email:	Brendan_Tate@fws.gov

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

Name and title:	Brendan Tate, International Affairs Specialist
Name of organisation:	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mailing address:	MS: IA, 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3803
Telephone/Fax:	[+1] 703-358-2105
Email:	Brendan_tate@fws.gov

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

Name and title:	
Name of organisation:	
Mailing address:	
Telephone/Fax:	
Email:	

Section 2: General summary of national implementation progress and challenges

In your country, in the past triennium (i.e., since COP13 reporting):

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

1) There is an increasing national awareness of the importance of wetlands and greater concern for their conservation, as wetlands are perceived to be key components of the global life support systems that maintain quality of life and sustain societies and economies.

2) There is greater awareness about environmental change and how it is influenced by wetland functions such as hydrologic regulation and coastal protection. Advances in information technology have increased the means and opportunities for education, societal engagement and collaborative decision-making.

3) Framing of the Convention for sustainable recreation and wise-use continues to be well received in the United States by states and non-governmental organization (NGO) partners. The importance of the Ramsar Convention is becoming better recognized in conservation sectors throughout the United States and will likely continue to do so.

4) Social engagement has led to greater collaboration between private landowners, NGOs, Native American Tribes, and state agencies to achieve conservation goals.

5) Wetland conservation has become a shared national goal as wetlands are becoming better understood as a vital part of the country's wise-use infrastructure.

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

1) The greatest difficulty in implementation is presented by the size of the country. The United States is the world's third largest country by size – slightly larger than China and twice the size of the European Union.

2) Geographic size brings ecological diversity. The country extends from the subtropics to the Boreal zones and includes continental as well as insular settings, terrestrial and marine domains in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. Eighty-five distinct ecoregions are found within the continental United States alone. Implementing ecosystem management strategies requires harmonization of efforts across federal agencies, state agencies, and NGOs that are responsible or involved in the management of the different types of resources within each of these geographical areas.

3) A further complexity is that the country operates under a federalist system. The United States is a federation of 50 semi-sovereign states that are not directly subordinate to federal authorities. States are neither provinces nor subdivisions of the federal government. States are relatively powerful and have their own laws and regulations, in particular for administering natural resources. The division of power between the states and the federal government is constitutionally determined and cannot be altered by unilateral decisions of either party. The Constitution's principle of federalism provides that powers not delegated to the federal government by the Constitution, nor prohibited to the states, are reserved to the states or the people. In addition, there are 567 federally recognized indigenous tribes spread throughout the United States across over 55 million acres (22 million hectares) of land and responsible for protecting and restoring rivers, streams, and lakes, as well as ground water on their land. Each tribe brings unique practices, belief systems, and traditional ecological knowledge to aquatic resource management and restoration practices.

4) Wetland conservation takes place within the context of a wide range of pressing environmental issues, which requires extremely careful allocation of effort and limited resources. Although the United States invests millions of dollars a year in wetland conservation, maintaining public support for these programs amid competing priorities is a complex task. The coordination of efforts to align multiple constituencies is difficult in spite of shared visions and interests.

5) Short-term problem solving approaches are common despite the need for long-term infrastructure planning.

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

1) Wise recreational use and access by the public to wetland sites. Activities may include hunting, fishing, tourism, birding, boating, etc.

2) Promote the North American Wildlife Conservation Model as the foundation for wise use and conservation.

3) Promote Ramsar within the context of management of natural infrastructure and resilience.

4) Promote wetlands conservation and wise use as compatible with job creation and economic growth for local businesses and within the U.S. economy more broadly.

5) Improve Ramsar branding and awareness regarding the importance of Ramsar-designated sites.

D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning priorities for implementation assistance and requirements for such assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?

With the STRP's target audiences focused on policymakers and site managers – which we welcome – it is more important than ever to engage CEPA actors in order to translate the scientific findings into language that is meaningful and useful for those audiences.

- 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)

While the IOPs are able to sit in on meetings with the Parties and so receive greater access and information than other NGOs or IGOs, it is not currently very clear what benefit the Parties and Convention itself receive from the special status of the IOPs. The expertise and resources of the IOPs should be better leveraged to benefit Parties' work to implement the Convention on the ground. A number of the IOPs have field offices/activities in Ramsar Contracting Parties but it appears that they are rarely if ever using those assets to support countries on the ground or to ensure that their relevant activities benefit Ramsar – or even indicate an awareness of Ramsar or Ramsar sites, and it is hard to understand why this is the case. We are aware that IUCN is supporting a Ramsar Regional Initiative from one of its field office, which is positive but it begs the question of why this is not a standard practice. Moreover, a number of the IOPs have tremendous visibility and reach via their social media platforms, yet they do not use them to benefit Ramsar or even wetlands – several do not even recognize Wetlands Day. It seems a very simple and no-cost activity for them to use their special IOP status to raise the visibility of the convention and its work, which would help Ramsar with one of its many goals. Ultimately, the few current efforts that exist are not visible to Parties. Improved efforts need to be made to solicit support from the IOPs for implementation of various aspects of the Convention, and better efforts need to be made to publicize any benefits the IOPs might be bringing now to the Convention and the Parties as we are not aware of very many at present. This is an easy yet missed opportunity.

- 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)?

This is most effectively achieved at the national level, potentially through close cooperation by the national focal points of the various conventions, each of which is best equipped to understand the scopes and mandates of their convention within their own national context. We have found such engagement to be successful in the United States, especially regarding leveraging scarce resources and sharing lessons learned.

- G. How is the Ramsar Convention 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) and how this could be improved?

This can be accomplished through continued collaboration at the national level.

- H. According to paragraph 21 of Resolution XIII.18 on *Gender and wetlands*, please provide a short description about the balance between men and women participating in wetland-related decisions, programmes and research.

The government of the United States strives for diversity, gender balance, and inclusion, while operating under principles of meritocracy. The U.S. Government has a long history of empowering women in conservation. These include famous and influential women such as Rachel Carson, as well as lesser known but equally as important women such as Mamie Parker. See examples below.

<https://www.fws.gov/ventura/newsroom/womeninsciencerelease2020.html>

<https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/USDOIFWS/bulletins/2842716>

<https://usfwsnortheast.wordpress.com/2015/03/02/women-making-history-in-the-u-s-fish-and-wildlife-service/>

<https://usfwsnortheast.wordpress.com/2015/04/24/meet-sciencewoman-susan-adamowicz/>

<https://usfwsnortheast.wordpress.com/2015/04/22/meet-sciencewoman-julie-devers/>

<https://www.wilderness.org/articles/article/11-women-who-made-wilderness-history>

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

In order to be effective, simple, concise messaging, along with easy to navigate databases and websites is critical. Interpretative materials generated by the Secretariat can be of great service to Parties, e.g., articulating how implementation of Ramsar helps countries meet their SDG goals and objectives and taking a similar approach to the forthcoming Global Biodiversity Framework.

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

This Report was developed by the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in collaboration with other federal government agencies, state fish and wildlife agencies, and other state partners.

Section 3: Indicator questions and further implementation information

Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation

[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15]

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.

[Reference to Aichi Target 2]

1.1 Have wetland conservation and the identification of wetlands benefits been integrated into sustainable approaches to the following national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i		
A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant		
a)	National Policy or strategy for wetland management:	A
b)	Poverty eradication strategies:	A
c)	Water resource management and water efficiency plans:	A
d)	Coastal and marine resource management plans:	A
e)	Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan:	A
f)	National forest programmes:	A
g)	National policies or measures on agriculture:	A
h)	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD:	Y
i)	National policies on energy and mining:	A
j)	National policies on tourism:	A
k)	National policies on urban development:	A
l)	National policies on infrastructure:	A
m)	National policies on industry:	A
n)	National policies on aquaculture and fisheries {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i:	A
o)	National plans of actions (NPAs) for pollution control and management:	A
p)	National policies on wastewater management and water quality:	A

1.1 Additional information:

The above policies are addressed through federal legislation. As the United States operates as a federalist system, this does not include state legislation that may be more specific. Regulation of wetlands, in general, is administered through five federal agencies: the Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; the Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; the Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service; and the Department of Defense, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

One of the overarching pieces of legislation addressing the above elements is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). NEPA linked the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality with overall welfare, declaring that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures to foster and promote the general welfare, creating and maintaining conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony. NEPA acknowledged the responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practical means to improve and coordinate federal plans, functions, programs, and resources in order that the Nation may fulfill its responsibilities as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations. More specifically, NEPA requires every federal agency to examine the environmental impacts of proposed major federal actions and to consider reasonable alternatives and cumulative impacts, sharing its analysis with the public for comment, before deciding on action. Because the substantive statute pursuant to which an agency is undertaking a particular action may provide broad discretionary power to agency decision making, NEPA's "procedural" requirements are often the principal, and in some cases the most powerful tool available to citizens for challenging agency action in the courts. NEPA also established a national policy for the environment and established the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The Chair of CEQ serves as the President's principal environmental policy advisor. CEQ oversees Federal agencies' implementation of NEPA through regulations implementing the procedural provisions of the act and through interpretation of statutory requirements.

<https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-national-environmental-policy-act>

The Federal Government regulates, through Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, some of the activities that occur in wetlands. The Section 404 program originated in 1972, when Congress substantially amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and created a Federal regulatory plan to control the discharge of dredged or fill materials into wetlands and other waters of the United States. Discharges are commonly associated with projects such as channel construction and maintenance, port development, fills to create dry land for development sites near the water, and water-control projects such as dams and levees. Other kinds of activities, such as the straightening of river channels to speed the flow of water downstream and clearing land, are regulated as Section 404 discharges if they involve discharges of more than incidental amounts of soil or other materials into wetlands or other waters.

<https://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/overview-clean-water-act-section-404>

Illustrative examples of additional relevant legislation:

Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (aka the Farm Bill) –

<https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ334/PLAW-115publ334.pdf>

Coastal Zone Management Act – <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/act/>

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.*

[Reference to Aichi Targets 7 and 8], [Sustainable Development Goal 6, Indicator 6.3.1]

<p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>2.1 Additional information:</p> <p>The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) investigates the occurrence, quantity, quality, distribution, and movement of surface and underground waters and disseminates the data to the public, state and local governments, public and private utilities, and other federal agencies involved with managing water resources through the National Water Information System (http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis).</p> <p>The USGS National Water Census-Data Portal (https://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis) provides national estimates of water budget components for local watersheds, withdrawal data for counties, tools to calculate statistics of daily streamflow records, modeled daily streamflow at ungauged stations, and access to records of aquatic biology observations.</p>	
<p>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)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>

2.2 Additional information:

The USGS Cooperative Water Program collaborates with local, state, and tribal partners, as well as other federal agencies to increase understanding of how alteration of streamflow and land management activities affect ecological health of rivers and streams across the country.

The USGS National Water Census Program develops products, tools, and web-accessible architecture to help practitioners assess water budgets and possible impacts on aquatic health, and run management scenarios to optimize water resources that support both human and ecological needs.

The USGS National Water Quality Assessment Program produced a nationwide study on the alteration of streamflow magnitudes and potential ecological consequences.

The USGS Ecosystems Mission Area provides long term ecological research in all aspects of wetlands management, including issues such as large river management, ecological understanding of lakes, and biological understanding of fish and migratory birds.

The USGS Climate Adaptation Science Centers deliver science to managers to better understand and adapt to changes in climate. Previous and ongoing projects address the impacts of climate change on wetlands and aquatic resources. Some examples include providing terrestrial and wetland habitat maps for adaption planning, mapping wetland hydrology in the Columbia Plateau, and enhancing coastal wetlands capacity to adapt to sea-level rise and development.

<https://cascprojects.org>

<p>2.3 What, if any, initiatives have been taken to improve the sustainability of water use (or allocation of water resources) in the context of ecosystem requirements across major river basins (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12)? (Action 3.4.6.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; O= No Change; X= Unknown</p>
---	--

2.3 Additional information:

One illustrative example is the 2019 Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan Authorization Act (P.L. 116-14). More information can be found here:

<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45546>

<p>2.4 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.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
---	--

2.4 Additional information:

While the management of water varies state to state and even tribe to tribe throughout the United States, there are a number of examples on federally managed lands where the management of water is applied to decision-making processes for ecological restoration programs.

One such illustrative example comes from the Wetland State-and-Transition Model Project (<https://ecos.fws.gov/ServCat/Reference/Profile/54956>):

This project is designed to understand resources in different wetland states through water management and monitoring of resource responses. The project is being implemented at semi-permanently flooded wetland habitats throughout the Intermountain West and western Prairie Pothole regions that provide important resources for migrating and breeding migratory birds and other wetland-dependent wildlife. Project sites including some of the largest wetland complexes as National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) (e.g., Benton Lake, Malheur, and Red Rock Lakes NWRs) and state Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) (e.g., Farmington Bay, Freezeout Lake, and Market Lake WMAs). Wetland management actions often mimic natural disturbance processes in order to maintain ecological function in modified systems. Objectives for semi-permanently flooded wetland habitats within these regions typically focus on one of the two following approaches to management: 1) managing for wetland function to provide a desired plant community, or 2) managing to provide habitat for a specified population size and/or life-history requirement(s) of focal wildlife species. For example, sago pondweed (*Stuckenia pectinata*), a pioneering wetland plant species, is more nutritious and often more preferred by herbivorous migratory birds than species more tolerant of anoxic conditions such as shortspike watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum sibiricum*). Hence, management objectives for semi-permanently flooded wetlands often include maintaining a relatively high abundance of sago pondweed for the benefit of migratory birds.

The primary disturbance process of management interest in semi-permanently flooded wetland habitats is the dynamic wet/dry hydrological cycle, which is a key driver of wetland productivity and vegetation community structure. Water level changes (either managed or natural) are perturbations that influence nutrient turnover rates, vegetation, aquatic invertebrates, and resource availability for wetland-dependent wildlife. The frequency, timing, and duration of drawdowns (natural or managed) are important factors in determining which vegetation community phases are expressed within a semi-permanently flooded wetland area. The ability to predict the response of vegetation to water level changes varies depending on the knowledge of the wetland system being managed and life history characteristics of plants. The first component of this project is to build a common management framework for semi-permanently flooded wetland habitats across the three regions. The framework will incorporate ecological processes, and site and management potentials, to define a range of states and vegetation community phases within states.

This project was started in 2013 and is ongoing. Results are being used to fine-tune wetland management and Inventory and Monitoring Plans to verify local aquatic state and transition models and water control schedules to optimize water bird numbers or wildlife diversity depending on a site's management objectives and conservation goals. Results can be found at the ServCat link provided above for annual reports produced in 2014-2019.

2.5 Percentage of households linked to sewage system ? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.	X
2.5 Additional information: The exact figure is unknown, but nearly 100 percent are linked to a sewage system, including decentralized systems.	
2.6 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.	E=75% E=# percent; F= Less than # percent; G= More Than # percent; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant
2.6 Additional information: Approximately 75 percent are connected to centralized systems; the remaining 25 percent are connected to decentralized systems.	
2.7 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine if relevant to your country? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.	E=25% E=# percent; F=Less Than # percent; G= More Than # percent; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant
2.7 Additional information:	
2.8 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.	Y A= Yes, B= No; C= Partially, D=Planned X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant
2.8 Additional information: In the context of SDG Target 6.3.1, constructed wetlands/ponds are generally not used as wastewater treatment for households in the United States. Constructed wetlands may be used as wastewater treatment in some cases in industrial and agricultural applications. Usually such systems would require permits issued under the Clean Water Act.	
2.9 Number of wastewater treatment plants (or volume treated exist at national level)? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.	E=14,748 E= # plants; F= Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant
2.9 Additional information: The Nation's 14,748 wastewater treatment plants are the most basic and critical infrastructure systems for protecting public health and the environment.	

<p>2.10 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants? If relevant to your country SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.</p> <p>2.10 Additional information:</p> <p>Wastewater treatment plants are required to be fully functional in order to meet permit requirements which are legally enforced standards.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Good; B=Not Functioning; C=Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X=Unknown; Y= Not Relevant</p>
<p>2.11 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.</p> <p>2.11 Additional information:</p>	<p>X</p> <p>A=Good; B=Not Functioning C=Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X=Unknown; Y= Not Relevant</p>
<p>2.12 Number of wastewater reuse systems (or volume re-used) and purpose? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.</p> <p>2.12 Additional information:</p> <p>As of 2017, there were 763 water reuse projects in the United States.</p>	<p>A</p>
<p>2.13 What is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system if relevant to your country ? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.</p> <p>2.13 Additional information: Please indicate if the wastewater reuse system is for free or taxed or add any additional information.</p>	<p>X</p> <p>R=Agriculture; S=Landscape; T=Industrial; U=Drinking; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>2.14 Does your country use a wastewater treatment process that utilizes wetlands as a natural filter while preserving the wetland ecosystem?</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; X= Unknown;</p>

2.14 Additional information: If Yes, please provide an example

A limited number of municipalities utilize wetlands as a natural filter under local management. The U.S. Federal government provides guidance through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). See example below.

<https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/constructed-wetlands>

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}
 [Reference to Aichi Targets 3, 4, 7 and 8]

<p>3.1 Is the private sector encouraged to apply the Ramsar wise use principle and guidance (Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1} KRA 1.10.i</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>3.1 Additional information:</p>	

<p>3.2 Has the private sector undertaken activities or actions for the conservation, wise use and management of? {1.10.2} KRA 1.10.ii:</p>	<p>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant</p>
<p>a) Ramsar Sites b) Wetlands in general</p>	<p>a) A b) A</p>

3.2 Additional information:

There are numerous wetland sites in general for which U.S. companies and private entities undertake actions for conservation and wise use.

Illustrative examples include:

Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary is managed privately by the National Audubon Society (Audubon) for the purposes of providing habitat for the endangered Wood Stork and numerous other species of birds, mammals, and rare plants. Audubon staff and volunteers collect and make conservation data available to inform decision-making about conservation and restoration. Staff and volunteers also collect data on the Sanctuary’s wildlife, including listed species such as the Florida Panther, and also birds, butterflies, plants, and trees.

The New Jersey Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership is an example of partnership work that is going on across the country. This organization takes a collaborative approach with 30 corporate partners to preserve, protect, or restore wetlands in the state of New Jersey. Among its current projects is the Slade Dale Living Shoreline, a 12.9 acre preserve with a low marsh habitat that is important for several vulnerable bird populations.

www.njcwrp.org

<p>3.3 Have actions been taken to implement incentive measures which encourage the conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.1} KRA 1.11.i</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>3.3 Additional information:</p> <p>Illustrative examples include:</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA): The Agricultural Conservation Easement Program provides financial and technical assistance directly to private landowners and Indian tribes to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands through the purchase of a wetland reserve easement. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/easements/acep/</p> <p>USDA: The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) pays farmers to remove environmentally sensitive land from agricultural production. Within this program, the USDA targets high-priority conservation issues through the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/conservation-reserve-program/index http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/conservation-reserve-enhancement/index</p> <p>USDA: The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) provides financial and technical assistance to agricultural producers to plan and implement conservation practices that improve soil, water, plant, animal, air, and related natural resources on agricultural land and non-industrial private forest land. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/financial/eqip/</p> <p>USDA: The Farmable Wetlands Program (FWP) provides funding to restore previously farmed wetlands and wetland buffers to improve both vegetation and water flow. FWP is a voluntary program to restore up to one million acres of farmable wetlands and associated buffers. Participants must agree to restore the wetlands, establish plant cover, and to not use enrolled land for commercial purposes. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/farmable-wetlands/index</p> <p>USDA: The Wetland Conservation Compliance program aims to protect wetlands by coupling eligibility for certain USDA programs and benefits to compliance with conservation requirements, such as not planting or producing an agricultural commodity on a converted wetland or converting a wetland which makes the production of an agricultural commodity possible. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/water/wetlands/</p> <p>EPA: The Five Star Restoration Grant Program provides grants, technical support, and information exchange for community based wetland restoration projects. http://www.epa.gov/wetlands/5-star-wetland-and-urban-waters-restoration-grants</p>	

3.4 Have actions been taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.2} KRA 1.11.i	Z A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable
3.4 Additional information:	

Target 4. *Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment.*
{Reference to Aichi Target 9}

4.1 Does your country have a national inventory of invasive alien species that currently or potentially impact the ecological character of wetlands? {1.9.1} KRA 1.9.i	A A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned
<p>4.1 Additional information:</p> <p>In the United States, inventories for invasive alien species are locally designed and implemented. National scale results from the inventories have primarily taken the form of databases and associated information systems. These resources generally include non-native or non-indigenous species in addition to those that are invasive. Similarly, they address numerous aquatic environments and are not limited to wetlands (note: this broader focus on aquatic environments relates to the subsequent questions as well).</p> <p>Some of the key information systems include:</p> <p>Biodiversity Information Serving Our Nation (BISON): Maintained by the USGS, BISON collates information from the above systems as well as numerous others containing location data for native and non-native species. https://bison.usgs.gov/#home</p> <p>Great Lakes Aquatic Nonindigenous Species Information System (GLANSIS): GLANSIS functions as a Great Lakes specific node of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Species (NAS) information resource by providing targeted access to information on nonindigenous species established in the Great Lakes that are listed in the NAS Database. https://www.glerl.noaa.gov/glansis/index.html</p> <p>National Exotic Marine and Estuarine Species Information System (NEMESIS): Developed and maintained by the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, NEMESIS is a relational database that compiles detailed information on approximately 500 different non-native species of plants, fish, invertebrates, protists and algae that have invaded U.S. coastal waters. https://invasions.si.edu/nemesis</p> <p>Nonindigenous Aquatic Species (NAS) Information Resource: Maintained by the USGS, the NAS serves as a central repository for accurate and spatially referenced biogeographic accounts of nonindigenous aquatic species, including scientific reports, spatial data sets, and general information. The NAS database encompasses aquatic</p>	

ecosystems (e.g., wetlands, lakes, rivers, estuaries, coastlines) throughout the United States and its territories. <https://nas.er.usgs.gov/>

Attention to managing the spread of invasive, non-native, or noxious species has accelerated in U.S. agencies managing natural resources. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service recently compiled various protocols (<https://ecos.fws.gov/ServCat/Reference/Profile/128344>) for conducting inventory and monitoring of invasive, non-native or noxious plant species to aid future surveys and management at Wildlife Refuges or lands administered by other federal and state agencies. Similarly, a Non-governmental organization, The Nature Conservancy, has a very active role in inventorying and managing invasive species on its administered lands.

<p>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</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>4.2 Additional information:</p> <p>In the United States, the primary interagency body addressing aquatic invasive species is the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANS Task Force) which includes representation from relevant federal agencies as well as from states, academia, industry, NGOs and other experts. It is also complemented by six geographically based Regional Panels. The ANS Task Force was created by the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act (NANPCA) of 1990, 16 U.S.C. 4721-28, as amended. Under the Act, the ANS Task Force is charged with developing and implementing a program for waters of the United States to prevent introduction and dispersal of aquatic nuisance species; to monitor, control and study such species; and to disseminate related information.[†] The ANS Task Force is guided by its strategic plan, which establishes goals that serve as a blueprint for action and coordination and includes actions to prevent, monitor, and control aquatic nuisance species as well as to increase public understanding of their associated problems and impacts. These efforts include development of relevant guidance and management plans for specific aquatic nuisance species, geographies, and pathways of introduction. http://www.anstaskforce.gov/</p> <p>The ANS Task Force also coordinates closely with the National Invasive Species Council on items of mutual interest where aquatic invasive species issues, including those relevant to wetlands, overlap with broader high-level policy and management priorities identified by the leadership of federal departments. http://www.invasivespecies.gov</p> <p>[†] The term “waters of the United States” is defined by the Clean Water Act 40 CFR 230.3(s), and includes wetlands, ponds, lakes, oxbows, impoundments, and similar waters. The term “aquatic nuisance species” is defined by NANPCA as a nonindigenous species that threatens the diversity or abundance of native species or the ecological stability of infested waters, or commercial, agricultural, aquacultural or recreational activities dependent on such waters.</p>	

4.3 Has your country successfully controlled through management actions invasive species of high risk to wetland ecosystems?	C
--	---

4.3. Additional information: (If 'Yes', please provide examples, including the species name and the successful management actions)

It is difficult to provide a specific number of invasive species being controlled, as numerous species are managed at national, state, and local levels by the ANS Task Force members, its Regional Panels, and other entities responsible for wetland management. States, tribes, and interstate organizations create and implement State and Interstate Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plans, which identify technical, enforcement, and/or financial assistance for activities needed to eliminate or reduce the environmental, public health, and safety risks associated with aquatic nuisance species. They focus on identifying feasible, cost-effective management practices and measures that will be undertaken by state agencies, local programs, cooperating federal agencies, and others to prevent and control ANS infestations in an environmentally sound manner. Since the passage of NANPCA in 1990, 43 plans (40 state and three interstate) have been approved by the ANS Task Force.

ANS Task Force partners have also formed networks of agencies, organizations, and citizens to enhance management efforts for specific invasive species. For example, the Great Lakes Phragmites Collaborative was established to reduce the spread and occurrence of Phragmites in the Great Lakes basin by improving management and research and enhancing communication and collaboration. The Collaborative also serves as a resource center for information on Phragmites biology, management, and research.

Work to control invasive species requires collaboration at all levels of government and with the private sector, and special task forces and councils have been set up for rapid responses to deal with new sightings of invasive species.

Some illustrative examples of success in our wetlands include:

In 2020, The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) reported that invasive zebra mussels have been successfully eradicated from Lake Waco in Central Texas, preventing property damage, protecting water supply infrastructure and avoiding harm to the aquatic ecosystem. The introduction of zebra mussels was first reported in 2014. The department emphasized the vital importance of continued help from boaters, marina operators and others to clean, drain and dry boats before moving them and remain vigilant to stop the spread.

<https://tpwd.texas.gov/newsmedia/releases/?req=20210121a>

Practitioners from the Adirondack Park Invasive Plant Program (APIPP) and researchers from Cornell University published in 2017 the results of a seven-year study evaluating management of Phragmites (*Phragmites australis*) in the Adirondacks. Published in the journal *Biological Invasions*, "Management of invasive Phragmites australis in the Adirondacks: a cautionary tale about prospects of eradication," documented broad success in controlling the species and suggests that over 70% of infestations within the interior Adirondacks will eventually be successfully eradicated, allowing native species to recolonize.

<http://www.adkinvasives.com/News/Detail/32#>

Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge: Following the success of pilot projects, in 2010 Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge began working with partners to carry out

removal of all existing invasive *Spartina* within refuge boundaries (~300 acres). As of 2016, approximately 87 percent of the *Spartina* has been treated on the refuge and native marsh species are recovering.

http://www.fws.gov/refuge/Humboldt_Bay/wildlife_and_habitat/SpartinaManagement.html

4.4 Are there invasive species of high risk to wetland ecosystems that have not been successfully controlled through management actions?	C A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; X= Unknown
<p>4.4 Additional information: (If 'Yes', please provide examples, including the species name and the challenges to management)</p> <p>Given the large geographic scope of the United States, there are a variety of wetland types, many of which are impacted by invasive species. These include a range of plant, vertebrate, and invertebrate species, which can impact native biodiversity and ecosystem functions. One example is nutria (<i>Myocastor coypus</i>), a large rodent, that can adversely affect wetland vegetation due to their feeding habits. In some cases, such wetland destruction can increase coastal vulnerability particularly to storm surges and erosion associated with hurricanes and other major weather events. Nutria are present in approximately one third of U.S. states with major concentrations in the Pacific Northwest, coastal states of the Gulf of Mexico, and the East coast. A twenty-year effort to eradicate nutria from the Delmarva Peninsula and portions of the Chesapeake Bay has been very successful (monitoring is still ongoing), but control actions in other areas have been less effective and new populations are expanding (e.g., in California).</p> <p>Additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-indigenous Aquatic Species Database: https://nas.er.usgs.gov/ • Chesapeake Bay Nutria Eradication Project: https://www.fws.gov/Chesapeakebay/conservation/nutria-eradication/index.html • Nutria (<i>Myocastor coypus</i>) - Ecological Risk Screening Summary: https://www.fws.gov/fisheries/ans/erss/highrisk/Myocastor-coypus-ERSS-FINAL-Sept-2017.pdf 	

4.5 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed?	C A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant
<p>4.5 Additional information:</p> <p>Management programs differ in their performance measures and evaluation techniques. The ANS Task Force regularly compiles accomplishments from its members and regional panels in order to assess progress, as well as gaps, as they relate to their strategic and management plans.</p>	

Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network

[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 6, 11, 13, 14, 15]

Target 5. *The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}*

[Reference to Aichi Targets 6,11, 12]

5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the <i>Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List</i> ? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i	B A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned
5.1 Additional information:	
5.2 Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its tools being used in national identification of further Ramsar Sites to designate? {2.2.1} KRA 2.2.ii	B A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned
5.2 Additional information: The RSIS tool, while comprehensive, remains restrictive and has sections that are somewhat difficult to use. We recommend adding additional flexible inputs where possible in lieu of dropdown menus. Navigation is also not always clear, particularly in places the application requires an input, or where an input requires additional narrative.	
5.3 How many Ramsar Sites have a formal management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i	E=41 E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant
5.4 Of the Ramsar Sites with a formal management plan, for how many of these is the plan being implemented ? {2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i	E=41 E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant
5.5 Of the Ramsar sites without a formal management plan, for how many is there effective management planning currently being implemented through other relevant means e.g. through existing actions for appropriate wetland management? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i	Y E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant
5.3 – 5.5 Additional information:	
5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with either a formal management plan) or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management ? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii	A A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned

5.6 Additional information:

The United States regularly conducts effectiveness assessments on conservation management programs on our National Wildlife Refuges. Presently, 23 of the 41 U.S. Ramsar sites are on National Wildlife Refuges. Information on ongoing conservation assessments can be found at <http://www.fws.gov/refuges/>.

<p>5.7 How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv</p>	<p>E=17 E= # sites; F=Less than # sites; G=More than # sites; X=Unknown, Y=Not Relevant;</p>
<p>5.7 Additional information (if at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site of sites): We define cross-sectoral as being managed by more than one agency. By this definition, 17 U.S. sites have cross-sectoral management.</p>	

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

<p>7.1 Are mechanisms in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of negative human-induced changes or likely changes in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.1} KRA 2.6.i</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites; D=Planned</p>
<p>7.1 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Some sites', please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established): We are continuing our efforts to engage with our site managers to foster improved reporting and Ramsar branding.</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases; O=No Negative Change</p>
<p>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):</p>	
<p>7.3 If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, such as requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii</p>	<p>B A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable</p>

7.3 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate the actions taken):

The only U.S. site on the Montreux Record is the Everglades National Park. The issues at this site are well understood, and restoration activities are continuing. We do not anticipate requesting a Ramsar advisory mission as a result.

The United States submits a report to the World Heritage Committee every two years regarding the ongoing efforts to restore the park and remove it from the “World Heritage in Danger List.” The reports can be found at: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/3839>.

Goal 3. Wisely using all wetlands

[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]

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

[Reference to Aichi Targets 12, 14, 18, 19]

<p>8.1 Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned</p>
<p>8.1 Additional information:</p> <p>The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) was established by the USFWS to conduct a nationwide inventory of U.S. wetlands that provide biologists and others with information on the distribution and type of wetlands to aid in conservation efforts.</p> <p>This data is available via an on-line data discovery “Wetlands Mapper.” The techniques used by NWI have been adopted by the Federal Geographic Data Committee as the federal wetland mapping standard. This standard applies to all federal grants involving wetland mapping to ensure the data can be added to the Wetlands Layer of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure. NWI also produces national wetlands status and trends reports required by Congress. http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/</p>	
<p>8.2 Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; C1= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>

8.2 Additional information:

The NWI Wetlands Mapper can be expanded and updated, and organizations and individuals are able to contribute data. The wetlands layer is expanded every year as analog data is digitized and as data is contributed from federal, state, and local organizations.

The NWI also produces status and trends reports on a decadal basis.

8.3 Is wetland inventory data and information maintained? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii	A
	A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned

8.3 Additional information:

The NWI maintains wetlands geospatial data that can be used to generate maps and information on U.S. wetlands and the national wetlands status and trends reports derived from data collected from a scientific monitoring study of wetland changes over time. <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>

8.4 Is wetland inventory data and information made accessible to all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii	A
	A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned

8.4 Additional information:

The public has free and open access to the information and make good use of NWI data on a daily basis via the NWI website (Wetlands Mapper). Wetlands data can also be downloaded or incorporated as a direct link by any organization through a web mapping service. <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>

8.5 Has the condition* of wetlands in your country, overall, changed during the last triennium? {1.1.3} a) Ramsar Sites b) wetlands generally Please describe on the sources of the information on which your answer is based in the green free- text box below. If there is a difference between inland and coastal wetland situations, please describe. If you are able to, please describe the principal driver(s) of the change(s). * 'Condition' corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention	N=Status Deteriorated; O=No Change; P=Status Improved
	a) O b) N

8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b):

The USFWS Wetland Status and Trends Program characterizes changes in wetland acreage across the contiguous United States. Between 1998 and 2004, the country as a whole gained wetlands at an estimated rate of 32,000 acres (12,960 ha) annually. However, coastal watersheds experienced an average annual net loss of about 59,000 acres (24,300 ha). Gulf of Mexico coastal watersheds exhibited substantial losses in freshwater wetlands as well, with a rate of loss six times higher than the rate of freshwater vegetated wetlands losses in the Atlantic coastal watersheds. There was a net gain of an estimated 24,650 acres (10,000 ha) in the Great Lakes coastal watersheds over the same timeframe.

Estimates of wetland acreage have been found to not be significantly different between 2004 and 2009, although there was a net loss of 62,300 acres (25,200 ha). Marine and estuarine intertidal wetlands declined by an estimated 84,100 acres (34,050 ha), whereas freshwater wetland area increased slightly. During this timeframe, 489,600 acres (198,230 ha) of former upland area were reestablished as wetland. However, net gain was only 21,900 acres (8,870 ha).

The EPA's National Wetland Condition Assessment (NWCA) is a statistical survey designed to answer basic questions about the extent to which U.S. wetlands support healthy ecological conditions and the prevalence of key stressors at the national and regional scale. Paired with the USFWS Wetland Status and Trends Program, these two efforts provide government agencies, wetland scientists, and the public with comparable, scientifically-defensible information documenting the current status and, trends in both wetland quantity (i.e., area) and quality (i.e., ecological condition).

The 2011 NWCA was the first national evaluation of the ecological condition of the nation's wetlands. The second field sampling season was conducted in 2016. The 2011 NWCA found that 48 percent of national wetland area is in good condition, 20 percent is in fair condition, and 32 percent is in poor condition. Physical disturbances to wetlands and their surrounding habitat such as compacted soil, ditching, and removal or loss of vegetation, are the most widespread problems across the country. Wetlands with high levels of compacted soil are about twice as likely to have poor plant communities. Non-native plants are also a problem across the country, particularly in the interior plains and west.

<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Status-and-Trends/index.html>
<http://www.epa.gov/national-aquatic-resource-surveys/nwca>

8.6

Based upon the National Wetland Inventory if available please provide a figure in square kilometres for the extent of wetlands (according to the Ramsar definition) for the year 2020 and provide the relevant disaggregated information in the box below. This Information will also be used to report on SDG 6, Target 6.6, Indicator 6.6.1, for which the Ramsar Convention is a co-custodian.

G = 445,395 Km²

E= # Km² ;; G=More than # Km²; X= Unknown

8.6

According to the Ramsar definition and classification of wetlands, the disaggregated information on wetland extent is as follows:

Area by type of wetland				Total area by category of wetland
Marine/Coastal	e.g Coral Reefs: xx Km ²	e.g Estuarine waters xx Km ²	e.g Coastal brackish/saline lagoons: xx Km ²	23,412 Km ²
Inland	e.g Permanent freshwater marshes/swamps: xx Km ²	e.g Non-forested peatlands (includes shrub or open bogs, swamps, fens): xx Km ²	e.g Permanent freshwater lakes: xx Km ²	421983 Km ²
Human-made				
Total				445,395 Km ²
Date of the inventory:				
Reference or link: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/status-and-trends/Status-and-Trends-2004-2009.html				

Note:

The minimum information that should be provided is the total area of wetlands for each of the three major categories; “marine/coastal”, “inland” and “human-made”.

If the data on inventories are partial or not complete, use the information that is available.

Guidance on information on national wetland extent, to be provided in Target 8 “National Wetlands Inventory” of the National Report Form can be consulted at:

<https://www.ramsar.org/document/guidance-on-information-on-national-wetland-extent>

The most recent studies available indicate that there were an estimated 110.1 million acres (44.6 million ha) of wetlands in the conterminous United States in 2009. Although the losses of 551,870 acres of wetlands exceeded the gains of 489,620, the change was not statistically significant. The rate of wetland reestablishment increased by 17 percent from the previous study period (1998 and 2004) and conversely, the wetland loss rate increased 140 percent during the same time period.

Additional information: If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years. Please note: For the % of change in the extent of wetlands, if the period of data covers more than three years, provide the available information, and indicate the period of the change.

8.7 Please indicate your needs (in terms of technical, financial or governance challenges) to develop, update or complete a National Wetland Inventory

The entire continental United States and territories have been mapped along with 42% of Alaska. The average age of data is 1989 and it is difficult to get funding for updates.

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}.*

[Reference to Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7].

<p>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)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned</p>
<p>9.1 Additional information:</p> <p>Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act – 1899 http://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/section-9-rivers-and-harbors-appropriation-act-1899 http://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/section-10-rivers-and-harbors-appropriation-act-1899 Migratory Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission – 1929 https://www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/mbcc.html National Environmental Policy Act – 1969 http://www.epa.gov/nepa/what-national-environmental-policy-act Clean Water Act – 1972 http://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-clean-water-act Coastal Zone Management Act – 1972 http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/act/ Endangered Species Act – 1973 http://www.fws.gov/endangered/laws-policies/ Food Security Act of 1985, as amended http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farmbill/ North American Wetlands Conservation Act – 1989 http://www.fws.gov/birds/grants/north-american-wetland-conservation-act.php Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) – 1990 http://www.lacoast.gov/new/Default.aspx</p>	
<p>9.2 Have any amendments to existing legislation been made to reflect Ramsar commitments? {1.3.5}{1.3.6}</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned</p>

9.2 Additional information:	
9.3 Are wetlands treated 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	A
	A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned
9.3 Additional information:	
<p>The United States considers the watershed approach to be the most effective framework to address today’s water resource challenges. The EPA has traditionally focused on identifying impaired waters and restoring their water quality but has now begun efforts for the protection and conservation of healthy, functioning watersheds, which provide the ecological support system essential for achieving large scale water quality restoration. The watershed approach is a proven tool to deal with non-point discharges and for providing an integrated framework for aligning government and private management and conservation efforts across all parts of society. http://www.epa.gov/hwp</p>	
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}	A
	A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned
9.4 Additional information:	
<p>Federal, state, and local government and NGO partners have made great progress in protecting healthy watersheds and bring significant resources and complementary tools to this work. EPA’s Healthy Watersheds Program both supports and integrates the work of these efforts to encourage more holistic protection of aquatic ecosystems. A variety of approaches to protection are available, ranging from state and federal policies and programs to locally driven protection projects. https://www.epa.gov/hwp/initiatives-create-and-protect-healthy-watersheds</p> <p>Several examples of Integrated Assessments for Watershed Health incorporate CEPA expertise using partnership forums. Most statewide-scale efforts are undertaken in partnership with state agencies and non-governmental organizations; others are targeted studies of specific ecological regions or river basins. Some statewide assessment examples include California, Wisconsin, Alabama and Tennessee. Targeted assessments have included, for example, the Taunton River Basin, the Clinch River Basin, the Mobile Bay Watershed and the Montana Prairie Potholes Region. More information can be found at: http://www.epa.gov/hwp/examples-integrated-assessments-watershed-health.</p> <p>EPA has also funded various projects designed to prevent trash from entering waterways. http://www.epa.gov/trash-free-waters/trash-free-waters-projects</p>	
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	A
	A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned
9.5 Additional information:	

<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>9.6 Additional information:</p> <p>USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) manages voluntary conservation programs that benefit both agricultural producers and the environment. These programs have slowed down and in some instances have reversed the loss of wetlands to agriculture while providing conservation incentives to farmers. These programs include the Wetland Conservation Provisions (WC) which was authorized in the 1985 Farm Bill, and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) which was authorized in the 1990 Farm Bill.</p> <p>The 2018 Farm Bill reauthorized the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP), which provides financial and technical assistance to help conserve agricultural lands and wetlands and their related benefits. Under the Agricultural Land Easements component, NRCS helps Indian tribes, state and local governments, and NGOs protect working agricultural lands and limit non-agricultural uses of the land. Under the Wetlands Reserve Easements component of the ACEP, NRCS helps to restore, protect and enhance enrolled wetlands.</p> <p>http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farbill/</p>	
<p>9.7 Has research to inform wetland policies and plans been undertaken in your country on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) agriculture-wetland interactions b) climate change c) valuation of ecosystem services <p>{1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned</p> <p>a) A b) A c) A</p>
<p>9.7 Additional information:</p>	
<p>9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>9.8 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate How many request have been submitted):</p>	
<p>9.9 Has your country made efforts to conserve small wetlands in line with Resolution XIII. 21?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>

9.9 Additional information: (If 'Yes', please indicate what actions have been implemented):

Under the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule, waters eligible for protection include lakes, ponds, and impoundments contributing surface flow to traditional navigable waters in a typical year; and adjacent wetlands as defined.

The Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, a collaborative project that includes federal and state agencies, non-governmental conservation groups, private landowners (among others), continues to support, restore, and manage small wetlands. A recent collaboration with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Natural Resources Conservation Service of Montana strengthens these efforts at the local level with technical assistance in the form of data transfer and application of existing wildlife-habitat models.

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.*
 [Reference to Aichi Target 18]

<p>10.1 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)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned</p>
<p>10.1 Additional information: (If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands).</p> <p>The Kakagon and Bad River Sloughs Ramsar site is under the management of the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Tribe.</p>	
<p>10.2 Have the guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities' and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands been used or applied such as</p> <p>a) stakeholders, including local communities and indigenous people are represented on National Ramsar Committees or similar bodies</p> <p>b) involvement and assistance of indigenous people's and community-based groups, wetland education centres and non-governmental organizations with the necessary expertise to facilitate the establishment of participatory approaches;</p> <p>(Resolution VII. 8) (Action 6.1.5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">a) A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">b) A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned</p>

10.2 Additional information: (If the answer is “yes” please indicate the use or application of the guidelines)

The United States has its own consultation process to ensure participation of local communities and indigenous people. This varies from state to state and tribe to tribe.

As an illustrative example, in evaluating proposed impacts of a restoration project in San Diego, the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation engaged in the process related to the EIS for the Otay River Estuary Restoration Project and was included as a Concurring Party to a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the State Historic Preservation Office. As part of the interpretation of the salt ponds in south San Diego Bay, the MOA includes an interpretive panel that will include the Kumeyaay traditional ecological knowledge and discussions regarding resource exploitation of San Diego Bay.

<p>10.3 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their application encouraged (Action 6.1.2)</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned</p>
<p>10.3 Additional information:</p> <p>Traditional knowledge and shared management practices with indigenous tribes have been a part of U.S. conservation policy for decades. As an illustrative example, the United States developed a 2,000 acre meadow wetland restoration analysis to support efforts of the Greenville Rancheria and Mountain Maidu Tribe. In this analysis, the United States integrated traditional approaches with ecological approaches to restoration, calling attention to standard sierra meadow wetland restoration construction practices that are disruptive and disturbing to cultural resources and landscapes.</p>	

Target 11. *Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.}*

[Reference to Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 14]

<p>11.1 Have ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands been researched in your country, recorded in documents like State of the Environment reporting, and the results promoted? {1.4.1} KRA 1.4.ii</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
--	--

11.1 Additional information: (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, how many wetlands and their names):

The U.S. government regularly conducts evaluations of ecosystem benefits/services for wetland sites. Larger sites like the Everglades National Park have had individual evaluations. However, not all Ramsar sites have been addressed to date. Additionally, Gardner and Connolly studied 22 U.S. Ramsar sites to ascertain if and how designation had resulted in benefits to these sites.

http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/wurc/wurc_gardner_elr2007.pdf

Wetland assessments are also conducted at the state level. As an illustrative example, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency developed one the country's leading rapid assessment methods, known as the Ohio RAM, which has been adapted for use by many other states. This tool allows for the expeditious assessment of the ecological quality and level of function of wetlands and has simplified review and permitting decisions.

<http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/401/ecology.aspx>

<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>11.2 Additional information:</p>	

<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>11.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):</p> <p>Sites which are designated as Ramsar sites, or which have had their wetlands restored, tend to increase in economic value. This is important for local communities and townships, as this directly correlates to improved property values and an increased local tax base.</p> <p>An illustrative example is the Niagara River Corridor. The Niagara River Corridor, known as the site of Niagara Falls, became a Ramsar site in 2019 and the region is capitalizing on the designation by producing an Outdoor Adventure Guide to promote travel and tourism that is more than just a single-night stopover. A local association called Visit Buffalo Niagara is also leveraging the economic value of its wetlands as a destination for birding and ecologically-minded tourism. At the state level, the government of the State of New York is providing funding to develop the Niagara River Watershed Management Plan, a Niagara River Atlas, and a State of the Niagara River Watershed Report.</p>	

<p>11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19)? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>11.4 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):</p> <p>In the United States, Ramsar designations are locally driven; thus, by default, social, ecological cultural and economic concerns are considered in the designation.</p>	

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.}*
[Reference to Aichi Targets 14 and 15].

<p>12.1 Have priority sites for wetland restoration been identified? {1.8.1} KRA 1.8.i</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>12.1 Additional information:</p>	

<p>12.2 Have wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes, plans or projects been effectively implemented? {1.8.2} KRA 1.8.i</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>12.2 Additional information: (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored):</p> <p>One illustrative example of effective implementation of wetland restoration/rehabilitation programs is the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA), which conserves North America's waterfowl, fish and wildlife resources while producing a variety of environmental and economic benefits. Its success is driven by partnerships involving federal, state and local governments; nonprofit organizations such as Ducks Unlimited; and community groups. Every federal dollar provided by NAWCA must be matched by at least one dollar from nonfederal sources.</p> <p>Because the program is so effective, NAWCA funds are usually tripled or quadrupled on the local level. Most recently, NAWCA has granted \$1.83 billion in federal funding for projects – a figure that has leveraged an additional \$3.75 billion from matching and non-matching funds. Since its inception, more than 3,000 NAWCA projects have contributed to the conservation of almost 30 million acres of habitat across North America.</p>	

12.3 Have the Guidelines for Global Action on Peatlands and on Peatlands, climate change and wise use (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.11) been implemented including?	A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant
a) Knowledge of global resources	B
b) Education and public awareness on peatlands	B
c) Policy and legislative instruments	B
d) Wise use of peatlands	B
e) Research networks, regional centres of expertise, and institutional capacity	B
f) International cooperation	B
g) Implementation and support	B
12.3 Additional information: (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, the progress in implementation:	

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.*

[Reference to Aichi Targets 6 and 7].

13.1 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	A
	A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned
13.1 Additional information:	
<p>Several of the most important environmental regulatory mechanisms in the country are not wetland specific, but play key roles in wetland conservation. These are: the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (known as the Clean Water Act, CWA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Rivers and Harbors Act, and the Agriculture Improvements Act of 2018 (Farm Bill). These laws have resulted in the regulation of activities undertaken in areas designated as wetlands; acquisition of wetlands through purchase or protective easements that prevent certain activities, such as draining and filling; restoration of damaged wetlands or the creation of new wetlands; and disincentives to altering wetlands or incentives to protect them in their natural states.</p>	

13.2 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands? {1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii	A
A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases	
<p>13.2 Additional information:</p> <p>NEPA requires federal agencies to incorporate environmental considerations in their planning and decision-making through a systematic interdisciplinary approach. Specifically, all federal agencies are to prepare detailed environmental impact statements assessing the environmental impact of and alternatives to major federal actions significantly affecting the environment.</p>	

Goal 4. Enhancing implementation

[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17]

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	B
A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned	
15.1 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Planned', please indicate the regional initiative(s) and the collaborating countries of each initiative):	
15.2 Has your country supported or participated in the development of other regional (i.e., covering more than one country) wetland training and research centres? {3.2.2}	B
A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned	
15.2 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate the name(s) of the centre(s):	

Target 16. Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}.

[Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 18].

<p>16.1 Has an action plan (or plans) for wetland CEPA been established? {4.1.1} KRA 4.1.i</p> <p>a) At the national level b) Sub-national level c) Catchment/basin level d) Local/site level (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)</p>	<p>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned</p>
<p>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):</p> <p>While plans are not CEPA plans, per se, broad CEPA objectives for CEPA-style actions have been established at the state and national levels. In addition, numerous outreach and communication initiatives have been undertaken at state and local levels.</p> <p>Illustrative examples include:</p> <p>As part of the Upper Coonamessett River Restoration Project, a significant river and wetlands restoration in Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Division of Ecological Restoration has partnered the Coonamessett River Trust and the Falmouth STEM Boosters to mainstream the awareness of restoration work. https://www.masslive.com/news/2021/01/nashawannuck-brook-in-northampton-to-be-restored-one-of-8-river-and-wetlands-designated-as-priority-projects.html</p> <p>The Society of Wetland Scientists, a national organization based in Wisconsin, supports CEPA-style actions with robust programming, including webinars, photography contests, and a New Media Initiative. https://www.sws.org/education-outreach/</p> <p>Wisconsin Wetlands Association (WWA): WWA's Wisconsin Wetland Gems® program recognizes 100 sites distributed throughout the state that collectively include examples of all of Wisconsin's wetland community types. To bring more hope and positivity into the world during the pandemic, WWA developed new virtual wetland programming to help everyone staying at home to remain connected with the outside world and with each other while learning about and sharing their love for wetlands. WWA held nearly 20 "Wetland Coffee Breaks" featuring live online presentations about wetland topics, including soils, birds, hydrology, and more, filmed seven each of their "Wetland Walks" and "Wetlands Words" videos hosted by WWA staff and supporters sharing their love of wetlands, wetlands poetry, and more. The programs were watched live by hundreds of viewers from across Wisconsin, the United States, and internationally and were subsequently posted on their website and social media where they have been viewed countless times more. http://wisconsinwetlands.org/learn/about-wetlands/explore/</p>	<p>a) A b) B c) B d) A</p>

<p>16.2 How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii</p> <p>a) at Ramsar Sites</p> <p>b) at other wetlands</p>	<p>E= # centres; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X=Unknown; y=Not Relevant;</p> <p>a) E 21b) X</p>
<p>16.2 Additional information (If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks):</p> <p>Twenty-three of our 41 U.S. sites occur on National Wildlife Refuges, and 15 of those sites have visitors' centers and education centers, and six sites have visitor contact stations. At least five additional sites share educational, outreach, or research centers with other natural and protected areas. Some privately owned Ramsar sites likewise have visitor or nature centers. While we cannot accurately estimate the number of centers at other wetlands, many of our national parks and national wildlife refuges that are not Ramsar sites, which have centers, also have wetland components.</p>	
<p>16.3 Does the Contracting Party:</p> <p>a) promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management</p> <p>b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management? {4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii</p>	<p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p> <p>a) A</p> <p>b) A</p>
<p>16.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved):</p> <p>Stakeholders are engaged at the state and local levels, as well as at the federal level in decision-making processes related to wetlands and a range of other matters. Stakeholders are also included in the Ramsar designation process from beginning to end – applications are frequently initiated by the stakeholders themselves, and stakeholders are involved in the application review process.</p>	
<p>16.4 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v</p>	<p>B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>16.4 Additional information (If 'Yes', indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has):</p>	
<p>16.5 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral body equivalent to a National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v</p>	<p>B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>

16.5 Additional information (If 'Yes', indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has):

<p>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:</p> <p>a) Ramsar Site managers b) other MEA national focal points c) other ministries, departments and agencies {4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi</p>	<p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p> <p>a) C b) C c) C</p>
---	--

16.6 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please describe what mechanisms are in place):

The U.S. Ramsar national focal points communicate regularly with other MEA national focal points, departments, and agencies through interagency coordination processes.

<p>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 COP13? {4.1.8}</p> <p>16.7 Additional information:</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No</p>
---	-----------------------------

<p>16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP13 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9}</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned</p>
--	---

16.8 Additional information (If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this):

Federal and state governments as well as NGOs in the United States have carried out campaigns, programs, and projects to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands. Even through COVID-19 restrictions, the Wisconsin Wetlands Association has hosted a virtual “Wetland Coffee Break” series to raise awareness of specific wetlands issues. On a more general level, the Departments of State and Interior use their social media platforms to raise awareness of wetlands within the United States, focusing on the benefits we receive from protecting these resources.

Illustrative examples include:

<http://www.americaswetland.com/>
<http://carolinawetlands.org/index.php/wetland-treasures-of-the-carolinas/>
<http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/News/Pages/American-Wetlands-Months-25th-anniversary-marked-by-DNREC.aspx>
<http://www.epa.gov/wetlands/wetlands-education>
<http://wetlandforests.org/>
<http://wisconsinwetlands.org/learn/about-wetlands/explore/>

Target 17. Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}

[Reference to Aichi Target 20]

<p>17.1 a) Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2018, 2019 and 2020? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable</p>
<p>b) If 'No' in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment:</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No</p>
<p>17.2 Additional information (If 'Yes' please state the amounts, and for which activities): The United States has provided funding for the Wetlands for the Future Fund to support a total of USD 163,000 in capacity building, training, and other activities that promote conservation of wetlands on the ground in the Latin America and Caribbean region.</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>A A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable</p>

17.3 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate the countries supported since COP12):

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has funded projects that directly support wetland conservation and management in other countries; many other projects support wetland conservation as part of a larger ecosystem management plan.

Illustrative examples include:

Biodiversity and Climate Change Project – West Africa: This project, completed in 2020, included protection and rehabilitation of mangroves in Sierra Leone and Ivory Coast. It addressed coastal resilience and other direct and indirect drivers of natural resource degradation to improve livelihoods and natural ecosystems across the region. <http://www.usaid.gov/west-africa-regional/fact-sheets/west-africa-biodiversity-and-climate-change-wa-bicc>

Caribbean Regional Biodiversity Program: This program, which ran from 2014-2019, supported marine protected area management in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Grenada. <https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/where-we-work/caribbean/stories-in-caribbean/caribbean-marine-biodiversity-program/>

The Colombia Forests and Wetlands Activity: This activity provides technical assistance and resource management expertise to local government and community actors. Among the components is an initiative to construct maps of wetlands, and build local capacities to perform wetland mapping. The activity runs from 2020 to 2023. <https://www.usaid.gov/documents/fact-sheet-colombia-forests-and-wetlands-activity>

Lac Télé-Lac Tumba: Lac Télé-Lac Tumba is the largest of the nine USAID-supported landscapes. More than 500 kilometers long and 250 kilometers wide, it straddles the border between the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the Republic of Congo (ROC). Situated in the alluvial plain of the vast Central Basin region of the Congo River watershed, it is one of the most biologically diverse wetlands in Africa. This multifaceted protection plan includes a wetlands and fisheries management plan, restoration of degraded land areas, and financial and technical support. <https://www.usaid.gov/documents/1860/lac-tele-lac-tumba-landscape>

National Infrastructure for Water Security project in Peru: In 2018, USAID in partnership with the government of Canada launched the National Infrastructure for Water Security project in Peru. The project will enhance the Government of Peru's institutional capacity to regulate water supply and reduce the risks of floods, droughts, and water contamination by scaling up investment in natural infrastructure, and will use wetlands management among other tactics to mitigate water scarcity and climate risk. <https://www.usaid.gov/news-information/news/united-states-and-canada-launch-natural-infrastructure-water-security-project>

Sustainable Ecosystems Advanced (SEA) – Indonesia: This five-year program that began in 2016 works with local communities and the Government of Indonesia to improve the management and conservation of coastal habitats - especially coral reefs,

mangrove forests and estuaries - to enhance the well-being of local communities and the Indonesian economy.
<http://www.tetrattech.com/en/projects/the-indonesia-sustainable-ecosystems-advanced-project>

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	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant; Z=Not Applicable</p>
---	---

17.4 Additional information:

USAID conducts initial environmental impact assessments to ensure that development activities are not just economically sustainable, but also protect the environment.
http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/environment/compliance

In addition, Country Development and Cooperation Strategies developed by USAID must be informed by Tropical Forest and Biodiversity (FAA 118 and 119) Assessments
<http://www.usaidgems.org/faa118119.htm>

USAID Biodiversity Policy requires that all biodiversity conservation programs supported by congressionally earmarked funds for international biodiversity conservation comply with the following four criteria: (1) The program must have the explicit biodiversity objective (it is not enough to have biodiversity conservation result as a positive externality from another program); (2) Activities must be identified based on an analysis of drivers and threats to biodiversity and a corresponding theory of change; (3) Site-based programs must have the intent to positively impact biodiversity in biologically significant areas; and (4) The program must monitor indicators associated with a stated theory of change for biodiversity conservation results.
<http://www.usaid.gov/biodiversity/policy>

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}	<p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable</p>
--	---

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?	<p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable</p>
---	---

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}

<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>18.1 Additional information:</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>18.2 Additional information:</p> <p>The U.S. Ramsar focal points collaborate with focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies through established interagency coordination processes.</p>	
<p>18.3 Has your country received assistance from one or more UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO) or the Convention's IOPs in its implementation of the Convention? {4.4.1} KRA 4.4.ii. The IOPs are: BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), Wetlands International, WWF and Wildfowl & Wetland Trust (WWT).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>18.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' please name the agency (es) or IOP (s) and the type of assistance received):</p>	
<p>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}</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>

18.4 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate the networks and wetlands involved):

Big Cypress National Preserve in Florida is a “Sister Protected Area” to Indonesia's Tanjung Puting National Park, and provides technical assistance through field and classroom-based training, on-site assessments of management challenges, and embedded senior advisors.

<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/internationalcooperation/sister-park-list-by-country.htm>

Everglades National Park is a Sister Park to Pantanal National Park in Brazil and Cienaga de Zapata in Cuba. Park staff have provided assistance to and collaborated with numerous other Ramsar sites around the world, including Botswana's Okavango Delta, Brazil's Pantanal, and Spain's Doñana National Park.

Indiana Dunes National Park has a Sister Park relationship with Kampinos National Park in Poland. Both parks are dominated by upland dunes with marshes and wetlands.

<http://www.nps.gov/indu/learn/management/sisterparks.htm>

Point Reyes National Seashore has a Sister Park relationship with Kolkheti National Park in the Republic of Georgia. Kolkheti National Park has ecologically important wetlands.

http://www.nps.gov/pore/getinvolved/partners_sisterparks.htm

<p>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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>18.5 Additional information:</p> <p>http://www.fws.gov/international/wildlife-without-borders/ramsar-wetlands-convention.html</p> <p>http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/</p>	

<p>18.6 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable</p>
<p>18.6 Additional information:</p> <p>Transboundary wetlands are mapped on the NWI mapper. http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html</p>	

<p>18.7 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</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; Y=Not Relevant</p>
---	---

18.7 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place):

The International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) applies the boundary and water treaties between the United States and Mexico.

http://www.ibwc.gov/About_Us/About_Us.html

The International Joint Commission (IJC) was created by the United States and Canada in 1909 by the Boundary Waters Treaty. The IJC regulates shared water uses, and investigates transboundary issues and recommends solutions.

http://ijc.org/en /Role_of_the_Commission

18.8 Does your country participate in regional networks or initiatives for wetland-dependent migratory species? {3.5.3} KRA 3.5.iii	A A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable
---	---

18.8 Additional information:

Migratory Bird Treaty Act: <http://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/laws-legislations/migratory-bird-treaty-act.php>

North American Waterbird Conservation Plan:

<http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/bird-management-plans/waterbird-conservation-for-the-americas.php>

Partners in Flight North American Landbird Conservation Plan:

<http://www.partnersinflight.org/what-we-do/science/plans/>

Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management:

<http://www.trilat.org/>

United States Shorebird Conservation Plan: <http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/bird-management-plans/the-us-shorebird-conservation-plan.php>

Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network: <http://www.whsrn.org/>

Target 19. Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced.

[Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 17]

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

19.1 Additional information:

As an illustrative example, while not specifically focused on training needs for the implementation of the Convention, is the Association of State Wetlands Managers (ASWM), an organization that produces 40-45 new webinars each year. ASWM assesses needs and training priorities through an iterative process that includes surveys and questionnaires, but also informal interactions with agency partners, who identify a specific project or work group that needs support to build its capacity.

<https://aswm.org/webinars-trainings>

19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes?	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned</p>
<p>19.2 Additional information: If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials:</p> <p>There are numerous environmental education programs in the United States that focus on wetland conservation.</p> <p>As an illustrative example, at the federal level, the USFWS supports a federal education facility, the National Conservation Training Center, which teaches advanced conservation techniques, of which human dimensions and wise-use practices are a part. http://nctc.fws.gov/courses/catalog/</p>	

<p>19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP13? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv</p> <p>a) at Ramsar Sites b) at other wetlands</p>	<p>a) X b) X</p> <p>E=# opportunities; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant</p>
<p>19.3 Additional information (including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training):</p> <p>There are many avenues for training for wetland site managers in the United States. The Association of State Wetland Managers has compiled a robust collection of training and informational webinars to build the skills of and provide knowledge and information to wetland site managers throughout the country. https://aswm.org/webinars-trainings</p> <p>The Wetland Training Institute, Inc. (WTI) provides wetland training courses on wetland delineation, soils and hydrology, wetland construction and restoration, plant identification, mitigation banking concepts, wetland policy and permitting, and other riparian resource issues. https://wetlandtraining.com/</p>	

19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii	<p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable</p>
<p>19.4 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring):</p>	