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

**National Reports to be submitted to the 13th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, 2018**

The purpose of this Microsoft Word form is to help Contracting Parties to collect data for the National Report. However, the data collected through this form must be transferred to the online National Reporting system at https://reports.ramsar.org or send the Word form by email (nationalreports@ramsar.org ) by 21 January 2018 for the official submission of the National Report. If you have any questions or problems, please contact the Ramsar Secretariat for advice (nationalreports@ramsar.org).

Please note that for Contracting Parties wishing to provide information in the Online Reporting System on national targets (Section 4 optional) of the National Report Format or on the Word Form the deadline is 30 November 2016.

# National report to Ramsar COP13

## Section 1: Institutional Information

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of Contracting Party:** | **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<br>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Interior |
| Head of Administrative Authority - name and title: | Ms. Judith G. Garber<br>Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs<br>U.S. Department of State<br>HST Room 3880<br>2201 C St., NW<br>Washington, D.C. 20520<br><br>Mr. Greg Sheehan<br>Principal Deputy Director<br>U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service<br>312 MIB<br>1849 C Street, NW<br>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<br>Office of Conservation and Water, OES/ECW |
| Mailing address: | U.S. Department of State<br>HST Room 2658<br>2201 C Street, NW<br>Washington, D.C. 20520 |
| Telephone/Fax: | Phone: [+1] 202-647-4511<br>Fax: [+1] 202-647-1636 |
| Email: | derosabm@state.gov |
| Name and title: | Mr. Cade London, Policy Advisor |
| Mailing address: | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service<br>MS: IA<br>5275 Leesburg Pike<br>Falls Church, VA 22041-3803 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Telephone/Fax: | [+1] 703-358-2584 |
| Email: | Cade_London@fws.gov |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Name and title: | Cade London, Policy Advisor |
| Name of organisation: | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Mailing address: | MS: IA, 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3803 |
| Telephone/Fax: | [+1] 703-358-2584 |
| Email: | Cade_London@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 COP12 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 as 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 has been 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) Societal engagement continues to strengthen and new problem framing methodologies such as collaborative structured decision-making have been developed to frame problems at landscape scale while incorporating broader participation of collaborative communities for more effective, context relevant problem solving. |
| 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 is a federated state. The United States is a federation of 50 semi-sovereign states that are not directly subordinated to federal authorities. States are not mere provinces or subdivisions of a 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 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 implementation assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?

Now that the STRP's target audiences have been changed to focus on policymakers and site managers, 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. The current efforts are not visible to Parties and better efforts need to be made to publicize the benefits the IOPs bring to the Convention and the Parties.

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

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

H. 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.

I. 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

***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.*

| COP13 REPORT | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | Have wetland issues/benefits been incorporated into other national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i | |
| | 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: | | |

***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.*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 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. | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.1 Additional information:<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br><br>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).<br><br>The USGS National Water Census-Data Portal (http://cida.usgs.gov/nwc/) 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 ungaged stations, and access to records of aquatic biology observations. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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) | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.2 Additional information:<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>The USGS National Water Quality Assessment Program produced a nationwide study on the alteration of streamflow magnitudes and potential ecological consequences. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.3 Have Ramsar Sites improved the sustainability of water use in the context of ecosystem requirements? | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; O= No Change; X= Unknown |

2.3 Additional information:

In one illustrative example, recent case studies from the Everglades Ramsar site in Florida show this to be true. Site managers set a goal for water entering Everglades National Park to be low in nutrients, with concentrations of phosphorus in surface water at 10 parts per billion (ppb), as established by the State of Florida. Total phosphorus (TP) concentrations above this level lead to imbalances in flora and fauna.

Additionally, water needed to be cleaned upstream of the park, via improvement of agricultural practices and treatment by stormwater treatment areas (STAs). Site managers concluded that the reduction of nutrient concentrations and redistribution of phosphorus loading by sheet flow discharges would contribute to healthier freshwater Everglades wetlands, as well as a healthier estuary in Florida Bay.

While construction of the state's restoration strategies projects are scheduled to be completed by 2025, several of the projects may be completed ahead of schedule. The component of these remedies that affects park water quality most directly—a 60,000 acre-ft. Flow Equalization Basin (FEB)—was constructed in 2015, and a west expansion (6,500 acres) is expected by 2018.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.4 Have the Guidelines for allocation and management of water for maintaining ecological functions of wetlands (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12 ) been used/applied in decision-making processes. (Action 3.4.6.) | C<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

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 is:

At Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge in New Mexico, the refuge uses gates and dams to flood and drain certain wetlands on seasonal schedules. Lowering water levels in marshes to create moist fields promotes growth of native marsh plants. Marsh management is rotated so that varied habitats are always available.

Dry impoundments are diced or burned, then re-flooded, to allow natural marsh plants to grow. When mature marsh conditions are reached, the cycle is repeated. Wildlife foods grown this way include smartweed, millets, chufa, bulrush, and sedges. Irrigation canals ensure critical water flow. Daily monitoring, mowing, and clearing keeps them functioning.

Controlling the water enables refuge staff to manage the habitat. Throughout the refuge, a network of small canals connects different "moist soil units" with the region's main water supply, which is a 57-mile canal that runs along the river. Each moist-soil unit can be flooded or drained as needed to grow the best mix of wetland plants to feed migrating birds.

Thanks to hearty and thriving wetland vegetation, a great diversity of native wildlife, including coyotes and year-round and migratory birds, live in and around the wetlands.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.5 Have projects that promote and demonstrate good practice in water allocation and management for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands been developed (Action r3.4.ix. ) | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

2.5 Additional information:

As an illustrative example, Eel River Headwater Restoration Project (Plymouth, Massachusetts) used a process-based approach to transform 60 acres of former commercial cranberry farm into self-sustaining freshwater wetlands. The experiences and lessons learned from this site are helping guide the work at hundreds of other wetland restoration projects now in progress in Massachusetts.
http://www.mass.gov/service-details/eel-river-headwaters-restoration-project

In addition, a list of USGS projects related to monitoring and assessment of environmental streamflow at USGS Water Science Centers across the United States can be found here: http://water.usgs.gov/coop/enviroflows_summary.pdf

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.6 How many household/municipalities are linked to sewage system? SDG Target 6.3.1. | X<br>E=# household/municipalities; F= Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |

2.6 Additional information:

The exact figure is unknown, but nearly 100 percent are linked to a sewage system, including decentralized systems.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.7 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country? SDG Target 6.3.1. | 75%<br>E=# percent; F= Less than # percent; G= More Than # percent; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |

2.7 Additional information:

Approximately 75 percent are connected to centralized systems; the remaining 25 percent are connected to decentralized systems.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.8 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine? SDG Target 6.3.1. | 25%<br>E=# percent; F=Less Than # percent; G= More Than # percent; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |

2.8 Additional information:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.9 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology? SDG Target 6.3.1. | Y<br>A= Yes, B= No; C= Partially, D=Planned X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |

2.9 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.10 How do the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology perform?<br>SDG Target 6.3.1. | X<br>A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.10 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.11 How many centralised wastewater treatment plants exist at national level? SDG Target 6.3.1. | 14,748<br>E= # plants; F= Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.11 Additional information:<br><br>There are 14,748 publicly owned treatment works. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.12 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants?<br>SDG Target 6.3.1. | A<br>A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.12 Additional information:<br><br>Wastewater treatment plants are required to be fully functional in order to meet permit requirements which are legally enforced standards. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.13 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is?<br>SDG Target 6.3.1. | X<br>A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.13 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.14 Is there a wastewater reuse system?<br>SDG Target 6.3.1. | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 2.14 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | R, S, T |
| 2.15 What Is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system? SDG Target 6.3.1. | R=Agriculture; S=Landscape; T=Industrial; U=Drinking; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 2.15 Additional information:<br><br>Agriculture, landscape, industrial, groundwater recharge (indirect potable reuse) although certain states are in the process of developing direct potable reuse standards. | |

***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}

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A |
| | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 3.1 Additional information: | |

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

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:

The Francis Beidler Ramsar site is managed privately by the National Audubon Society for the purposes of supporting vital habitat for South Carolina's birds along U.S. waterways. Audubon society staff regularly measure levels of nitrates, nitrites, and phosphates to ensure the waterways are clean, benefitting more than a million people who depend on the Savannah River Basin for their drinking water. Additionally, Audubon South Carolina has aquired 18,000 acres and helped manage an additional 25,000 acres around the Ramsar site in order to protect 30 miles of the 34-mile floodplain.

Chevron created the Richmond Water Enhancement Wetland, converting 90 acres of former effluent treatment ponds into a wetland environment for many plant and animal species. Chevron also completed the Wildcat Creek Marsh Restoration Project on more than 250 acres of natural wetlands northeast of the refinery.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned |

3.3 Additional information:

Illustrative examples include:

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/

USDA: The Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program is an element of the CRP that targets high-priority conservation issues. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/conservation-reserve-enhancement/index

USDA: The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) pays farmers to remove environmentally sensitive land from agricultural production.
http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/conservation-reserve-program/index

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/

USDA: The Farmable Wetlands Program pays farmers to restore wetlands and establish plant cover. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/farmable-wetlands/index

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.
http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detailfull/national/programs/farmbill/?cid=stelprdb1257899

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (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

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |

3.4 Additional information:

The United States has developed a robust mitigation strategy and policy that requires entities to mitigate impacts their activities may have on species and their habitats.

As an illustrative example, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) mitigation policy focuses on achieving the following outcomes: 1) effectively mitigating impacts to managed resources and their values, services, and functions; 2) providing project developers with added predictability and efficient and timely environmental reviews; 3) encouraging strategic conservation investments in lands and other resources; 4) increasing compensatory mitigation effectiveness, durability, transparency, and consistency; and 5) better utilizing mitigation measures to help achieve conservation goals. The requirement for compensation for wetland and other habitat loss incentivizes thoughtful, strategic conservation investments and wise-use and removes perverse incentives. http://www.fws.gov/endangered/improving_esa/cmp.html

***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.*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 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<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

4.1 Additional information:

In the United States, inventories for invasive alien species primarily take 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).

Some of the key information systems include:

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. http://bison.usgs.gov/

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. http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/glansis/index.html

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. http://invasions.si.edu/nemesis

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

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

4.2 Additional information:

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/

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

[†] 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.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | X |
| 4.3 | How many invasive species are being controlled through management actions?. | E= # species; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C=Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

4.3 Additional information: (If 'Yes', please indicate the year of assessment and the source of the information):

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.

The USFWS manages more than 561 refuges, encompassing more than 150 million acres of wildlife habitat, within the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Refuge System conducts a variety of innovative and aggressive steps to deal with invasive species.

Illustrative examples include:

Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge: In 2002, the USFWS and USDA Wildlife Services implemented an integrated wildlife damage control program designed to eradicate nutria (*Myocastor coypus*) from the Delmarva Peninsula. The project has successfully reduced the original population and is now monitoring areas to locate possible residual nutria. To date over 13,000 nutria have been removed from more than 150,000 acres. Following removal of nutria, much of the nutria-damaged marsh is recovering. http://www.fws.gov/chesapeakenutriaproject/FAQs.html

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

San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex: The San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex has worked with partners to reduce Spartina by 97 percent from over 800 acres at the peak infestation in 2005. The partners continue to monitor, treat, and carry out restoration activities for 19,000 acres of tidal habitats owned and/or managed by the Refuge Complex with eradication of Spartina as the ultimate goal. In

most areas where non-native Spartina has been eradicated to date, the result has been rapid and large-scale return to a native plant species dominated habitat at low- and mid-marsh elevations, and a return to the natural mudflat and tidal channel conditions at lower elevations. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10530-016-1177-3

| | |
|---|---|
| 4.4 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed? | C<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

4.4 Additional information:

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.

## Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network

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

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the *Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List*? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i | B<br>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<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |

5.2 Additional information:

The current online version of the RSIS tool has not been flexible enough to serve our needs as we seek to update reporting or enter data for prospective Ramsar sites and we have had difficulties using it. We would recommend the system be further improved in a number of ways in order to foster use and updated reporting.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.3 | How many Ramsar Sites have an effective, implemented management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i | E=37<br>E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.4 | For how many of the Ramsar Sites with a management plan is the plan being implemented?<br>{2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i | E=37<br>E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.5 | For how many Ramsar Sites is effective management planning currently being implemented (outside of formal management plans ? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i | Y<br>E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; 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 (through formal management plans where they exist or otherwise through existing actions for appropriate wetland management ? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

5.6 Additional information:

The United States regularly conducts effectiveness assesments on conservation management programs on our National Wildlife Refuges. Presently, 22 of the 38 U.S. Ramsar sites are on National Wildlife Refuges. Information on ongoing conservation assessments can be found at http://www.fws.gov/refuges/.

Additionally, Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) have been established to create a network of partners working in unison to ensure the sustainability of land, water, wildlife and cultural resources. LCCs are an emerging tool designed for the delivery of context appropriate conservation (in the form of landscape-level guidance for governance or management prescriptions) across scales, based on best available information and decentralized, multi-level collaborative management.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.7 | How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv | E = 17<br>E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C= Partially; X=Unknown, Y=Not Relevant; |

5.7 Additional information:

We define cross-sectoral as being managed by more than one agency. By this definition, 17 U.S. sites have cross-sectoral management.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.8 | For how many Ramsar Sites has an ecological character description been prepared (see Resolution X.15)? {2.4.5}{2.4.7} KRA 2.4.v | E=38<br>E=# sites; F=Less than #; G=More than; C= Partially #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.8 Additional information:<br><br>Where ecological character is defined as the combination of the ecosystem components, processes, benefits and services that characterize the wetland at a given point in time, all U.S. sites have had their ecological character described. That said, a number of sites are in need of updates. | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.9 | Have any assessments of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management been made? {2.5.1} KRA 2.5.i | C<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites |
| 5.9 Additional information:<br><br>Many of the U.S. Ramsar sites are located on wildlife refuges, and site assessments are performed on refuges anually or every five years as part of the strategic planning processes for the refuge. | | |

***Target 7.*** *Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}.*

| **COP13 REPORT** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites; D=Planned |
| 7.1 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Some sites', please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established):<br><br>We are continuing our efforts to engage with our site managers to foster improved reporting and Ramsar branding. | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | O<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases; O=No Negative Change |
| 7.2 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Some cases', please indicate for which Ramsar Sites the Administrative Authority has made Article 3.2 reports to the Secretariat, and for which sites such reports of change or likely change have not yet been made): | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.3 | If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, including requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |

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

The only U.S. site on the Montreaux Record is the Everglades National Park. The issues at this site are well understood, and restoration activities are underway. 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:
http://www.nps.gov/ever/learn/nature/worldheritage.htm

## Goal 3. Wisely Using All Wetlands

***Target 8.*** *National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i*

| COP13 REPORT | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8.1 | Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |

8.1 Additional information:

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.

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/

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8.2 | Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade? | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; C1= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

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<br>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<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

8.4 Additional information:

The public consults 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}<br>a) Ramsar Sites<br>b) wetlands generally<br>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).<br>* 'Condition' corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention | N=Status Deteriorated; O=No Change; P=Status Improved<br>a) O<br>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 conterminous 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 baseline figure in square kilometres for the extent of wetlands (according to the Ramsar definition) for the year 2017. SDG Target 6.6 | G = 445558 Km $^2$ |
| | E= # Km $^2$ ; F=Less than #; G=More than #; A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 8.6 Additional information: If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years.<br><br>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. | |

***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.}.*

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 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<br>(If 'Yes', please give the title and date of the policy in the green text box) | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 9.1 Additional information:<br><br>Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act – 1899<br>http://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/section-9-rivers-and-harbors-appropriation-act-1899<br>http://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/section-10-rivers-and-harbors-appropriation-act-1899<br>Migratory Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission – 1929<br>https://www.fws.gov/refuges/realty/mbcc.html<br>National Environmental Policy Act – 1969<br>http://www.epa.gov/nepa/what-national-environmental-policy-act<br>Clean Water Act – 1972<br>http://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-clean-water-act<br>Coastal Zone Management Act – 1972<br>http://coast.noaa.gov/czm/act/<br>Endangered Species Act – 1973<br>http://www.fws.gov/endangered/laws-policies/<br>Food Security Act of 1985, as amended<br>http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farmbill/<br>North American Wetlands Conservation Act – 1989<br>http://www.fws.gov/birds/grants/north-american-wetland-conservation-act.php<br>Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) – 1990<br>http://www.lacoast.gov/new/Default.aspx | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9.2 Have any amendments to existing legislation been made to reflect Ramsar commitments? {1.3.5}{1.3.6} | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| 9.2 Additional information: | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9.3 | Do your country's water governance and management systems treat wetlands as natural water infrastructure integral to water resource management at the scale of river basins? {1.7.1} {1.7.2} KRA 1.7.ii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |

9.3 Additional information:

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |

9.4 Additional information:

Illustrative examples include:

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

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.

EPA has also funded various projects designed to prevent trash from entering waterways. http://www.epa.gov/trash-free-waters/trash-free-waters-projects

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

9.5 Additional information:

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.6 Additional information:<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br><br>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 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.<br><br>The 2014 Farm Bill authorized 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. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farmbill/ | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9.7 Has research to inform wetland policies and plans been undertaken in your country on:<br>a) agriculture-wetland interactions<br>b) climate change<br>c) valuation of ecoystem services<br>{1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i | A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned<br>a) A<br>b) A<br>c) A |
| 9.7 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ? | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.8 Additional information: (If 'Yes', please indicate How many request have been submitted): | |

***Target 10.*** *The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels.*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| | A |
| 10.1 Have the guiding principles for taking into account the cultural values of wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19) been used or applied?.(Action 6.1.2/ 6.1.6) | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1= Partially; D= Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 10.1 Additional information:<br><br>The Kakagon and Bad River Ramsar site is under the management of the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Tribe. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | A |
| 10.2 Have case studies, participation in projects or successful experiences on cultural aspects of wetlands been compiled. Resolution VIII.19 and Resolution IX.21? (Action 6.1.6) | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.2 Additional information: (If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands).<br><br>As a part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), entities utilizing federal trust resources that are not categorically exempt and may have an adverse impact on the environment must complete either an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Environmental Impact Assessment (EA). Numerous EIS's have been conducted in which cultural values of projects affecting wetlands have been considered as a part of the assessment process. | |

| 10.3 Have the guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities' and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands been used or applied. (Resolution VII. 8) (Action 6.1.5) | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
|---|---|

10.3 Additional information: (If the answer is "yes" please indicate the use or aplication 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.

| 10.4 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their application encouraged (Action 6.1.2 ) | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
|---|---|

10.4 Additional information:

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.

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

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| | C1 |
| 11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.1} KRA 1.4.ii | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.1 Additional information: (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):<br><br>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.<br>http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/wurc/wurc_gardner_elr2007.pdf<br><br>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.<br>http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/401/ecology.aspx | |

| | A |
|---|---|
| 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 | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.2 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

11.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):

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.

Illustrative examples include:

In 2016, residents of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area voted with a 70% majority to pass the "Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure," a $12 parcel tax (a flat property tax that is assessed per unit of property rather than as a rate based on property value) which will raise approximately $25 million annually, or $500 million over twenty years, to fund shoreline projects that will protect and restore the Bay.

At the Waubesa Wetlands in Wisconsin, residents elected to increase their land tax in order to provide additional funding to restoration efforts in the area, knowing that the value of their property would rise as a result.

| | |
|---|---|
| 11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |

11.4 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):

In the United States, Ramsar designations are locally driven; thus, by default, social, ecological cultural and economic concerns are considered in the designation.

***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.}*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 12.1 Have priority sites for wetland restoration been identified? {1.8.1} KRA 1.8.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

12.1 Additional information:

| | |
|---|---|
| 12.2 Have wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes, plans or projects been effectively implemented? {1.8.2} KRA 1.8.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 12.2 Additional information: (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored ):<br><br>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.<br><br>Because the program is so effective, NAWCA funds are usually tripled or quadrupled on the local level. More than $1 billion in federal grants has been allocated for NAWCA projects – a figure that has leveraged an additional $3 billion from matching and non-matching funds. Since its inception, more than 2,000 NAWCA projects have contributed to the conservation of almost 27 million acres of habitat across North America. | |

***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*

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 13.1 Have actions been taken to enhance sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands? | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 13.1. Additional information: (If 'Yes', please indicate the actions taken):<br><br>Several of the most important environmental regulatory mechanisms in the country are not wetland specific, but play key roles in wetland conservation. These are: NEPA, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (CWA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Rivers and Harbors Act, and the 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. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 13.2 Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? {1.3.3} {1.3.4} KRA 1.3.ii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 13.2 Additional information:<br><br>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. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 13.3 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands? {1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases |
| 13.3 Additional information:<br><br>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. | |

## GOAL 4. Enhancing implementation

> ***Target 15.*** *Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 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<br>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<br>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}.*

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 16.1 Has an action plan (or plans) for wetland CEPA been established? {4.1.1} KRA 4.1.i | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| a) At the national level | a) A |
| b) Sub-national level | b) B |
| c) Catchment/basin level | c) B |
| d) Local/site level | d) A |
| (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) | |

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):

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.

Illustrative examples include:

Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) Freshwater Wetland Outreach Toolbox: The toolbox is intended to encourage people to find out if they have freshwater wetlands on their land, get them to use the DNREC Interactive Mapper Tool, and to inform the public about freshwater wetland basics, facts, and other resources. http://dnrec.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Cascade/index.html?appid=c7c3d922dd8c4a62a589fadaca859c18

Nebraska Game and Parks Commission's Wetlands of Nebraska program: This program was developed to educate the public about Nebraska's wetland resources, the benefits they provide for people, and available conservation options. They developed a list of commonly asked questions which resulted in an outline for the Wetlands of Nebraska publication and video. http://outdoornebraska.gov/nebraskawetlands/

New Mexico: New Mexico has developed a highly successful stakeholder engagement model, bringing together key parties from across the state to jointly discuss and plan on critical wetland issues. These state wetland "roundtables" have been documented as having real and meaningful impact on the exchange of information and the creation of political capital for wetland protection efforts. http://www.env.nm.gov/surface-water-quality/wap/

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. WWA has also developed a *My Healthy Wetland* handbook for

landowners, which has been distributed to more than 2,000 private wetland landowners in Wisconsin, and more than 100 landowners have attended wetland management workshops in recent years. http://wisconsinwetlands.org/learn/about-wetlands/explore/

Association of State Wetland Managers (ASWM): ASWM compiled a report of case studies representing successful outreach and communication initiatives across the United States: http://www.aswm.org/pdf_lib/aswm_wetland_communications_case_studies_project_report_0717.pdf

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.2 How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii<br>a) at Ramsar Sites<br>b) at other wetlands | E= # centres; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C= Partially; X=Unknown; y=Not Relevant;<br>a) G 15<br>b) X |

16.2 Additional information (If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks):

Where 22 of our 38 U.S. sites are situated on National Wildlife Refuges, we are aware of at least 15 sites with robust visitors' centers and education centers. While we cannot estimate the number of centers at other wetlands, many of our national parks and national wildlife refuges, which have centers, also have wetland components.

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.3 Does the Contracting Party:<br>a) promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management<br>b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management?<br>{4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned<br>a) A<br>b) A |

16.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved):

Stakeholders are engaged at the state and local levels, as well as at the federal level in decisionmaking 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.4 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.5 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral body equivalent to a National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 16.5 Additional information (If 'Yes', indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP12; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has): | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.6 Are other communication mechanisms (apart from a national committee) in place to share Ramsar implementation guidelines and other information between the Administrative Authority and:<br>a) Ramsar Site managers<br>b) other MEA national focal points<br>c) other ministries, departments and agencies<br>{4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned<br>a) C<br>b) C<br>c) C |
| 16.6 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please describe what mechanisms are in place):<br><br>The U.S. Ramsar national focal points communicate regularly with other MEA national focal points, departments, and agencies through interagency coordination processes. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.7 Have Ramsar-branded World Wetlands Day activities (whether on 2 February or at another time of year), either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out in the country since COP12? {4.1.8} | A<br>A=Yes; B=No |
| 16.7 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP12 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9} | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 16.8 Additional information (If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this):<br><br>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 since COP-12.<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br>http://www.americaswetland.com/<br>http://carolinawetlands.org/index.php/wetland-treasures-of-the-carolinas/<br>http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/News/Pages/American-Wetlands-Months-25th-anniversary-marked-by-DNREC.aspx<br>http://www.epa.gov/wetlands/wetlands-education<br>http://www.thewetlandsproject.org/<br>http://wetlandforests.org/<br>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.}*

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 17.1<br>a) Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2015, 2016 and 2017? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| b) If 'No' in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment: | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 17.2 Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to non-core funded Convention activities? {4.2.2} KRA 4.2.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No |
| 17.2 Additional information (If 'Yes' please state the amounts, and for which activities):<br><br>The United States has provided funding for the Wetlands for the Future Fund to support capacity building, training, and other activities that promote conservation of wetlands on the ground in the Latin America and Caribbean region (2016: USD 76,953.57; 2017: USD 41,677.91). | |

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

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 support wetland conservation and management in other countries.

Illustrative examples include:

Biodiversity and Climate Change Project – West Africa: This project includes protection and rehabilitation of mangroves in Sierra Leone and Ivory Coast. http://www.usaid.gov/west-africa-regional/fact-sheets/west-africa-biodiversity-and-climate-change-wa-bicc

Caribbean Regional Biodiversity Program: This program supports marine protected area management in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Grenada. http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/caribbean/caribbean-marine-biodiversity-program-grenadine-bank-2017-1.pdf

Climate-Resilient Ecosystem and Livelihoods (CREL) – Bangladesh: Although climate change resilience is the focus of this program, it also targets the conservation of forests, wetlands and related biodiversity, including an activity to create new freshwater protected areas. http://www.winrock.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/CREL-handout.pdf

Ecosystems Improved for Sustainable Fisheries (ECOFISH) – Philippines: This project worked with the Government of the Philippines and local communities to improve fisheries management through participatory governance and enhancing the functionality of networks of marine protected areas. In total, ECOFISH helped improve the management of over 1.8 million hectares of municipal marine waters. http://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=Mzk5MTQ5

Fisheries Integration of Society and Habitats Project (FISH) – Malawi: This program is a five-year endeavor launched in September 2014 with the overall goal to achieve "increased social, ecological and economic resilience of freshwater ecosystems and people who depend on them" in the four freshwater ecosystems of Lakes Malawi, Malombe, Chiuta and Chilwa. http://www.pactworld.org/country/malawi/project

Management of Aquatic Resources and Economic Alternatives (MAREA) – Central American Region: This program worked with regional institutions, national governments and local communities to improve marine conservation and sustainable management. http://www.usaid.gov/global-waters/january-2012/marea-program

Promoting Sustainable Management of the Mara Wetlands – Tanzania: This project seeks to conserve and protect the Mara Wetlands through strengthening governance for sustainable transboundary wetland management and increasing awareness of Mara wetland values. http://www.birdlife.org/africa/projects/promoting-sustainable-management-mara-wetlands-%E2%80%93-tanzania

Sustainable Ecosystems Advanced (SEA) – Indonesia: This program 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.tetratech.com/en/projects/the-indonesia-sustainable-ecosystems-advanced-project

Sustainable Wetlands Adaptation and Mitigation Program (SWAMP): This program supports policymakers' efforts to protect and rebuild mangroves and peat bogs. http://www.climatelinks.org/resources/sustainable-wetlands-adaptation-and-mitigation-program-swamp-fact-sheet

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant; Z=Not Applicable |

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} | Z<br>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |

17.5 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate from which countries/agencies since COP12):

| | |
|---|---|
| 17.6 Has any financial support been provided by your country to the implementation of the Strategic Plan? | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.6 Additional information (If "Yes" please state the amounts, and for which activities): | |

***Target 18.*** *International cooperation is strengthened at all levels* ***{3.1}***

| **COP13 REPORT** | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.1 Additional information: | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.2 Additional information:<br><br>The U.S. Ramsar focal points collaborate with focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies through established interagency coordination processes. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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.<br>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). | Y<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 18.3 Additional information (If 'Yes' please name the agency (es) or IOP (s) and the type of assistance received): | |

| 18.4 Have networks, including twinning arrangements, been established, nationally or internationally, for knowledge sharing and training for wetlands that share common features? {3.4.1} | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
|---|---|

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

Illustrative examples include:

Everglades National Park has 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

Over the last 21 years, the Arizona Game and Fish Department has implemented 18 wetlands training workshops in Mexico, in collaboration with wetlands scientists and managers from Mexico, the United States and Canada. This program has trained more than 650 resources managers in Mexico and the United States.

| 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 | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
|---|---|

18.5 Additional information:

http://www.fws.gov/international/wildlife-without-borders/ramsar-wetlands-convention.html

http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/

| 18.6 Has information about your country's wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites been transmitted to the Ramsar Secretariat for dissemination? {3.4.3} KRA 3.4.ii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
|---|---|

18.6 Additional information:

| 18.7 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
|---|---|
| 18.7 Additional information:<br><br>Transboundary wetlands are mapped on the NWI mapper.<br>http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html | |

| 18.8 Is effective cooperative management in place for shared wetland systems (for example, in shared river basins and coastal zones)? {3.5.2} KRA 3.5.ii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; Y=Not Relevant |
|---|---|
| 18.8 Additional information (If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place):<br><br>The International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) applies the boundary and water treaties between the United States and Mexico.<br>http://www.ibwc.gov/About_Us/About_Us.html<br><br>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.<br>http://ijc.org/en_/Role_of_the_Commission | |

| 18.9 Does your country participate in regional networks or initiatives for wetland-dependent migratory species? {3.5.3} KRA 3.5.iii | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
|---|---|
| 18.9 Additional information:<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br><br>Migratory Bird Treaty Act: http://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/laws-legislations/migratory-bird-treaty-act.php<br>North American Waterbird Conservation Plan:<br>http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/bird-management-plans/waterbird-conservation-for-the-americas.php<br>Partners in Flight North American Landbird Conservation Plan:<br>http://www.partnersinflight.org/what-we-do/science/plans/<br>Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management:<br>http://www.trilat.org/<br>United States Shorebird Conservation Plan: http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/bird-management-plans/the-us-shorebird-conservation-plan.php<br>Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network<br>http://www.whsrn.org/ | |

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

| COP13 REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 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<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partial |
| 19.1 Additional information:<br><br>As an illustrative example, while not specifically focused on training needs for the implementation of the<br>ASWM conducted a wetland training needs assessment as part of its "Increasing Access to High Quality<br>Project."<br>http://www.aswm.org/pdf_lib/wetland_training/increasing_access_to_high_quality_affordable_wetland_t | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes}. | A<br>A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 19. 2 Additional information: If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials.<br><br>There are numerous environmental education programs in the United States that focus on wetland conservation.<br><br>Illustrative examples include:<br><br>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/<br><br>In private education, many environmental programs at the university graduate level offer course materials that emphasize wise-use practices as a part of sustainable management strategies. One illustrative example is Vermont Law School's environmental program, which considers sustainable use as a part of its education model.<br>http://www.vermontlaw.edu/academics/courses/environmental-law/env424 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP12? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv<br>a) at Ramsar Sites<br>b) at other wetlands | a) X<br>b) X<br>E=# opportunities; F=Less than #; G= More than #; C= Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |

19.3 Additional information (including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training):

There are many avenues for training for wetland site managers in the United States. One illustrative example since COP-12 is that ASWM has conducted approximately 40 webinars to provide information to wetland site managers throughout the country. ASWM also hosts online training modules and completed a project in 2017 to improve access to high quality wetland training for states, tribes and other wetland professionals across the United States. http://www.aswm.org/webinars-trainings

| | |
|---|---|
| 19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii | B<br>A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |

19.4 Additional information (If 'Yes', please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring):