Ramsar National Report to COP14

COP14 National Report

Background information

1. The COP14 National Report Format (NRF) has been approved at its 57th meeting (SC57) for the Ramsar Convention's Contracting Parties to complete as their national reporting to the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties of the Convention (China, 2021).

2. The NRF is being issued by the Secretariat in 2019 to facilitate Contracting Parties' implementation planning and preparations for completing the Report. The deadline for submission of national targets is by 24 January 2020 and the deadline for submission of completed National Reports is 21 January 2021 (final dates will be updated once the dates for COP14 are agreed).

3. This COP14 NRF closely follows that of the NRF used for COP13, to permit continuity of reporting and analysis of implementation progress by ensuring that indicator questions are as far as possible consistent with previous NRFs (and especially the COP13 NRF). It is also structured in terms of the Goals and Strategies of the 2016-2024 Ramsar Strategic Plan adopted at COP12 as Resolution XII.2.

4. This COP14 NRF includes 90 indicator questions. In addition, Section 4 is provided as an optional Annex in order to facilitate the task of preparing the Party's National Targets and Actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024 according to Resolution XII.2.

5. As was the case for previous NRF, the COP14 NRF includes an optional section (Section 5) to permit a Contracting Party to provide additional information, on indicators relevant to each individual Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar Site) within its territory.

6. Note that, for the purposes of this national reporting to the Ramsar Convention, the scope of the term "wetland" is that of the Convention text, i.e. all inland wetlands (including lakes and rivers), all nearshore coastal wetlands (including tidal marshes, mangroves and coral reefs) and human-made wetlands (e.g. rice paddy and reservoirs), even if a national definition of "wetland" may differ from that adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention.

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

7. National Reports from Contracting Parties are official documents of the Convention and are made publicly available on the Convention's website.

8. There are seven main purposes for the Convention's National Reports. These are to:
i) provide data and information on how, and to what extent, the Convention is being implemented
ii) provide tools for countries for their national planning
iii) capture lessons and experience to help Parties plan future action;
iv) identify emerging issues and implementation challenges faced by Parties that may require further attention from the Conference of the Parties;
v) provide a means for Parties to account for their commitments under the Convention;
vi) provide each Party with a tool to help it assess and monitor its progress in implementing the Convention, and to plan its future priorities; and
vii) provide an opportunity for Parties to draw attention to their achievements during the triennium.

9. The data and information provided by Parties in their National Reports have another valuable purpose as well, since a number of the indicators in the National Reports on Parties' implementation provide key sources of information for the analysis and assessment of the "ecological outcome-oriented indicators of effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention".

10. To facilitate the analysis and subsequent use of the data and information provided by Contracting Parties in their National Reports, the Ramsar Secretariat holds in a database all the information it has received and verified. As for COP13, the COP14 reports will be in an online National Reporting system.

11. The Convention's National Reports are used in a number of ways. These include:
i) providing an opportunity to compile and analyze information that contracting parties can use to inform their national planning and programming.
ii) providing the basis for reporting by the Secretariat to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the global, national and regional implementation, and the progress in implementation, of the Convention. This is provided to Parties at the COP as a series of Information Papers, including:
* the Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Convention at the global level;
* the Report of the Secretary General pursuant to Article 8.2 (b), (c), and (d) concerning the List of Wetlands of International Importance); and
* the reports providing regional overviews of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in each Ramsar region;
iii) providing information on specific implementation issues in support of the provision of advice and decisions by Parties at the COP.
iv) providing the source data for time-series assessments of progress on specific aspects in the implementation of the Convention included in other Convention products. An example is the summary of progress since COP3 (Regina, 1997) in the development of National Wetland Policies, included as Table 1 in Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 2 (4th edition, 2010); and
v) providing information for reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on the national implementation of the CBD/Ramsar Joint Work Plan and the Ramsar Convention's lead implementation role on wetlands for the CBD. In particular, the Ramsar Secretariat and STRP used the COP10 NRF indicators extensively in 2009 to prepare contributions to the in-depth review of the CBD programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems for consideration by CBD SBSTTA14 and COP10 during 2010 (see UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/3). Similar use of COP13 NRF indicators is anticipated for the CBD's post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

12. The structure of the COP14 National Report Format

Section 1 provides the institutional information about the Administrative Authority and National Focal Points for the national implementation of the Convention.
Section 2 is a 'free-text' section in which the Party is invited to provide a summary of various aspects of national implementation progress and recommendations for the future.
Section 3 provides the 90 implementation indicator questions, grouped under each Convention implementation Goals and Targets in the Strategic Plan 2016-2024, and with an optional 'free-text' section under each indicator question in which the Contracting Party may, if it wishes, add further information on national implementation of that activity.
Section 4 is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that has developed national targets to provide information on the targets and actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024.
In line with Resolution XII.2, which encourages Contracting Parties "to develop and submit to the Secretariat on or before December 2016, and according to their national priorities, capabilities and resources, their own quantifiable and time-bound national and regional targets in line with the targets set in the Strategic Plan", all Parties are encouraged to consider using this comprehensive national planning tool as soon as possible, in order to identify the areas of highest priority for action and the relevant national targets and actions for each target.
The planning of national targets offers, for each of them, the possibility of indicating the national priority for that area of activity as well as the level of resourcing available, or that could be made available during the triennium, for its implementation. In addition, there are specific boxes to indicate the National Targets for implementation by 2021 and the planned national activities that are designed to deliver these targets. Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024 shows the synergies between CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Ramsar Targets. Therefore, the NRF provide an opportunity that Contracting Parties indicate as appropriate how the actions they undertake for the implementation of the Ramsar Convention contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets according to paragraph 51 of Resolution XII.3.
Section 5 is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that so wishes to provide additional information regarding any or all of its Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites).

General guidance for completing and submitting the COP14 National Report Format

Important – please read this guidance section before starting to complete the National Report form
13. All Sections of the COP14 NRF should be completed in one of the Convention's official languages (English, French, Spanish).
14. The deadline for submission of the **completed NRF is January 21st 2021**. It will not be possible to

include information from National Reports received after that date in the analysis and reporting on Convention implementation to COP14.
15. The deadline for submission of **national targets is by 24 January 2020**
16. To help Contracting Parties refer to relevant information they provided in their National Report to COP12, for each appropriate indicator a cross-reference is provided to the equivalent indicator(s) in the COP12 NRF or previous NRF, shown thus: {x.x.x}
17. For follow up and where appropriate, a cross-reference is also provided to the relevant Key Result Area (KRA) relating to Contracting Parties implementation in the Strategic Plan 2009-2015.
18. Only Strategic Plan 2016-2024 Targets for which there are implementation actions for Contracting Parties are included in this reporting format. Those targets of the Strategic Plan that do not refer directly to Parties are omitted in the National Report Format as the information is provided through the Ramsar Sites Data Base or the Work Plan of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (e.g. targets 6 and 14).
19. For each indicator question you can choose only one answer. If you wish to provide further information or clarification, do so in the additional information box below the relevant indicator question. Please be as concise as possible (**maximum of 500 words** in each free-text box).
20. The NRF should ideally be completed by the principal compiler in consultation with relevant colleagues in their agency and others within the government and, as appropriate, with NGOs and other stakeholders who might have fuller knowledge of aspects of the Party's overall implementation of the Convention. The principal compiler can save the document at any point and return to it later to continue or to amend answers. Compilers should refer back to the National Report submitted for COP13 to ensure the continuity and consistency of information provided. In the online system there is an option to allow consultation with others.
21. The completed NRF **must be accompanied by a letter that can be uploaded in the online system or send by email (nationalreports@ramsar.org) in the name of the Head of Administrative Authority, confirming that this is the Contracting Party's official submission of its COP14 National Report**.
If you have any questions or problems, please contact the Ramsar Secretariat for advice (nationalreports@ramsar.org).

Section 1: Institutional Information

Important note: the responses below will be considered by the Ramsar Secretariat as the definitive list of your focal points, and will be used to update the information it holds. The Secretariat's current information about your focal points is available at https://www.ramsar.org/search?f%5B0%5D=type%3Aperson#search-contacts

Name of Contracting Party

The completed National Report **must be accompanied by a letter** in the name of the Head of Administrative Authority, confirming that this is the Contracting Party's official submission of its COP14 National Report. It can be attached to this question using the "Manage documents" function (blue symbol below)
› Canada

Designated Ramsar Administrative Authority

Name of Administrative Authority
› Daniel Wolfish

Head of Administrative Authority - name and title
› Daniel Wolfish, Director General, Regional Operations Directorate, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment and Climate Change Canada

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

(DW)_Signé_-_National_Report_Submission_Letter_COP14_Canada.pdf - National Report Submission letter from AA

Mailing address
› 351 St. Joseph Blvd., Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0H3

Telephone/Fax
› 819-420-7729

Email
› daniel.wolfish@canada.ca

Designated National Focal Point for Ramsar Convention Matters

Name and title
› Jacey Scott, Section Head, Wetlands Office, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment and Climate Change Canada

Mailing address
› 351 St. Joseph Blvd., Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0H3

Telephone/Fax
› 343-552-8534

Email
› jacey.scott@canada.ca

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

Name and title
› Line Rochefort, Full Professor, Researcher

Name of organisation
› Laval University

Mailing address
› 2480 Hochelaga Blvd., Laval University

Telephone/Fax
› 1-418-670-2731 ext. 402583

Email
› line.rochefort@fsaa.ulaval.ca

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

Name and title
› n/a

Name of organisation
›

Mailing address
›

Telephone/Fax
›

Email
›

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

Name and title
› n/a

Name of organisation
›

Mailing address
›

Telephone/Fax
›

Email
›

Section 2: General summary of national implementation progress and challenges

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

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

1)
› New and improved policies and legislation continue to guide wetland conservation in Canada. For example, Quebec's Act respecting the conservation of wetlands and bodies of water came into effect in 2017 and a preliminary analysis conducted by the government of Quebec showed a reduced loss of wetlands across the province.
The Government of the Northwest Territories operates under Healthy Land, Healthy People: Government of the Northwest Territories Priorities for Conservation Network Planning 2016-2021 which defines objectives for the creation of a network of areas to protect biodiversity, ecological integrity and cultural continuity, including the conservation of wetlands.
In December 2017, the Government of Saskatchewan released its overarching Prairie Resilience climate change strategy, designed to make the province more resilient to the climatic, economic and policy impacts of climate change. Continued implementation of Saskatchewan's agricultural water management framework helps assure continued productivity, enhances wetland habitat conservation and improves runoff management in times of both drought and flood.
In 2017, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry released "A Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario", which outlines a 2017-2030 framework for wetland conservation in the province of Ontario. It has two main goals: to halt net loss of wetland function and area by 2025 in areas where net loss is greatest, and for a net gain to be achieved in these same areas by 2030.
The Yukon government is currently developing a wetland stewardship policy, with the aim of completing the policy by summer 2021. Until completion, the Territory has also put in place an interim approach to the protection and reclamation of wetlands in the Indian River Valley (effective January 2020).

2)
› Through Budget 2018, the Government of Canada allocated $1.3 billion over 5 years to protect ecosystems, landscapes, and biodiversity including species at risk. This investment represents one of the biggest single investments in nature conservation in Canadian history. This Nature Legacy Initiative is being used to: develop a connected network of protected and conserved areas and expanded natural and wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries; increase federal capacity to manage protected areas, including national parks; transform the approach to species at risk and biodiversity conservation; build relationships and advancing reconciliation with Indigenous peoples; and, support the Canada Nature Fund, making it possible to secure private land, establish protected and conserved areas including Indigenous protected and conserved areas, and support provincial/territorial species protection efforts.

3)
› Implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, an international action plan to conserve migratory birds throughout North America, continues to be the cornerstone of wetland and waterfowl conservation in Canada. Between April 1, 2017, and March 31, 2020, Canadian North American Waterfowl Management Plan partners secured over 1.2 million hectares and enhanced over 603,800 hectares of wetlands and associated uplands in Canada. This brings the total secured wetlands and associated uplands under the auspices of the Plan to over 9.3 million hectares since 1986.

4)
› Fisheries and Oceans Canada's Coastal Restoration Fund is providing $75 million over 5 years (2017-2022) to support coastal habitat restoration programs at the local and community level, with the intention of mitigating marine stressors. Currently, the Fund is projected to restore 65,046 hectares of aquatic habitat and contribute to the survival or recovery of 223 threatened and endangered species. Within this funding, $4.7 million was allotted over the 5 years for projects supporting estuary restoration and connectivity at the Fraser River Delta Ramsar site.

5)
› The Marsh Monitoring Program is a wildlife monitoring program for coastal and inland marshes. In 2020, it celebrated 25 years of a binational partnership led by Birds Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Since 1995, more than 1,800 Citizen Scientists have volunteered 150,000 hours to collect information on birds, frogs and their habitats at 6,500 unique survey stations. During this time, 39% of 18 marsh bird species saw an increased population, 33% decreased and 28% remained stable.

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

1)
› Most recently, the global pandemic caused by COVID-19 has reduced overall capacity and focus on wetlands conservation. The pandemic has delayed field work and monitoring across the country. Since the majority of on-the-ground activities occur during spring and summer, much of this work has not occurred to full capacity, causing potential major disruptions in long-term data gathering, conservation and monitoring. Furthermore, shifts in economic priorities to address the pandemic has also caused delays or reduced funding.

2)
› Limited data to accurately assess the full extent of wetlands in Canada, especially in the northern regions, and lack of ongoing monitoring programs to track status and trends of all classes of wetlands and key aspects of the ecological goods and services that they provide.

3)
› Limited financial resources and capacity among various organizations relating to the implementation of the Convention across Canada, including communication and information sharing and engaging partners in a national dialogue for advancing Ramsar objectives in Canada.

4)
› Overall communication of the values and roles of wetlands to the public to increase and support responsible management, use, and conservation of wetlands.

5)
› Challenges with Ramsar Sites' management related to biophysical factors such as changing water levels and spread of invasive alien species.

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

1)
› Create formalized partnerships with Indigenous peoples ensuring that their voices, traditional knowledge and cultural resources are valued and incorporated in decision-making regarding the conservation of wetlands.

2)
› Work with partners, such as the Canadian Wetlands Roundtable, to continue the development of the wetlands inventory across Canada. The inventory is crucial in providing a baseline data for many other studies such as determining the impacts of climate change, monitoring species movement, determining status and trends of wetlands. The inventory is only at 25% complete. Given the funding, resources and personnel needed, this is an ongoing task.

3)
› Explore opportunities to advance the implementation of the Ramsar Convention as it relates to nature-based climate solutions, the creation of a Canada Water Agency, the Pan-Canadian Approach to Transforming Species at Risk Conservation in Canada, and increasing diversity and gender representation in wetlands conservation.
For example, the federal government's 2020 Speech from the Throne made a commitment towards using nature-based solutions to fight climate change, including by planting two billion trees. This was followed by the 2020 fall economic statement in which the Federal government proposes to provide up to $631 million over ten years, starting in 2021-22, for Environment and Climate Change Canada to work with partners to implement climate smart, natural solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions related to ecosystem loss.

4)
› Better communicate the importance of wetlands to Canadians by increasing dialogue and opportunities for sharing information between wetland stakeholders with a focus on improving the understanding and implementation of the Ramsar Convention.
For example, the Canadian Wetlands Roundtable and North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) promote wetlands role in mitigating and adapting to climate change, and encourage responsible wetland management. Furthermore, examine ways to provide support to assist with documenting and addressing changes to Ramsar Sites and supporting new Ramsar site nominations.

5)
› Conserve wetlands as part of Canada's commitment to conserve at least 25 percent of Canada's terrestrial (which includes land and freshwater) and 25 percent of Canada's oceans through a network of parks, protected and conserved areas, and other effective area-based conservation measures by 2025. These areas, including wetlands, conserve Canada's biodiversity, contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, provide habitat to recover species at risk, and prevent other species from becoming at risk.

D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning priorities for implementation assistance and

requirements for such assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?
› No specific recommendations at this time.

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)
› No specific recommendations at this time.

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)?
› Canada has various national-scale coordination mechanisms focused on environmental subjects. These national committees and steering groups facilitate the exchange of ideas between government agencies, between different levels of government and with partners and stakeholders. Opportunities to work collaboratively on issues that are shared between MEAs are identified and enabled through these groups. Nevertheless, synergies between national implementation of the Ramsar Convention and other biodiversity-related conventions can be improved through exploring ways to avoid duplication, information sharing among government departments and agencies involved in biodiversity and climate change, and promoting opportunities to achieve shared or overlapping implementation objectives.

G. How is the Ramsar Convention linked with the implementation of water policy/strategy and other strategies in the country (e.g., on sustainable development, energy, extractive industries, poverty reduction, sanitation, food security, biodiversity) and how this could be improved?
› Currently, Ramsar guidance and wise use principles are considered, where possible, in provincial, territorial, and federal strategies and their use should continue to be encouraged. Through sustainable development initiatives and analysis of ecosystem services, improved strategies will be researched, shared, and supported by policy-makers to influence the conservation and management of wetlands.

H. According to paragraph 21 of Resolution XIII.18 on Gender and wetlands, please provide a short description about the balance between men and women participating in wetland-related decisions, programmes and research.
› The Government of Canada has chosen to make gender equality a priority. The Government of Canada formed Canada's first gender-balanced cabinet in 2015, and appointed the first woman Government House leader as well as the first ever Minister fully dedicated to gender issues. The Government of Canada serves on the UN Commission on the Status of Women, and the Prime Minister of Canada is the youth ambassador for HeforShe and continues to support the UN Women's HeforShe campaign.
Gender-based analysis is now a prerequisite for most of Government of Canada activities and equality and inclusiveness are broadly defining priorities of the Government.

I. Do you (AA) have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention?
› Ramsar's Scientific and Technical Review Panel needs to continue collaboration and leverage the expertise of other bodies (e.g. Convention on Biological Diversity, Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, International Organization Partners) in order to undertake tasks with minimal resources. For example, during the next triennium, Ramsar will be updating their Global Peatland Action Plan. This work should be done in collaboration with UNEP – Global Peatland Initiative.

J. Please list the names of the organisations which have been consulted on or have contributed to the information provided in this report
› The following organizations were invited to provide input into the National Report:
International organization: International Joint Commission (Canadian section)
Federal government: Agriculture and Agri-food Canada; Environment and Climate Change Canada; Global Affairs Canada; Natural Resources Canada; Parks Canada Agency; Statistics Canada
Provincial/territorial government: Alberta; British Columbia; Manitoba; New Brunswick; Newfoundland and Labrador; Northwest Territories; Nova Scotia; Nunavut; Ontario; Prince Edward Island; Quebec; Saskatchewan; Yukon
Crown Corporation: Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation (Manitoba); Water Security Agency (Saskatchewan)
Municipal: Alberta Urban Municipalities Association; Association of Manitoba Municipalities; Association of Municipalities in Ontario; Association of Yukon Communities; Fédération Québécoise des Municipalités; Federation of Prince Edward Island Municipalities; Municipalities of Newfoundland and Labrador; Municipalities of Saskatchewan; Northwest Territories Association of Communities; Nunavut Association of Municipalities; Union of British Columbia Municipalities; Union of Municipalities of New Brunswick; Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities;
Academia: Acadia University; Laval University; McGill University; Northern Alberta Institute of Technology;

Nunavut Research Institute; University of Alberta; University of New Brunswick; University of Saskatchewan; University of Waterloo
Private/industry: Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers; Canadian Canola Growers' Association; Canadian Cattleman's Association; Canadian Federation of Agriculture; Canadian Institute of Planners; Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association; CropLife Canada; Federation of Municipalities; Forest Products Association of Canada; Land Stewardship Centre – Alberta Stewardship Network; Mining Association of Canada; New Brunswick Peat Producers Association; Quebec Horticultural Peat Producers Association
Non-government: Alberta Conservation Association; ALUS Canada; Birds Canada; British Columbia Waterfowl Society; Canadian Freshwater Alliance; Canadian Institute for the Advancement of Women; Canadian Weltands Roundtable; Canadian Wildlife Federation; Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust; Delta Waterfowl; Ducks Unlimited Canada; Environmental Defence Canada; International Institute for Sustainable Development; Ivey Foundation;; Nature Canada; Nature Conservancy of Canada; Nature United Canada; Nature Trust of British Columbia; ; Wildlife Habitat Canada; Wildlife Conservation Society of Canada; Trout Unlimited Canada
Indigenous: Assembly of First Nations; Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami; Métis Federation; Métis Nation of Alberta; Métis Nation of British Columbia; Métis National Council; Métis Nation of Ontario; Métis Nation of Saskatchewan; National Aboriginal Forestry Association; Native Women's Association of Canada

Section 3: Indicator questions and further implementation information

Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation

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

Target 1

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

1.1 Have wetland conservation and the identification of wetlands benefits been integrated into sustainable approaches to the following national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i

Please select only one per square.

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

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

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

h) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD - Canadian Biodiversity Strategy | biodivcanada (chm-cbd.net)

h) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD - 2020 Biodiversity Goals and Targets for Canada | biodivcanada (chm-cbd.net)

g) National policies or measures on agriculture - Factsheet

g) National policies or measures on agriculture - Canadian Agricultural Partnership - Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)

1.1 Additional information

› 1.1 Additional information:
Various federal, provincial/ territorial strategies and planning processes incorporate wetland conservation values.
a) National policy or strategy for wetland management
Wetland conservation in Canada is a shared federal, provincial, and territorial responsibility and therefore, no national policy exists. However, there is a Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991) and a number of provincial and territorial policies that contribute to the development of a national approach to wetland management in Canada.
The Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991) promotes wetland conservation through federal decisions and shared responsibilities between provinces. Other federal policies (e.g. Federal Water Policy, Federal Policy

on Land Use, the Fisheries and Oceans Canada Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat, the Federal Environmental Quality Policy Framework, and the Arctic Marine Conservation Strategy) support wetland conservation at the federal level.
The Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) operates under Healthy Land, Healthy People: GNWT Priorities for Conservation Network Planning 2016-2021 which defines objectives for the creation of a network of areas to protect biodiversity, ecological integrity and cultural continuity, including the conservation of wetlands.
In December 2017, the Government of Saskatchewan released its overarching Prairie Resilience climate change strategy, designed to make the province more resilient to the climatic, economic and policy impacts of climate change. Continued implementation of Saskatchewan's agricultural water management framework helps assure continued productivity, enhances wetland habitat conservation and improves runoff management in times of both drought and flood. The Yukon government is currently developing a wetland stewardship policy, with the aim of completing the policy by summer 2021. Until completion, the territory has also put in place an interim approach to the protection and reclamation of wetlands in the Indian River Valley (effective January 2020).
The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry released A Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario in 2017. The Strategy provides a framework for wetland conservation in Ontario from 2017 to 2030. It has four strategic directions that reflect critical components of the conservation of Ontario’s wetlands: awareness, knowledge, partnership, and conservation. The Strategy also outlines a comprehensive suite of actions to be undertaken by the province, including improving Ontario’s wetland inventory and developing policies and tools to reduce the net loss of wetlands. The strategy’s main goals are to halt net loss of wetlands by 2025 in areas where loss is greatest, and to achieve a net gain in wetland function in these areas by 2030.
b) Poverty eradication strategies
In August 2018, the Government of Canada released Opportunity for All – Canada’s First Poverty Reduction Strategy. This strategy brings together investments of $22 billion that the Government has made since 2015 to support the social and economic well-being of all Canadians. While wetlands are not directly included in the strategy, there is a strong focus on clean water with specific initiatives that help to support this strategy, specifically:
• First Nations On-Reserve Water and Wastewater Infrastructure: This investment supports continued efforts to eliminate and prevent long-term drinking water advisories and improve access to clean and safe drinking water on reserves. As of March 31, 2020, $1.64 billion of targeted funds has been invested to support water and wastewater-related infrastructure projects; 619 water and wastewater-related infrastructure projects have been identified and of these, 331 are completed; and, 581 First Nations communities are benefitting from this.
• Clean Water and Wastewater Fund: Budget 2016 invested $2.0 billion over four years, in a new Clean Water and Wastewater Fund. The fund supports projects that will also foster economic growth and support a cleaner and healthier environment for communities.
c) Water resource management and water efficiency plans
Federal and provincial governments are moving towards more efficient uses of water to reduce costs for supplying the resource. The following are provincial examples that all recognize the importance of wetland ecosystem services in water resource management planning: British Columbia’s Water Sustainability Act (2016); the Yukon Water Strategy and Action Plan (2014, 2019); Nova Scotia’s Wetland Conservation Policy (2011); Ontario’s Protecting Property and People: Ontario’s Flooding Strategy (2020); Quebec’s Act Respecting the Conservation of Wetlands and Bodies of Water (2017); and the Northwest Territories and Alberta’s transboundary water management agreement for the Slave River.
d) Coastal and marine resource management plans
Canada’s Ocean Strategy, stemming from the federal Oceans Act (1997), provides a strategic framework for coastal and marine programs and policies based on sustainable development, integrated management and the precautionary approach. Principles are applied through the development and implementation of integrated management plans. Continued research provides opportunities to document changes in wetlands within priority coastal and marine areas over time through land use activities, agriculture, urban/industrial activities, or the effects of climate change.
Natural Resources Canada is supporting the development of a blue economy strategy which is led by Fisheries and Oceans Canada in collaboration with Environment and Climate Change Canada and Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. While not specific to wetlands, the strategy has potential to support key areas of Canada’s blue economy. The northern coastal margin of Yukon is co-managed by Parks Canada and the Inuvialuit First Nation. The Wildlife Management Advisory Council (North Slope)--one component of the Inuvialuit co-management regime--is developing a Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan for the Yukon North Slope, however, wetlands have not been identified as a focal area/habitat in this plan. Since many focal species rely on coastal wetlands, they are considered in these species’ conservation requirements.
e) Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan
Integrated coastal management planning considers ecologically significant areas, including wetlands. The Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries in Nova Scotia is currently considering additional protection for coastal wetlands, has a coastal management strategy that is under consideration, and may provide additional protection for coastal wetlands.
f) National forest programmes
Forest management guidelines and regulations provide standards for consideration of many wetlands and

buffers (e.g. Ontario’s Crown Forest Sustainability Act (1994), Newfoundland’s Forestry Act (1990), British Columbia's Forest and Range Practices Act (2002); Yukon’s Forest Resources Act (2008) and Quebec’s Sustainable Forest Development Act (2010) and Sustainable Forest Management Strategy (2015)).
In order for forest operations to occur on Crown land, forest management plans must be approved by provincial governments. A key component of this approval process is the application of provincial operating guidelines, which require the recognition of water bodies in forest management plans through maintenance of buffer zones and implementation of appropriate road infrastructure. Furthermore, the overarching principles outlined in the Ramsar Handbook aid in the implementation of wise use of wetlands in forest management.
National and regional guidance documents are used to inform forest management planning. Examples of provincial guidebooks used across Canada include the Ontario Site and Stand Guide, Alberta Operating Ground Rules, and Manitoba’s Forest Management Guidelines for Riparian Management.
Sustainable forests certified by independent certification bodies (i.e. the Canadian Standards Association, Forest Stewardship Council, and Sustainable Forestry Initiative) have requirements regarding operations near waterbodies, including wetlands, in their standards. All Forest Products Association of Canada members are certified by one of these bodies and are subject to third party forest certification audits to make sure they are implementing their wetland and other management performance measures. Canada has the largest area of forests where the practices are third party independently certified in the world.
Through one of its research programs, Natural Resources Canada maps forested wetlands of Canada and develops a forested wetland carbon accounting framework integrating upland forest carbon accounting for the National Inventory Report.
g) National policies or measures on agriculture
In April 2018, the Canadian Agricultural Partnership, led by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, launched a five-year $3 billion investment by federal, provincial and territorial governments, that will strengthen the agriculture, agri-food, and agri-based products sector and address priority environmental issues related to water, soil, biodiversity, and climate change. Under the Partnership, up to $690 million in federal programs is available to enhance the competitiveness of the sector, with an emphasis on environmental sustainability and clean growth. Up to $436 million is available for cost-shared programs between the federal and provincial/territorial governments meant to increase awareness of environmental risks among producers and encourage the adoption of technologies and beneficial management practices that will reduce these risks.
h) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD
In 1996, the Canadian Biodiversity Strategy was adopted in response to Canada’s obligation as a party to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity. The strategy recognizes the importance and value of wetland ecosystems and includes a reference to the Ramsar Convention. In 2015, the national Biodiversity Strategy was updated with the 2020 Biodiversity Goals and Targets for Canada by a federal-provincial-territorial working group with input from stakeholders and Indigenous organizations using the Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan for 2011-2020, specifically the global Aichi Targets, as guidance. Under Goal A, Target 1, Canada commits to the conservation of at least 17 percent of terrestrial areas and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas through networks of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. Goal A, Target 3 refers directly to wetland conservation: 'By 2020, Canada's wetlands are conserved or enhanced to sustain their ecosystem services through retention, restoration and management activities.'
i) National policies on energy and mining
Legislation, policy, guidance and stewardship programs in support of mining and energy best practices are in place at the national and many sub-national levels across Canada to guide land-use decisions that impact wetlands.
As part of the federal Fisheries Act (1985), the Metal and Diamond Mining Regulations regulate metal and diamond mining effluent into wetlands and waterbodies. Mining and energy projects generally have to consider the impact to wetland function in any environmental assessment.
Under the federal environmental assessment process, projects could be required to implement mitigation measures to avoid impacts to wetland function, and could be required to offset any residual impacts to wetland function through habitat restoration or enhancement. Specific policies are usually implemented at the provincial or territorial level. For example, Saskatchewan has an environmental review process to manage the impacts of oil and gas development and the Yukon’s wetlands policy is cross-sectoral and applies to energy and mining.
j) National policies on tourism
Socio-economic functions of wetlands are attributed as attractions for tourism and recreation in many parts of Canada and wetlands are valued in the billions of dollars range, including the financial value of annual production directly related to wetlands, for both consumptive activities such as hunting, fishing and trapping, and non-consumptive activities such as tourism and recreation (Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation, 1991). For example, Toursim Saskatchewan promotes provincial destinations and activities such as hunting, birding and nature which would indirectly benefit wetlands.
k) National policies on urban development
There is no overarching national policy on urban development and wetlands; however, many provincial and municipal policies exist in Canada. For example, at the municipal level, the cities of Calgary, Alberta and Moncton, New Brunswick have adopted progressive wetland policies that include preservation of important wetlands. Ontario released a policy statement in 2020 that requires municipalities to identify water resource

systems (including wetlands), and to use subwatershed and watershed plans to inform land use planning decisions. Whereas, in the province of Quebec regional/municipal jurisdictions are responsible for incorporating wetlands into urban planning.

l) National policies on infrastructure

Canada’s 2016 infrastructure plan aims to ensure that Canadian communities are healthy and productive places to live and includes investments of $5 billion over five years towards infrastructure projects that protect communities and support Canada's ongoing transition to a clean growth economy. This includes Infrastructure Canada’s Clean Water and Wastewater Fund, a $2 billion fund which can support the construction of naturalized systems for management and treatment of wastewater and stormwater. To advance Canada’s efforts to build a clean economy, Budget 2017 laid out a plan to invest $21.9 billion in green infrastructure, including initiatives that will support the implementation of the Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change. Of that amount, $9.2 billion has been provided to provinces and territories, to support projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, deliver clean water, safely manage wastewater, help communities prepare for challenges that result from climate change, and help build cleaner, better-connected electricity systems. A further $5 billion was available for green infrastructure projects through the Canada Infrastructure Bank and $2.8 billion through a series of national programs.

A number of provincial and territorial plans and policies on infrastructure exist as well. For example, in Ontario’s updated Provincial Policy Statement (2020) states that municipalities should promote green infrastructure (such as constructed wetlands) to complement built infrastructure. Furthermore, the newly released “Protecting People and Property: Ontario’s Flooding Strategy” includes a wide range of actions meant to increase Ontario’s resiliency to flooding, including focusing on preventing wetlands loss and working towards the net gain of wetlands.

m) National policies on industry

Although there are no national policies on industry that incorporate wetland issues or benefits, some examples of how wetlands may be considered are:

• In 2016, the Government of Canada released the Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change, developed in consultation with provinces, territories, and Indigenous Peoples to ensure Canadians meet emissions reduction targets for greenhouse gases and economic growth. This approach applies to pricing carbon pollution and measures to achieve reductions across all sectors. In 2019, significant progress was made including the establishment of a carbon-pollution pricing across Canada.

• Wetland management is an important part of reclamation for the mining, energy, oil and gas, and agriculture industries. Environment and Climate Change Canada partners with industry on a number of projects through the North American Waterfowl Management Plan focusing various projects across Canada aimed at species and habitats at risk.

• In Canada, peatlands are partially protected by the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991), but the responsibility for the management of natural resources is under the authority of the provincial and territorial governments. Provincially, Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick all have policies relating to peatland extraction and conservation of wetlands. For example, in Manitoba the Peatlands Stewardship Act (2014) promotes the protection and conservation of peatlands and is one of the first of its kind in Canada. In July 2020, Saskatchewan released its Peatlands Disposition Policy. This policy ensures that peatland development is carried out responsibly, with necessary measures in place to protect Saskatchewan’s peat resources.

• At the provincial level, the government of Quebec passed the Wetlands and Water Act in 2017, which contains an exhaustive framework targeting no net loss for wetland ecosystems. Following this, a formula was put in place to establish financial offsets that land developers must pay for wetland loss.

n) National policies on aquaculture and fisheries

Under the federal Fisheries Act (1985), Fisheries and Oceans Canada regulates the aquaculture industry in order to protect fish and fish habitat, including wetlands, through Canada’s Aquaculture Policy Framework (2008), Canada’s Wild Altantic Salmon Conservation Policy (2009), and the Sustainable Fisheries Framework (updated 2019). In addition to these policies, the federal Species at Risk Act (2002) sets out authorities to support the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, including those that use wetlands and their habitats.

o) National plans of actions (NPAs) for pollution control and management

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act (1999) is one of Canada’s primary tools for achieving sustainable development and pollution prevention. This Act supports the prevention and management of risks posed by harmful substances as well as the management of environmental and human health impacts of new and existing substances.

The federal and Ontario provincial government work together to achieve wetland benefits and address wetland conservation objectives through collaboration under the Canada-Ontario Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality and Ecosystem Health (2014). The Agreement includes commitments to restore, protect, and conserve wetlands and other coastal areas of the Great Lakes. Lakewide Action and Management Plans for each of the Canadian Great Lakes incorporate wetland conservation priorities with the Agreement and in Lake Biodiversity Conservation Strategies. The agreement is currently under review for 2020 updates and recently finalized public consultation.

Through the Chemicals Management Plan, the federal government has worked to prevent environmental pollution since it was launched in 2006. Since its launch, 4300 substances were identified as priorities for attention by 2020-2021, of which 3621 have been addressed to date.

p) National policies on wastewater management and water quality
All levels of government share the responsibility for managing the collection, treatment, and the release of wastewater effluent. The Canada-Wide Strategy for the Management of Municipal Wastewater Effluent (2009) set out a collective agreement to ensure that wastewater effluent is managed under a harmonized framework that is protective of the environment and human health, with each jurisdiction using its authority.
In southern Canadian jurisdictions, the federal government manages wastewater through the Wastewater Systems Effluent Regulations (2012) established under the federal Fisheries Act (1985). These regulations require wastewater systems to meet effluent quality standards equivalent to a secondary level of treatment. The regulations fulfill a federal commitment in the Strategy for the establishment of national effluent quality standards for secondary wastewater treatment. Northern jurisdictions were exempted until further research was conducted to establish tangible treatment targets that would be achievable in Arctic conditions and under current northern wastewater treatment systems. Discussions regarding the development of a Northern regulatory framework were re-initiated in June 2019 by Environment and Climate Change Canada outside of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment framework.
Regarding water quality, the Canadian Water Quality Guidelines represent national water quality guidelines for major water uses in Canada. Although not specific to wetlands, these guidelines suggest site-specific guidance for the protection of aquatic life, which includes wetlands and wetland species and agricultural water uses such as irrigation.
Investments in infrastructure are a priority for the federal government. In 2016, Canada launched a new water and wastewater fund to provide communities with more reliable water and wastewater systems so that both drinking water and effluent meet legislated standards. The Government of Canada entered into bilateral agreements with provinces and territories to support provincial, territorial, and municipal water and wastewater priorities. The federal government funds up to 50% of eligible costs of the fund for projects such as stormwater rehabilitation projects, constructed wetlands, stormwater ponds, and or expansions on infrastructure for treatment facilities.

Target 2

Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone.
[Reference to Aichi Targets 7 and 8], [Sustainable Development Goal 6, Indicator 6.3.1]

2.1 Has the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands been assessed to support the implementation of the Guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands (Resolution VIII.1, VIII.2) ? 1.24.
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

2.1 Additional Information
› Large, national-scale assessments have not been done. However, provincial/territorial government agencies and partners that monitor water quality and/or quantity parameters include British Columbia, Alberta, Northwest Territories, Ontario, Quebec, and Yukon.
In addition, scientists at the University of Alberta and the University of Waterloo have researched the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands to support the implementation of the guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands.

2.2 Have assessments of environmental flow been undertaken in relation to mitigation of impacts on the ecological character of wetlands (Action r3.4.iv)
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

2.2 Additional Information

› Assessments to measure environmental flow have been undertaken in some areas, but there is not a comprehensive assessment across Canada. For example, Parks Canada has numerous projects underway for heritage sites that involve monitoring environmental flow. In the Prairie and Atlantic regions, wetland habitat monitoring and environmental flow assessments have been undertaken. In Alberta, environmental flow assessments have been conducted as part of the Surface Water Allocation Directive. In Yukon, environmental flow is assessed for particular developments that might impact wetlands. British Columbia’s Water Sustainability Act requires environmental flow needs of streams (including wetlands) to be considered.

2.3 What, if any, initiatives been taken to improve the sustainability of water use (or allocation of water resources) in the context of ecosystem requirements across major river basins (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12)? (Action 3.4.6.)

Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned
☐ X=Unknown

2.3 Additional Information
› In Canada, natural resource management, including water allocation, is under provincial or territorial jurisdiction. Guidelines for water allocation and management for ecological functions vary from province to province. Many provinces utilize provincial permitting or licensing agreements for their large water users such as Ontario’s Permit to Take Water Program (2004), Alberta’s Water Licensing and Allocation Program (2008), or Quebec’s Environment Quality Act (1996).
Initiatives at the provincial, territorial and local level are underway such as in Alberta, the Land Stewardship Centre has been administering the Water Stewardship Grant (funded by the provincial government of Alberta) since 2006. In 2018 and 2019, the grant program allocated approximately $400,000 to 35 stewardship groups to undertake projects that enhance, restore or protect Alberta's water resources and watersheds.
From 2019 to 2020, a joint working group between the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Canadian Cattlemen’s Association, and the Canadian Canola Growers Association developed a draft list of activities to be considered for Fisheries and Oceans Canada’s Codes of Practice related to agricultural water use. The governments of Alberta and the Northwest Territories have entered into a Bilateral Water Management Agreement to manage shared water resources.
In June 2020, Ontario proposed enhancements to the province's water taking program, including a proposal to enhance existing authority to assess and manage multiple water takings together in areas of the province where water sustainability is a concern, such as the effects of a group of water takings on water availability and aquatic ecosystems within an area.
In addition, the International Joint Commission, through work to support implementation of the water-level regulation plan (Plan 2014), is working closely with provincial agencies and stakeholders to support the health and diversity of Lake Ontario and its coastal wetlands with regards to allocation and management of water for ecological functions. The Commission assists Canada and the United States in the protection of the transboundary environment and in the implementation of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.
Environment and Climate Change Canada is currently undertaking background research to support the formation of a Canada Water Agency. Once formed, this agency will ideally contribute to the sustainability of water use by addressing issues such as pollution, flooding, and climate change.

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

2.4 Additional Information
› Projects that promote and demonstrate good practice are conducted at all levels of jurisdiction and within various organizations. Here are a few examples from this triennium:
Environment and Climate Change Canada supports partners such as Ducks Unlimited Canada and Nature Conservancy of Canada to deliver the North American Waterfowl Management Plan Program in Eastern Canada through the Ontario Eastern Habitat Joint Venture. Projects include wetland securement, management and enhancement. Over 500 hectares of wetland management has taken place and 2,500 hectares of wetlands have been secured since 2018.
In 2016, Ducks Unlimited Canada, Forest Products Association of Canada, and several participating members established the Forest Management and Wetland Stewardship Initiative. Through this program, wetland and waterfowl conservation was integrated into ongoing forest management planning and field operations. This initiative has established wetland conservation guiding principles and best management practices that support companies in achieving their forest management objectives and help them meet the criteria for forest certification programs. Most recently, partners of this initiative have completed three projects aimed to support forest practitioners stay informed on wetlands: 1) Forestry and Waterfowl: Assessing and Mitigating Risk, 2) Guiding Principles for Wetland Stewardship and Forest Management, 3) Guide to Wetland BMPs for Forest Management - Planning and Operating Practices. This partnership has been extended to 2022.
Through the Canadian Agricultural Partnership, provinces and territories design, deliver, and manage federal

cost-shared environment programs that encourage the adoption of beneficial management practices. These practices may directly or indirectly support water allocation and management for maintaining wetland ecological function. Examples include precision fertilizer technologies, improving riparian area management, integrated pest management, planting shelterbelts and agroforestry areas, and on-farm water retention projects to better manage and protect surface water and increase irrigation efficiency.
Nunavut is in the process of creating a best practices guide for environmental assessment, which would cover all freshwater resources.
In Quebec, wildlife management projects with a water management dimension in the wetland-rich Lac Saint-Pierre ecosystem are undertaken.
The Canadian Peat Industry has been engaged in research for 30 years with several Canadian Universities, which has led to the development of many best practices on water management. An update to the Peatland Restoration Guide of 2003 was released in October 2020, and includes some of these best practices.
Nature Conservancy of Canada continues to do securement and restoration projects that promote and demonstrate good practice in water allocation and management for maintaining wetland ecological function.
At a municipal level, the City of Delta, British Columbia, has a long-term project to raise the water table and restore the hydrology of Burns Bog within the Fraser River Delta site. The Okanagan Basin Water Board demonstrates good practices in water conservation related to ecological function.

2.5 Percentage of households linked to sewage system?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
› 72.1

2.5 Additional Information
› Statistics reported are from 2009 which are found in the 2011 Municipal Water Use Report. In Canada, 72.1% of single family homes have water meters.

2.6 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact number (percentage)

› 87
☐ F=Less than (percentage)

›
☐ G=More than (percentage)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.6 Additional Information
› 87.1% of the population from the 1,524 responding municipalities in the 2011 Municipal Water Use Report is served by a piped sewer network.

2.7 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine if relevant to your country?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact number (percentage)

› 13
☐ F=Less than (percentage)

›
☐ G=More than (percentage)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.7 Additional Information
› 12.9% of the population from the 1,524 responding municipalities in the 2011 Municipal Water Use Report is on private septic systems/served sewage haulage.

2.8 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.8 Additional Information

› Canada uses constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technologies in various parts of the country. Many international airports, including Toronto and Edmonton use constructed wetlands for the treatment of glycol contaminated storm water. Constructed wetlands/ponds are used as wastewater treatment technology including tertiary treatment systems in Canada with examples in Nova Scotia, Yukon, and many remote northern communities.
In 2016, Canada launched a new water and wastewater fund to provide communities with more reliable water and wastewater systems, ensuring drinking water and effluent meet legislated standards. The federal government funds up to 50% of eligible costs of the fund for projects, such as stormwater rehabilitation projects, constructed wetlands, stormwater ponds, and/or expansions on infrastructure for treatment facilities.

2.9 Number of wastewater treatment plants (or volume treated exist at national level)? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option
☐ E=Exact number (plants)

›
☐ F=Less than (plants)

›
☑ G=More than (plants)

› 5800Mm3
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.9 Additional Information

› In 2017, the volume of treated wastewater was just over 5,800 million cubic meters of treated wastewater discharged.

2.10 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants? If relevant to your country SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option
☑ A=Good
☐ B=Not functioning
☐ C=Functioning
☐ Q=Obsolete
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.10 Additional Information

› In 2017, just over 30 million people were served by municipal wastewater systems that have daily flows that process 100 cubic metres per day or more. Primary treatment systems served 4.8 million people, secondary treatment systems processed wastewater for 15.1 million people, while 9.8 million Canadians were served by tertiary treatment systems. Over 600,000 people discharged their wastewater into systems that provide no treatment. The remaining five million Canadians either had their own on-site wastewater system or were served by other systems with daily flows of less than 100 cubic metres per day, or by other facilities outside the scope of the survey (Statistics Canada, survey number 5288).

2.11 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is? SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.

Please select only one option
☐ A=Good
☐ B=Not Functioning
☐ C=Functioning
☐ Q=Obsolete
☑ X=Unknown

☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.11 Additional Information
› The analysis to support this question is unavailable at this time.

2.12 Number of wastewater reuse systems (or volume re-used) and purpose?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
› 2,593.2

2.12 Additional Information
› The Industrial Water Survey (2015; released in 2018) includes estimates of water recirculation and most recent sources report 2,593.2 cubic metres of total water recirculation for all industries in Canada.

2.13 What is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system if relevant to your country ?
SDG 6 Target 6.3.1.
Please select only one option
☑ R=Agriculture
☐ S=Landscape
☐ T=Industrial
☐ U=Drinking
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

2.13 Additional Information

Please indicate if the wastewater reuse system is for free or taxed or add any additonal information.
› R = Agricultural, S = Landscape, T = Industrial
Canada has wastewater reuse systems in place for agriculture, landscape, and industrial use. Various regions of Canada may be impacted from water shortages at various times of the year due to droughts, surface and groundwater contamination, isolation from large-scale municipal treatment centres, under-capacity municipal potable water and wastewater treatment facilities. On-site water reuse technology offers an affordable alternative to conventional systems, particularly in areas where infrastructure expansion is required. Water reuse systems are used for agricultural irrigation, non-potable urban and recreational reuse, on-site grey water reuse, industrial reuse, rainwater or storm water collection and surface water augmentation and groundwater recharge in many parts of Western and Central Canada.
The majority of large wastewater reuse systems are taxed as they operate on municipal systems or municipal infrastructure.

2.14 Does your country use a wastewater treatment process that utilizes wetlands as a natural filter while preserving the wetland ecosystem?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ X=Unknown

2.14 Additional information: If Yes, please provide an example
› Canada uses constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technologies in various parts of the country; however, the impact to wetland ecosystems is unknown.

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

3.1 Is the private sector encouraged to apply the Ramsar wise use principle and guidance (Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1}
KRA 1.10.i
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

3.1 Additional Information
› Many of the principles and guidance provided by Ramsar are reflected in federal and/or provincial and territorial guidelines and programs available to the private sector. Many non-governmental organizations

including Ducks Unlimited Canada, Nature Conservancy of Canada, and Wildlife Habitat Canada promote their use with the private sector, through a number of their programs.
For instance, the Forest Products Association of Canada uses the Ramsar Handbook for guidance on overarching principles to aid in the implementation of wetland management. The peat moss industry also uses it, along with the Strategy for Responsible Peatland Management distributed through the International Peatland Society.

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

Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Sites	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
b) Wetlands in general	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes

3.2 Additional information

› In Canada, many activities and actions for wetlands are conducted through the four Canadian Habitat Joint Ventures (HJVs). The HJVs are a public-private partnership that actively research, monitor and evaluate waterfowl populations, and deliver habitat conservation programs at a regional level.
A few examples of how the private sector is involved through partnership opportunities:
a) Ramsar Sites
• Minesing: Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority works with private landowners to secure ecologically significant lands that are identified as priorities for conservation action.
• Shepody Bay: The Nature Conservancy of Canada has undertaken many stewardship and land conservation activities within or immediately adjacent to Shepody Bay. Ducks Unlimited Canada has done many wetland conservation and enhancement projects.
• In 2020, Ducks Unlimited Canada was able to secure the 200-hectare St. Luke’s Marsh (a significant coastal marsh area), which is adjacent to St. Clair National Wildlife Area Ramsar site.
b) Wetlands in general:
Conservation groups work with private landowners to support wetland conservation including contributing to the goals of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan; identifying beneficial management practices for wetland stewardship; and enabling wetland restoration. Hunters provide an ongoing financial commitment to support wetland conservation programs through provincial/territorial licensing fees and purchase of the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp associated with federal Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits.
Examples of such activities or actions:
• Through the Federal government’s Natural Heritage Conservation Program, $100 million will be invested from 2019 to 2023, for the securement of 80,000 hectares of private land containing wetlands.
• In the last three years, through funds generated from the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp, Wildlife Habitat Canada has been able to directly fund 112 wetland-related projects resulting in over 25,500 hectares of wetland conserved, restored or enhanced.
Furthermore, Canadian industries invest in wetland research and engagement through conservation partnerships such as
• The Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association is investing in research on peatlands, and is part of two six-year research programs (2018-2024). They are also involved in the development of a National Peatland Restoration Strategy.
• CropLife Canada supports the proper use of crop protection products as a key element of fresh water and wetland protection. Interactions with water are considered at every stage of the pest control product life cycle.
• In 2018, The Mining Association of Canada’s Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) initiative was expanded to include a new Water Stewardship Protocol. In addition to ensuring that a systematic approach to operational water management is in place, implementation of this protocol also involves watershed planning beyond the footprint of a mining facility. Additionally, the Water Stewardship Protocol complements TSM’s pre-existing Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol, which outlines commitments and standards related to the conservation of “significant biodiversity aspects”, such as valued ecosystems such as wetlands.

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

3.3 Additional information

› During the past triennium, a number of actions have been taken to implement incentive measures encouraging wetland conservation and wise use. Examples include:
Federal initiatives:
- From April 1, 2014, to March 31, 2019, the federal government invested $36.6 million through the National Wetland Conservation Fund (NWCF) to support on-the-ground activities to restore and enhance wetlands in local wetland conservation projects. Across Canada, 257 NWCF projects secured over 14,600 hectares, restored over 5,100 hectares and enhanced 374,000 hectares. In the last year of the program (2018-2019), over $3.0 million was invested in 59 projects.
- Under the federal Ecological Gifts Program, 195 ecologically sensitive lands were secured between January 2018 and June 2020, 45% of which are wetlands.
- The federal government invested $1.35 billion in 2018 in various nature conservation programs. This included establishing the Canada Nature Fund, which provided an increase in overall funding for the conservation of wetlands across the country. The Canada Nature Fund provides funding to advance progress toward Canada's biodiversity commitments (pertaining to Canada's Biodiversity Strategy). As a result, $10 million was allocated to the North American Waterfowl Management Plan to further the conservation and securement of just over 10,000 hectares of Canadian wetlands and associated upland habitats.
- Between the fiscal years of 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, the federal Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk invested $6 million/year to terrestrial projects that contribute to species at risk recovery. Some of these projects benefit wetland conservation. For example, in 2018-2019, $76,500 dollars went to the Rural Lambton Stewardship Network to increase biodiversity in the wetlands of the St. Clair Plains region in Ontario.
- Under the Canadian Agricultural Partnership, up to $436 million is available for environment and climate change cost-shared programs between the federal and provincial/territorial governments. These programs are designed to raise producers' awareness of environmental risks, and accelerate the adoption of on-farm technologies and beneficial management practices to reduce these risks. This includes protecting and improving on-farm wetlands.
Provincial initiatives:
- Ontario's provincial Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program provides a 100% property tax exemption over private conservation lands that have Provincially Significant Wetlands.
Several financial incentive measures have been implemented by government and private entities.
Non-government initiatives:
- In Alberta, the Land Stewardship Centre is launching a pilot project in conjunction with Beaver Hills Biosphere Reserve Association. This project will adopt an inter-municipal approach to supporting wetland restoration and stewardship. The projects will also involve land owners, and will explore an alternative approach to wetland conservation.
- Trout Unlimited Canada provides funding support for riparian fencing and off-stream livestock watering.
- Wildlife Habitat Canada's strategic plans for 2020-2025 will begin to actively direct grant funds to projects that implement incentive measures that will encourage the wise use of wetlands.

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned
☐ Z=Not Applicable

3.4 Additional Information

› While a number of perverse legislative and incentive measures are still in place in some regions, efforts are being made to reduce impacts. Through partnerships, actions of policy development/enforcement, economic benefit, funding incentives, and increases to infrastructure, perverse legislative and incentive measures continue to be minimized.
Policy development:
• Saskatchewan's Water Security Agency delivers a wetland retention incentive program to agricultural producers that covers the seed costs of converting annual cropland to perennial forage. This removes the motivation to drain wetlands.
• Ducks Unlimited Canada works extensively to influence provincial and federal policy-makers to develop and implement effective and integrative wetland protection policies. They have had success in some jurisdictions, most notably the Atlantic region, Quebec and Manitoba.
Economic benefits and funding:

• The Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation provides grant funding through the Conservation Trust and GROW Trust. The Conservation Trust was announced in March 2018, and the GROW trust was established in 2019. The Trust funds on-the-ground conservation projects across Manitoba's working landscapes that provide Ecological Goods and Services. Funds for these grants are sourced from endowments totalling about $200 million and will provide about $10 million in conservation funding per year to organizations working in Manitoba.
o Furthermore, In 2020, Manitoba established a third conservation trust fund, the Wetlands GROW Trust, with a $50.0 million contribution. The GROW Wetlands Trust is intended to support the protection of critical temporary wetlands within the province. This activity focuses on the conservation of existing temporary wetlands that have not been drained or filled but may be cultivated from time to time.
• Wildlife Habitat Canada has awarded grants to projects that specifically address perverse incentive measures.
• Quebec allows some compensation for developers that complete their projects outside of important wetlands.

Target 4

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

4.1 Does your country have a comprehensive national inventory of invasive alien species that currently or potentially impact the ecological character of wetlands? {1.9.1} KRA 1.9.i
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

4.1 Additional information
› Several online open access databases at the national scale are available on invasive alien species including those that impact wetlands.
-Canadian Wildlife Federation Invasive Aquatic Plant Encyclopedia (http://cwf-fcf.org/en/resources/encyclopedias/invasive-species/invasive-aquatic-animals-encyclopedia.html?src=menu).
-Wild Species 2015 (https://species-registry.canada.ca/index-en.html#/documents/3174) is a Canadian database with information on 2394 exotic species.
-The Canadian Wildlife Federation maintains an invasive alien species encyclopedia (http://cwf-fcf.org/en/resources/encyclopedias/invasive-species/).
Provinces and territories also maintain inventories listing invasive alien species:
-British Columbia: Tracks invasive species through several different platforms such as the Invasive Alien Plant Program Database and Map Display (IAPP), the BC Conservation Data Centre and through their Provincial Invasive Species Reporting Mobile App.
- Alberta: has a government-led database that tracks occurrences of Aquatic Invasive Species in a Fish & Wildlife Management Information system. Primarily focused on prohibited species but also tracking other species of concern like goldfish and Prussian carp. (https://www.alberta.ca/fisheries-and-wildlife-management-information-system.aspx). Alberta also leverages the citizen science platform of EDDMaps Alberta. (https://www.eddmaps.org/alberta/)
- Saskatchewan: The Saskatchewan Conservation Data Centre maintains iMapInvasives for mapping and inventorying invasive alien species in the province (http://www.biodiversity.sk.ca/invasives.htm).
- Ontario: Invasive Species in Ontario are reported/tracked using the web-based Eddmaps tool and a supporting hotline which is operated through a partnership with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters.
- Quebec: The province coordinates and funds programs to help detect and track invasive plant species in over 800 stations. The Sentinelle network is a citizen-based detection tool for invasive alien species (https://www.pub.mddefp.gouv.qc.ca/scc/#no-back-button).
Many management plans, such as those for National Parks and other federal Protected Areas also include partial inventories of invasive alien species.

4.2 Have national policies or guidelines on invasive species control and management been established or reviewed for wetlands? {1.9.2} KRA 1.9.iii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

4.2 Additional information

› Nationally, the 2004 Invasive Alien Species Strategy for Canada outlines a national approach for managing invasive alien species, including those that impact wetlands. The strategy assists to prevent new invasions, detect and respond to new invasive alien species as well as manage established invasive alien species through eradication, containment, and control. In 2015, federal-provincial-territorial Conservation, Wildlife and Biodiversity Ministers adopted recommendations to support continued progress on implementation of the Invasive Alien Species Strategy (http://biodivcanada.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=81BC7F85-1). These recommendations are relevant across Canada and include wetland areas affected, or potentially affected, by invasive alien species.

Many provinces and territories also have strategies or guidelines to address invasive alien species, including those present in wetlands (e.g. Invasive Alien Species Strategy for British Columbia (2017-2022); Ontario Invasive Species Strategic Plan (2012)). Ontario has adopted an Invasive Species Act (2015) and best management practices for addressing invasive alien Phragmites are promoted. Alberta has developed an Early Detection Rapid Response plan for aquatic invasive species. Quebec is currently drafting policies to address invasive species that target specific habitats including wetlands.

Non-governmental organizations, including Ducks Unlimited Canada and the Nature Conservancy of Canada, assist in controlling many invasive alien species such as European Water Chestnut (Trapa natans L.), Purple Loosestrife (Lythrum salicaria), Common Carp (Cyprinus carpio), Cordgrass (Spartina spp.) and Phragmites (Phragmites australis) on wetland project sites.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ X=Unknown

4.3 Additional Information

If ‘Yes’, please provide examples, including the species name and the successful management action

› A number of provincial programs exist for the control of invasive species through management actions specifically in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, and at specific websites as reflected in section 4.1.

For example, in Alberta, funding recipients of the Watershed Stewardship Grant, successfully eradicated Himalayan Balsam at Pigeon Lake to the benefit of watersheds and wetlands.

Invasive alien species-impacted wetlands are protected from further encroachment of invasive fish species. Successful programs include: the British Columbia Waterfowl Society has successfully controlled Purple Loosestrife through a biological control agent, as well as manual removal. There has been successful removal of American Bullfrog in the Okanagan region of British Columbia. Removal programs are ongoing in the Lower Mainland and Kootenay regions. Alberta has been successful in controlling Pale Yellow Iris and Purple Loosestrife through a combination of chemical treatments (mainly for Purple Loosestrife) and hand pulling (Pale Yellow Iris). In Manitoba, Ducks Unlimited Canada has built and installed physical barriers to exclude European Common Carp populations.

Ontario has successfully controlled Water Soldier, European Water Chestnut, Phragmites, and Parrot Feather in several locations. This includes a Phragmites removal project at Long Point by the Nature Conservancy of Canada and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. Between 2016 and 2018, more than 1,100 hectares of Phragmites-infested wetland at Long Point was successfully treated using a combination of chemical and mechanical removal.

In 2019, Environment and Climate Change Canada managed, through various control mechanisms, approximately 10 hectares of Phragmites at the Big Creek and Long Point National Wildlife Areas, which was the first Phragmites management project on federal land. The goal of this project is to manage up to 850 hectares on federal land by 2024.

4.4 Are there invasive species of high risk to wetland ecosystems that have not been successfully controlled through management actions?

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ X=Unknown

4.4 Additional Information

If ‘Yes’, please provide examples, including the species name and the challenges to management

› There are many invasive species that have dominated the landscape and for which organizations and governments continue to manage such as Hybrid Cattail throughout the Prairies, Spartina in the West Coast, European Water Chestnut in Quebec, and Purple Loosestrife throughout the country.

Phragmites (or European Common Reed) is one of the worst offenders across Canada and continues to cause

stress in many ecosystems. Its adaptability to North American wetlands has proved challenging, although some migratory bird species are adapting to them. At Long Point and Bkejwangong, various species of swallows have preferred it as their roosting habitat.
Common Carp also threatens many freshwater coastal wetlands in larger lakes. In Delta Marsh, control structures have been put in place to mitigate common carp population.

4.5 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

4.5 Additional Information
› A comprehensive effectiveness assessment of invasive alien species control programs is not available at this time. Ongoing assessments include:
- The Nature Conservancy of Canada has assessed its Phragmites control initiatives at Long Point to be highly effective.
- Birds Canada assessed the impact of Phragmites control in Ontario and found that the removal of the species had a more positive effect on marsh-breeding birds than on frogs.
- Ontario's control programs for water soldier, European water chestnut, and Phragmites are assessed annually by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network
[Reference to Sustainable Development Goals 6, 11, 13, 14, 15]

Target 5
The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}
[Reference to Aichi Targets 6,11, 12]

5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.1 Additional information
› Large, national-scale assessments have not been done. However, provincial/territorial government agencies and partners that monitor water quality and/or quantity parameters include British Columbia, Alberta, Northwest Territories, Ontario, Quebec, and Yukon.
In addition, scientists at the University of Alberta and the University of Waterloo have researched the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands to support the implementation of the guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands.

5.2 Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its tools being used in national identification of further Ramsar Sites to designate? {2.2.1} KRA 2.2.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

5.2 Additional information
›

5.3 How many Ramsar Sites have a formal management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i
Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact number (sites)

› 24
☐ F=Less than (sites)

›

☐ G=More than (sites)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

5.4 Of the Ramsar Sites with a formal management plan, for how many of these is the plan being implemented? {2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i
Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact number (sites)

› 24
☐ F=Less than (sites)

›
☐ G=More than (sites)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

5.5 Of the Ramsar sites without a formal management plan, for how many is there effective management planning currently being implemented through other relevant means e.g. through existing actions for appropriate wetland management? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i
Please select only one option
☐ E=Exact number (sites)

›
☑ F=Less than (sites)

› 15
☐ G=More than (sites)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

5.3 – 5.5 Additional information
› The following Ramsar Sites have a management plan for all or a portion of the site (depending on designation): Baie de l'Isle Verte (2017); Cap Tourmente (1986); Chignecto (2016); Columbia River Wetlands (2004); Creston Valley Wildlife Management Area (2004); Fraser River Delta (various dates by management unit); Grand Codroy Estuary (1995); Hay-Zama Lakes (2002); Lac Saint-François National Wildlife Area (2014); Lac Saint-Pierre (2014); Last Mountain Lake (1999); Long Point (1983); Mary's Point (2018); Matchedash Bay (1989); Mer Bleue Conservation Area (2007); Minesing Wetlands (2014); Old Crow Flats (2006, 2010 by management unit); Peace-Athabasca Delta (2010); Point Pelee National Park (2010); Polar Bear Provincial Park (1980); Shepody Bay (2016, National Wildlife Area portion); St. Clair National Wildlife Area (2018); Tabusintac Lagoon & River Estuary (2004); Whooping Crane Summer Range (2010); and Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary (2018).
Ramsar Sites that are drafting updates to their existing plans: Polar Bear Provincial Park.
Ramsar Sites with a management plan in preparation : Delta Marsh; Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary; McConnell River Migratory Bird Sanctuary; Polar Bear Pass.

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.6 Additional information
› Sites with a completed assessment of the effectiveness of their management plan include: Delta Marsh, Long Point, Peace-Athabasca Delta, Polar Bear Pass, Polar Bear Provincial Park, St. Clair National Wildlife Area, and Whooping Crane Summer Range.

5.7 How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv
Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact number (sites)

› 18
☐ F=Less than (sites)

›
☐ G=More than (sites)

›
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

5.7 Additional information

If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites
› The following Ramsar Sites have cross-sectoral management committees: Columbia River Wetlands (1463); Delta Marsh (238); Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary (249); Hay-Zama Lakes (242); Lac Saint-Pierre (949); Matchedash Bay (866); McConnell River Migratory Bird Sanctuary (248); Minesing Wetlands (865); Oak Hammock Marsh (366); Old Crow Flats (244); Peace-Athabasca Delta (241); Point Pelee National Park (368); Polar Bear Pass (245); Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary (246); St. Clair National Wildlife Area (319); Tabusintac Lagoon & River Estuary (612); Whooping Crane Summer Range (240) and Mer Bleue Conservation Area (755).

Target 7

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

7.1 Are mechanisms in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of negative human-induced changes or likely changes in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.1} KRA 2.6.i
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Some Sites
☐ D=Planned

7.1 Additional information

If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some sites’, please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established
› Thirteen Ramsar Sites are part of Environment and Climate Change Canada’s network of National Wildlife Areas and seven Ramsar Sites contain Migratory Bird Sanctuaries. Environment and Climate Change Canada has a system in place for reporting to the Administrative Authority on changes at these sites.
The 3-year national report cycle encourages all Ramsar Site managers to relay Ramsar Site management concerns to the Administrative Authority. In addition, Ramsar Site Managers participate in conference calls with the Administrative Authority, while the public may approach the Administrative Authority directly with concerns.

7.2 Have all cases of negative human-induced change or likely change in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites been reported to the Ramsar Secretariat, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.2} KRA 2.6.i
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Some Cases
☑ O=No Negative Change

7.2 Additional information

If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some cases’, please indicate for which Ramsar Sites the Administrative Authority has made Article 3.2 reports to the Secretariat, and for which sites such reports of change or likely change have not yet been made
› 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):
Within the last triennium, the Administrative Authority has not received any reports regarding changes in ecological character of Canada’s Ramsar Sites which required reporting to the Ramsar Secretariat.

7.3 If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, such as requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ Z=Not Applicable

7.3 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, please indicate the actions taken
› Not applicable

Goal 3. Wisely Using All Wetlands

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

Target 8

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

8.1 Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=In Progress
☐ D=Planned

8.1 Additional information
› The Canadian Wetland Inventory was established in 2002 with an initial partnership between the Canadian Space Agency, Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC), Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) and the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (NAWCC, Canada). The objective of the work was to provide a national wetland inventory that could be used for the conservation and sustainable management of wetlands for environmental and societal benefits, and to provide easy access to digitally mapped and classified wetlands using standardized data structure and management protocols. DUC currently hosts data for this initiative and reports that, to date, approximately 25% of the Canadian Wetland Inventory is underway or completed (representing over 251 million hectares).
Forest Products Association of Canada (FPAC) also supports DUC in ongoing wetland inventory and mapping initiatives, with the goal of complimenting existing forest inventory and enhancing wetland stewardship initiatives undertaken by the forestry industry. Moreover, FPAC is supporting the Saskatchewan Research Council, Sustainable Forestry Initiative, and DUC in developing a rapid assessment tool to measure carbon storage in boreal forest wetlands.
Canada’s “Extent of Canada's Wetlands” indicator (https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/environmental-indicators/extent-wetlands.html), published in 2016, is updated periodically as data sources from federal, provincial, territorial and non-governmental organizations become available.
There is also a project at ECCC that aims to create a Wetland Database. The Wetland Database is being generated integrating several data sources from provincial and territorial governments as well as data provided by the Ducks Unlimited Canada inventory. The base layer for this inventory is Canvec (Terres humides) from Natural Resources Canada which has been updated with the sources mentioned above.
The Canada Centre for Mapping and Earth Observation of Natural Resources Canada continues to develop new methodologies and geospatial platforms to advance the mapping and monitoring of Canada's wetlands, resulting in more accurate classification and monitoring frequency. Ongoing areas of research and development include the assessment of multi-frequency and polarimetric radar for measuring wetland change and extent (including peatlands and flooded vegetation). Federal and provincial agencies will incorporate these radar-based techniques to improve wetland monitoring and associated inventories (e.g. Environment and Climate Change Canada). The Centre is also working with Canadian industry to advance the use of Google Earth Engine for the development of satellite-based national scale wetland maps, to aid in national and regional wetland inventories. This effort and approach could expand to include U.S. and Mexican collaborators, with the goal of establishing harmonized classification standards and a systematic method to map wetlands on a continental scale.
At a provincial level, Newfoundland and Labrador has undertaken a multi-year project to compile a digital inventory of its wetlands at a spatial resolution of 10m, using Sentinel 1 and Sentinel 2 data. This approach was published in the journal Remote Sensing and may have potential for use in other parts of Canada (Mahdianpari et al., 2019).

8.2 Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=In Progress
☑ C1=Partially
☐ D=Planned
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

8.2 Additional information
› In the last 3 years, the Canadian Wetland Inventory saw an increase of approximately 43.2 million hectares, with mapping completed or underway in 12 areas of the country.

8.3 Is wetland inventory data and information maintained? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

8.3 Additional information
› The Canadian Wetland Inventory is currently managed by Ducks Unlimited Canada and the Extent of Canada's Wetlands indicator is maintained by Environment and Climate Change Canada. Regular updates occur for both.

8.4 Is wetland inventory data and information made accessible to all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

8.4 Additional information
› The Extent of Canada's Wetlands Indicator is available on Canada's Open Maps portal. The Canada Centre for Mapping and Earth Observation of Natural Resources Canada continues to develop big data technology to ease the dissemination and analysis of wetland information and trends to the public.
The Canadian Wetland Inventory map (http://maps.ducks.ca/cwi/) provides access to detailed wetland polygons and source and partner information for the various wetland inventory datasets are provided within the application.

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

Please describe on the sources of the information on which your answer is based in the free- text box below. If there is a difference between inland and coastal wetland situations, please describe. If you are able to, please describe the principal driver(s) of the change(s).
* 'Condition' corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention
Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Sites	☐ P=Status Improved ☑ O=No Change ☐ N=Status Deteriorated
b) Wetlands generally	☐ P=Status Improved ☑ O=No Change ☐ N=Status Deteriorated

8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b)
› a) The overall condition of Canada's Ramsar Sites has not changed since COP13. Some site managers continue to monitor water-level changes, coastal erosion, and effects of climate change while others continue to manage and control for invasive alien species.
Other sites have collaborated with academia to install erosion control structures and monitor coastal erosion. For example, Baie de L'Ile Verte has monitoring stations in the Cacouna and L'Isle-Verte marsh, in order to monitor coastal dynamics and coastal erosion processes. In 2016, a stone dike was raised in Cap Tourmente to serve as a breakwater which was finally consolidated in May 2020 for the Bois Sent-Bon Trail.
Other sites have shown habitat improvement. In 2018, the Delta Marsh site saw significant improvements in habitat including increased species diversity and density. While there was a decline in 2019, likely due to invasive species, 2020 saw improvements with significant beds of submerged aquatic vegetation growing.
b) The ecological condition of wetlands in Canada has not changed since COP 13; however, overall the loss of wetlands across Canada continues. These concerns are also expressed through dialogues with Indigenous representatives from organizations such as the Manitoba Metis Federation and the Metis Nation of Alberta who have observed changes in water quality and wetlands that caused impacts on their subsistence and commercial purposes. A prominent example of this is the effect of oil sand extraction activities on the wetlands around Fort McMurray, Alberta.
In its 6th National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (submitted in November 2018), Canada noted that wetland degradation is continuing and loss has now reached critical levels in many areas of the country. For example, wetlands in southern Saskatchewan continue to be lost at an estimated rate of 0.4%

annually. Wetlands in the Pacific southern region and in the dry interior have been degraded by agricultural development, such as drainage and livestock damage. Wetlands in the Northeast region of British Columbia are under pressure from energy development, with losses imminently occurring with approved dam construction along the Peace River as well as water withdrawal applications for natural gas extraction.
In order to reduce the negative effects of wetland loss, there is a need to ensure that remaining wetlands are conserved and utilized in a sustainable manner so that the benefits of wetlands continue. For example, the Nature Conservancy of Canada noted improved wetland condition through restoration and impact mitigation measures such as offsite watering systems in Alberta. In Ontario, a multi-partnered binational collaboration (the Great Lakes Coastal Wetland Monitoring Program) surveys key parameters in more than one thousand coastal wetlands across the Great Lakes Basin and identifies hotspots for restoration. Other federal (regional) monitoring of freshwater coastal wetlands also takes place. While some individual wetlands are getting better (coastal wetlands habitats in Lake Superior and the northern areas of Lakes Michigan and Huron) due to restoration efforts, others are getting worse (especially in the Lower Great Lakes), and overall condition has not changed much since the previous triennium.

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

Please select only one option

☑ E=Exact Number (km2)

› 1,290,187

☐ G=More than (km2)

›

☐ X=Unknown

8.6 Details

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

Note:

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

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

Guidance on information on national wetland extent, to be provided in Target 8 “National Wetlands Inventory” of the National Report Form can be consulted at: https://www.ramsar.org/document/guidance-on-information-on-national-wetland-extent

8.6 Marine/Coastal Wetlands

	Square kilometers (km2)
A -- Permanent shallow marine waters in most cases less than six metres deep at low tide; includes sea bays and straits.	
B -- Marine subtidal aquatic beds; includes kelp beds, sea-grass beds, tropical marine meadows.	
C -- Coral reefs.	
D -- Rocky marine shores; includes rocky offshore islands, sea cliffs.	
E -- Sand, shingle or pebble shores; includes sand bars, spits and sandy islets; includes dune systems and humid dune slacks.	

F -- Estuarine waters; permanent water of estuaries and estuarine systems of deltas.	
G -- Intertidal mud, sand or salt flats.	
Ga -- Bivalve (shellfish) reefs.	
H -- Intertidal marshes; includes salt marshes, salt meadows, saltings, raised salt marshes; includes tidal brackish and freshwater marshes.	
I -- Intertidal forested wetlands; includes mangrove swamps, nipah swamps and tidal freshwater swamp forests.	
J -- Coastal brackish/saline lagoons; brackish to saline lagoons with at least one relatively narrow connection to the sea.	
K -- Coastal freshwater lagoons; includes freshwater delta lagoons.	
Zk(a) – Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, marine/coastal.	

8.6 Marine/Coastal Wetlands total (km2)

›

8.6 Inland Wetlands

	Square kilometers (km2)
L -- Permanent inland deltas.	
M -- Permanent rivers/streams/creeks; includes waterfalls.	
N -- Seasonal/intermittent/irregular rivers/streams/creeks.	
O -- Permanent freshwater lakes (over 8 ha); includes large oxbow lakes.	
P -- Seasonal/intermittent freshwater lakes (over 8 ha); includes floodplain lakes.	
Q -- Permanent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes.	
R -- Seasonal/intermittent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes and flats.	

Sp -- Permanent saline/brackish/alkaline marshes/pools.	
Ss -- Seasonal/intermittent saline/brackish/alkaline marshes/pools.	
Tp -- Permanent freshwater marshes/pools; ponds (below 8 ha), marshes and swamps on inorganic soils; with emergent vegetation water-logged for at least most of the growing season.	
Ts -- Seasonal/intermittent freshwater marshes/pools on inorganic soils; includes sloughs, potholes, seasonally flooded meadows, sedge marshes.	
U -- Non-forested peatlands; includes shrub or open bogs, swamps, fens.	
Va -- Alpine wetlands; includes alpine meadows, temporary waters from snowmelt.	
Vt -- Tundra wetlands; includes tundra pools, temporary waters from snowmelt.	
W -- Shrub-dominated wetlands; shrub swamps, shrub-dominated freshwater marshes, shrub carr, alder thicket on inorganic soils.	
Xf -- Freshwater, tree-dominated wetlands; includes freshwater swamp forests, seasonally flooded forests, wooded swamps on inorganic soils.	
Xp -- Forested peatlands; peatswamp forests.	
Y -- Freshwater springs; oases.	
Zg -- Geothermal wetlands.	
Zk(b) – Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, inland.	

8.6 Inland Wetlands total (km2)

›

8.6 Human-made wetlands

	Square kilometers (km2)

1 -- Aquaculture (e.g., fish/shrimp) ponds.	
2 -- Ponds; includes farm ponds, stock ponds, small tanks; (generally below 8 ha).	
3 -- Irrigated land; includes irrigation channels and rice fields.	
4 -- Seasonally flooded agricultural land (including intensively managed or grazed wet meadow or pasture).	
5 -- Salt exploitation sites; salt pans, salines, etc.	
6 -- Water storage areas; reservoirs/barrages/dams /impoundments (generally over 8 ha).	
7 -- Excavations; gravel/brick/clay pits; borrow pits, mining pools.	
8 -- Wastewater treatment areas; sewage farms, settling ponds, oxidation basins, etc.	
9 -- Canals and drainage channels, ditches.	
Zk(c) – Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, human-made.	

8.6 Human-made wetlands total (km2)
›

8.6 Additional information

Additional information: If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years. Please note: For the % of change in the extent of wetlands, if the period of data covers more than three years, provide the available information, and indicate the period of the change.
› Based on the environmental indicator, the Extent of Canada's Wetlands, current wetlands in Canada account for 1,290,187 km2 (13% of landmass).

8.7 Please indicate your needs (in terms of technical, financial or governance challenges)to develop, update or complete a National Wetland Inventory
› Environment and Climate Change Canada and partners have been working to inventory and map wetlands across Canada. Wetlands are, however, difficult to map in part because different types of wetlands contain varied vegetation and are subject to seasonal variability. In addition, it is costly to map wetlands across Canada and to purchase mapping-related data.

Target 9

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

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

If 'Yes', please give the title and date of the policy in the green text box
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

☐ C=In Preparation
☐ D=Planned

9.1 Additional information

› Wetland conservation in Canada is a shared federal, provincial and territorial responsibility with several policies. The federal government is a major landowner and is responsible for implementing the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991). The Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991) and provincial and territorial wetland conservation/management policies are all based on the principle of wise use and associated mitigation hierarchy of avoidance, minimization and offsets.
Many provinces have a wetland policy or strategy that promotes the wise use of wetlands for regions under their jurisdiction. Ontario, as well as all 4 Atlantic provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island), have a wetland policy promoting the wise use of wetlands.
Other provinces and territories committed to developing a wetland policy include:
Quebec is in the process of developing regional wetland conservation plans, which should be completed by June 2022.
The government of Yukon is developing a policy (expected completion – 2021). In the interim, Yukon has an approach for the protection and reclamation of Indian River Valley wetlands.

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=In Progress
☐ D=Planned

9.2 Additional information

› No legislation refers directly to the Ramsar Convention, but new legislation does refer to the principles of the Convention. For example, Ontario’s Provincial Policy Statement (2020) was released under the Planning Act and includes commitments for municipalities in the identification and protection of natural heritage features, including wetlands and coastal wetlands. Saskatchewan amended its Water Security Act (2005), introducing a requirement for new and existing drainage works to be licensed.

9.3 Are wetlands treated as natural water infrastructure integral to water resource management at the scale of river basins? {1.7.1} {1.7.2} KRA 1.7.ii

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

9.3 Additional information

› Wetlands are recognized as natural water infrastructure at the scale of river basins through existing legislation, regulatory authority and policy. For example, in Ontario, under provincial legislation, Conservation Authorities are required to regulate proposed development and activities through a permitting process for impacts to the control of natural hazards in hazardous lands including for interference with wetlands as natural storage areas, such as flood attenuation and for shoreline erosion prevention/mitigation.
Canada and the United States are signatories to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (1972). Both countries recognize the importance of wetlands to the maintenance of the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the waters of the Great Lakes basin ecosystem.
In other provinces, independent watershed management groups designated by the provincial management authority assess watershed conditions and prepare management plans (e.g. Alberta's Watershed Planning and Advisory Councils, Quebec's Watershed Organizations, and Saskatchewan's Watershed Advisory Committees).

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

9.4 Additional information

› Wetland communication, education, participation and awareness are often part of wetland conservation projects funded by federal, provincial, and regional governments. CEPA plans have been implemented in a number of provinces by partners.
Provincial and territorial governments also work with stakeholders, such as watershed-based organizations and municipalities, to ensure participation in planning processes. For example, in Saskatchewan, wetland

issues have been examined during community-led, watershed-based, source water protection planning facilitated by the Saskatchewan Water Security Agency. In 2020, the Government of Quebec declared June as the month of water. Watershed organizations have received funding for communication and awareness programs across the province. Whereas, provincial wildlife enforcement agents are tasked with awareness and educational programs.
Other provinces, like New Brunswick, have incorporated CEPA tools into Saint John River basin planning and management. A Memorandum of Understanding for the Saint John River basin management has been signed by governments of the United States, Canada, First Nations, the province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

9.5 Additional information

› As a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Environment and Climate Change Canada is obligated to annually prepare and submit a national greenhouse gas inventory covering anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks. Canada’s annual greenhouse gas emission estimates date back to 1990 and the representation of wetland conversion and management includes greenhouse gas estimates from historic peatland loss to agriculture as cultivation of organic soils, and peatlands drained for peat harvesting. Work is ongoing to develop methods and quantify the greenhouse gas impacts of other human activities on wetlands.
In 2016, the Pan-Canadian Framework on Climate Change identifies recommendations designed to incorporate the use of restored and conserved natural wetlands to mitigate or offset the impacts of a changing climate. Canada’s Federal-Provincial-Territorial agricultural policy framework, the Canadian Agricultural Partnership (2018-2023), includes programming for producer incentives to support adoption of on-farm beneficial management practices (BMPs). Some BMPs directly or indirectly support the conservation and wise use of wetlands on agricultural lands which, in turn, can contribute to greenhouse gas mitigation and adaptation to climate change.
Several provinces and territories also have also established guidance on enhancing the role of wetlands in mitigating or adapting to climate change. In 2019, the Government of the Northwest Territories released the 2030 Northwest Territories Climate Change Strategic Framework (2019-2023). Its goals are to transition to a lower carbon economy, improve knowledge of climate change impacts, and build resilience and adapt to a changing climate. The Action Plan sets out a number of actions on improving knowledge of climate change impacts related to water and wetlands. Ontario is addressing climate change through both mitigation and adaptation strategies, including through the new Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario, 2017-2030; Ontario’s Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2016); and Naturally Resilient: Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry’s Natural Resource Climate Adaptation Strategy (2017). Saskatchewan's Climate Change Plan: Prairie Resilience acknowledges the role of natural lands in regulating climate extremes.
Many industries and non-government organizations collaborate with provincial and federal government agencies for the development of policies, regulations and guidelines relating to wetland enhancement, mitigation or adaptation to climate change. These partners include Québec Peat Moss Producers Association, Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association, the Forest Products Association of Canada, Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Canadian Cattlemen’s Association, Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust, and Ducks Unlimited Canada.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

9.6 Additional information

› Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) is committed to helping the agriculture sector contribute to protecting and sustainably managing water resources through innovation, science, and collaboration with federal, provincial, and territorial partners. In 2017, AAFC announced an allocation of $70 million over 5 years to support research into agricultural best management practices. AAFC has conducted research on agriculture-wetland interactions, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and valuation of ecosystem services.
AAFC also continues to lead the Environmental Farm Plan Program in partnership with provinces and

territories. Environmental Farm Plans and cost-shared incentives for implementation of beneficial management practices are delivered by the provinces and territories based on identified regional priorities. On-farm beneficial management practices eligible for financial assistance include water quality protection through soil and nutrient management, to riparian protection/enhancement, wetland restoration, biodiversity conservation, wildlife habitat stewardship and mitigation of wildlife damage.
The Canadian federal government's Species at Risk Partnerships on Agricultural Land (SARPAL) program works with the agricultural community to facilitate species at risk recovery in agricultural areas. Best management practices (BMP) under SARPAL may differ between provinces, but in Ontario, wetland restoration has been made an eligible BMP under this program as of 2019.
Several provinces have developed programs acknowledging the provision of ecological goods and services such as
• Nova Scotia's stewardship program, the Agricultural Biodiversity Conservation Plan, works with individual farmers to identify and inform them of the biodiversity values on their farm holdings and best practices to support biodiversity (including wetlands).
• Quebec has implemented several agroforestry initiatives, including the planting of buffer strips to mitigate water quality on agricultural lands, including wetlands. As part of its 2018-2030 Water Strategy, Quebec is implementing a pilot project that intends to restore agricultural wetlands.
Other provinces are currently developing programs:
• British Columbia is currently developing a companion guide for farmers that will include wetland protection.
• The province of Saskatchewan is developing an agricultural management strategy that will require mitigation of wetland drainage impacts. Saskatchewan's Ministry of Agriculture is also exploring options with its Ministry of Environment and Water Security Agency to encourage wetland retention as part of their next 5-year generation of farm stewardship programming.

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

{1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i
Please select only one per square.

a) agriculture-wetland interactions	☐ C=Planned ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
b) climate change	☐ C=Planned ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
c) valuation of ecoystem services	☐ C=Planned ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes

9.7 Additional information

› a) Agriculture-wetland interactions:
o Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada has undertaken projects evaluating the role of wetlands in maintaining productive agricultural systems, including the establishment of a Living Laboratory to address challenges such as agricultural landscape drainage and its effects on Prairie wetlands.
o Ducks Unlimited Canada conducted a study on the ability of wetlands to retain nutrients and mitigate eutrophication. Findings were published in January 2020.
o The Manitoba Métis Federation participates in research on agricultural-wetland interactions through the Lake Winnipeg Basin Stewardship Initiative.
o The Comité Zone d'Intervention du Lac Saint-Pierre in Quebec devised a 5-year plan (2019-2024) addressing agriculture-wetland interactions in the floodplain of Lac Saint-Pierre. This plan includes the restoration of wetlands in 217 hectares of formerly agricultural land, and developing agricultural systems to better serve the needs of wetland ecosystems in this region.
b) Climate change:
o Ducks Unlimited Canada recently conducted a study predicting the distribution of Prairie wetlands under future climate scenarios, and the publishing of the Impact of Climate Change on Wetland Density and Waterfowl Production in Prairie Canada report.
o The Manitoba Métis Federation is developing community capacity through the Indigenous Community Based Climate Monitoring Program to identify key Community priorities on the impact of climate change on traditional land use, with an emphasis on water resources.
o Ontario is currently undertaking a provincial climate change impact assessment examining the impacts on various sectors including ecosystems and the environment, and business and the economy. The results of the impact assessment will improve understanding of how climate change will impact key sectors and communities at a provincial scale, and will provide a foundation for local assessments that would support decision-making at the community level.
o Laval University, McGill University, and the University of Waterloo have partnered on a 5-year project (2018-

2023) to study peatland restoration as it relates to carbon sequestration.
o The Government of the Northwest Territories is participating in a three year (2019-2022) project led by the University of Saskatchewan on the status of nutrients and contaminants in wetlands in the Slave River Delta. The project will provide a basis for predicting future nutrient and contaminant trends should system hydrology change, such as a changing climate.
c) Valuation of ecosystem services:
o The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry is partnering with the University of Waterloo and Intact Centre on Climate Change Adaptation to assess flood mitigation services provided by southern Ontario wetlands in rural and urban environments.
o The Manitoba Métis Federation undertakes projects on environmental assessment and consultation regarding the significance of wetland ecosystem services to the Metis community for exercising harvesting rights.
o The National Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) funds' a research network called ResNet for the monitoring, modelling, and managing of ecosystem services in Canada, including those provided by wetlands.
o The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology has conducted studies on the value of ecosystem services provided by boreal wetlands in mitigating climate change.

9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

9.8 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, please indicate How many request have been submitted
› Yes. On March 13, 2020, Canada submitted one proposal for Wetland City accreditation for the city of Sackville, New Brunswick, in accordance with the Call for Applications for the 2019-2021 triennium.

9.9 Has your country made efforts to conserve small wetlands in line with Resolution XIII. 21?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

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

If ‘Yes’, please indicate what actions have been implemented
› Some provinces and territories have policies and initiatives specific to small wetlands, but most include small wetlands in main wetland policies.
• Yukon’s wetland policy applies to all wetlands, regardless of size.
• British Columbia has no policy specific to small wetlands, but small wetlands are included in other conservation measures.
• Quebec’s wetland policy applies to small ponds. Ponds are afforded the same protection as other wetlands.
• In Saskatchewan, the policy is still being developed. The Agricultural Water Management strategy will ensure that developers will not be exempt from permits required for the drainage of small ephemeral and temporary wetlands.
• In Ontario, several conservation plans include policy direction for wetland protection, including A Place To Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019), the Greenbelt Plan (2017), the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), the Niagara Escarpment Plan (2017) and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (2009).

Target 10

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

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

☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=In Preparation
☐ D=Planned

10.1 Additional information

If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands
› The Government of Manitoba is currently examining traditional knowledge associated with peatlands.
The Government of Northwest Territories is working with K'asho Got'ı̨nę to protect Ts'udé Nilı̨né Tuyeta, which includes the Ramparts River watershed.
While the province of Ontario does not compile these projects and experiences; their Wetland Strategy for Ontario 2017-2030 contains actions to support Indigenous communities in managing local traditional ecological knowledge related to wetlands.
Overall, improvements are needed to increase participation on cultural aspects of wetlands. For examples, the experiences of Manitoba Métis Federation and the Métis Nation of Alberta have either rarely or yet to be engaged in the study, review or management of wetlands in the Prairies.

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

Please select only one per square.

a) stakeholders, including local communities and indigenous people are represented on National Ramsar Committees or similar bodies	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=In Preparation ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
b) involvement and assistance of indigenous people's and community-based groups, wetland education centres and non-governmental organizations with the necessary expertise to facilitate the establishment of participatory approaches	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=In Preparation ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes

10.2 Additional information

If the answer is "yes" please indicate the use or aplication of the guidelines
› Indigenous communities are represented on a number of management committees for Ramsar sites.
Examples:
• Last Mountain Lake is fostering a collaborative relationship with Touchwood Tribal Council
• Peace-Athabasca Delta is part of the Wood Buffalo National Park, which has 11 Indigenous partners on its management committee.
• Other sites such as Minesing Wetlands encourage local municipalities and Indigenous groups to participate in site management
• Fraser River Delta: local Indigenous communities have been engaged in the drafting of the management plan. Local groups also are currently engaged in developing interpretation signage at Alaksen, outlining cultural values of the site.
Indigenous communities are involved in a number of conservation initiatives, primarily at the regional levels.
Examples:
• In Alberta, the Land Stewardship Centre's Watershed Stewardship Grant has funded several Indigenous groups in undertaking watershed management and outreach work.
• Nature Canada supported Moose Cree First Nation in its efforts to protect and manage the North French River Watershed (an area of 660,000 hectares). Nature Canada is also working with the Cree Nations of Quebec to identify and protect important coastal wetland habitat for birds along James Bay.
• Environment and Climate Change Canada initiated a five-year program (2017-2022) to assess how climate change will impact coastal wetlands in the Great Lakes Basin (Ontario) and identify evidence-based actions to enhance resilience. Partners on this project include three First Nations communities in Ontario for this program where three of the 20 study sites were located on community lands. Ongoing engagement with First Nations communities include annual face-to-face meetings where local impacts of climate change on wetlands are discussed and integrated in the program.

10.3 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their application encouraged (Action 6.1.2)
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=In Preparation
☐ D=Planned

10.3 Additional information
› Traditional knowledge and co-management for the wise use of wetlands are encouraged in Canada but best practices have not yet been documented and compiled. Many management plans do work in collaboration with Indigenous communities who use traditional knowledge and management practices. For example, the following sites incorporate traditional knowledge in their management practices: Chignecto; Delta Marsh; Grand Codroy Estuary; Mary's Point; Point Pelee; Shepody Bay; and Whooping Crane Summer Range. Recently updated management sites have also incorporated traditional knowledge into their new management plans: Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary; McConnell River; Queen Maud Gulf.

Target 11
Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.} [Reference to Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 14]

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

11.1 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, how many wetlands and their names
› Through the Canadian Wetlands Roundtable, a diverse group of stakeholders have been participating in a national dialogue with regard to ecological goods and services concepts in wetland conservation. At a workshop offered in 2017, participants reviewed the current status of wetland ecosystem goods and services knowledge and identified elements of a framework for ecosystem goods and services programming including market development, offsets and incentives. However, no further national assessment of the ecosystem services associated with wetlands has been undertaken since the activities mentioned in Canada's previous national report.
A number of local/regional assessments have been undertaken that contribute to a general understanding of the social, cultural and economic benefits associated with wetlands in Canada.
Some provincial and territorial assessments and research projects on wetland ecosystem services have been undertaken. Examples include:
- The development of an ecosystem services framed assessment protocol is underway in British Columbia.
- New Brunswick is developing an assessment method for both tidal and non-tidal wetland ecosystem services.
- Nova Scotia has done extensive work on educating the public on the cultural value of wetlands.
- Nunavut has done extensive research on the utility of wetlands as wastewater treatment areas.
- A joint project between Ducks Unlimited Canada, Intact Centre for Climate Adaptation, the University of Waterloo, and Ontario's Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry valuated the flood mitigation services of southern Ontario wetlands.
- University of Saskatchewan, Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, and Université Laval have ongoing research projects on wetland ecosystem services.
o Université Laval's Peatland Ecology Research Group has been conducting research on peatland ecosystem services for 27 years, and findings have been published in numerous national and international journals.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Canadian Wetlands Roundtable - We are a collection of organizations and agencies focused on advancing wetland conversation throughout Canada. - Canadian Wetlands Roundtable

Home: Groupe de recherche en écologie des tourbières (GRET) (ulaval.ca) - U Laval Peatlands Ecology Research Group

When the Big Storms Hit, Wetlands Reduce the Cost of Flood Damages — Ducks Unlimited Canada - DUC, U Waterloo, and MNRF joint project

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

Please select only one option

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

11.2 Additional information

› Provincial/territorial wetland programs or projects that contribute to poverty alleviation objectives or food and water security plans are ongoing in specific areas of Canada. For example, in Ontario, all 36 Conservation Authorities have legislated roles as source protection authorities under the provincial Clean Water Act and support the development of source protection plans that provide security for sources of drinking water. Mapping available through the province's Source Protection Information Atlas: https://www.gisapplication.lrc.gov.on.ca/SourceWaterProtection/Index.html?site=SourceWaterProtection&viewer=SWPViewer&locale=en-US . Additionally many conservation authorities have completed water mapping and ground water monitoring and support Ontario’s provincial groundwater monitoring program (https://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/map-provincial-groundwater-monitoring-network). Saskatchewan’s wetland and water management efforts are linked to its 25-year water security program.

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

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Additional information

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

› Twenty-five Ramsar Sites have socio-economic values included in their management planning: Baie de L'Isle-Verte; Cap Tourmente; Chignecto; Columbia River Wetlands; Creston Valley; Delta Marsh (draft management planning); Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary (draft management planning); Grand Codroy Estuary; Lac Saint-François; Lac Saint-Pierre; Last Mountain Lake; Long Point; Mary’s Point; McConnell River (draft management planning); Mer Bleue Conservation Area; Minesing Swamp; Old Crow Flats; Peace-Athabasca Delta; Point Pelee National Park; Polar Bear Pass (draft management planning); Polar Bear Provincial Park; Queen Maud Gulf (draft management planning); St. Clair National Wildlife Area; Tabusintac Lagoon & River Estuary; and Whooping Crane Summer Range.

For other wetlands, the preservation of socio-economic wetland values is guided by the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991), with its overall objective to promote the conservation of Canada’s wetlands to sustain their ecological and socio-economic functions now and in the future, and sub-national policies. Some examples include:

• A Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario (2017-2030) identifies actions to develop, implement, and promote initiatives that communicate the socio-economic value of wetlands.
• As part of the Prairie Habitat Joint Venture, Saskatchewan has identified human dimensions of wetland conservation as a new direction and priority for the 2020-2025 period of its implementation plan.
• Organizations such as Land Stewardship Centre and Nature Conservancy of Canada include socio-economic values in conservation, stewardship, and planning.

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19)? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.4 Additional information

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

› Twenty-five Ramsar Sites have cultural values included in their management planning: Baie de L'Isle-Verte; Cap Tourmente; Chignecto; Columbia River Wetlands; Creston Valley; Delta Marsh (partially; draft management planning); Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary (draft management planning); Grand Codroy

Estuary; Lac Saint-François; Lac Saint-Pierre; Last Mountain Lake; Long Point; Mary's Point; McConnell River (draft management planning); Mer Bleue Conservation Area; Minesing Swamp; Old Crow Flats; Peace-Athabasca Delta; Point Pelee National Park; Polar Bear Pass (draft management planning); Polar Bear Provincial Park; Queen Maud Gulf (draft management planning); St. Clair National Wildlife Area; Tabusintac Lagoon & River Estuary; and Whooping Crane Summer Range.
Cultural values of wetlands beyond Ramsar Sites have also been included in some provincial/territorial policies and guidelines. For example, in Nova Scotia, cultural values are considered during the approval process of assessing proposed activities or alterations to wetlands. Ontario's Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks developed the Woodland Caribou Signature Site Vegetation Management Plan with cultural values in mind. Yukon considers cultural values through Habitat Protection Area Planning and regional wetland plans in Quebec include elements of cultural value.

Target 12

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

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

Please select only one option

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

12.1 Additional information

› Under the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (updated in 2018), priority sites for wetland restoration for waterfowl productivity are recognized through four public-private Habitat Joint Venture partnerships in Canada. These Joint Ventures use a science-based implementation plan to deliver habitat conservation programs at a regional level (http://nawmp.wetlandnetwork.ca/joint-venture/habitat-joint-ventures/).
Habitat priorities, including wetlands, are also identified under federal funding programs (e.g. Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk). Conservation organizations and watershed organizations also use blueprinting, sustainability planning and biodiversity hotspot exercises to prioritize sites for restoration.
Other methods for determining priority wetlands vary by province. For example, Environment and Climate Change Canada initiated a 5-year program in 2017 to assess the impacts of climate change on coastal wetlands in the Great Lakes Basin, Ontario. This includes a vulnerability assessment to determine which wetlands are at greatest risk to climate change. These wetlands will be deemed priority sites for restoration.
The Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario 2017-2030 includes actions to prioritize areas for improving wetland inventory, knowledge and focusing efforts on conservation and restoration.

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

Please select only one option

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

12.2 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored
› A number of wetland restoration programs, plans or projects have been implemented in Canada; however, the extent is not known. A sampling of some projects is listed below:
Ducks Unlimited Canada's Conserving Nature program has restored over 550 hectares of wetland habitat in Ontario since 2018, through the Ontario Eastern Habitat Joint Venture as part of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan.
In 2019, Quebec launched a wetland restoration program with a budget of $30 million that seeks to create and restore wetlands to balance wetland losses (no net loss).
The Canadian peat moss industry implements restoration and rehabilitation projects every year. Each company follows their respective restoration and rehabilitation plan for sites that are no longer being extracted.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Natural Heritage Conservation Program provides new protection for Canada's wetlands — Ducks Unlimited Canada - DUC

Ontario | (ehjv.ca) - Ontario EHJV

Programme de restauration et de création de milieux humides et hydriques – Aide financière (gouv.qc.ca) - Quebec wetland restoration program

12.3 Have the Guidelines for Global Action on Peatlands and on Peatlands, climate change and wise use (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.11) been implemented including?

Please select only one per square.

a) Knowledge of global resources	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☑ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes
b) Education and public awareness on peatlands	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☑ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes
c) Policy and legislative instruments	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☑ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes
d) Wise use of peatlands	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☑ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes
e) Research networks, regional centres of expertise, and institutional capacity	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
f) International cooperation	☐ Y=Not relevant ☐ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☑ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes
g) Implementation and support	☐ Y=Not relevant ☑ X=Unknown ☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☐ A=Yes

12.3 Additional Information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please indicate, the progress in implementation
› a) The Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association participates in the International Peatland Society, through which full knowledge on all aspects of global peatland resources are provided.
Quebec collaborates with Ducks Unlimited Canada to map wetlands across the province, including peatlands.
Saskatchewan developed its Peatland Disposition Policy in July 2020, in collaboration with industry partners and the Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association.
b)The Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association and Laval University's Peatland Ecology Research Group post information for the general public on peatlands and peatland restoration on their respective websites.
Other education and public awareness initiatives include:
• Through the Treasured Wetlands of Nova Scotia program, a presentation on the importance of Atlantic peatlands was delivered at a symposium in New Brunswick. Public education has also taken place through the Big Meadow Bog Restoration Program.
• The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry undertakes Indigenous community-based information

sharing and engagement programs, primarily in the Hudson Bay Lowlands region.
• Quebec's provincial government has undertaken several public education initiatives, including the launching of an awareness program for landowners in 2019.
• Wildlife Society of Canada has a publicly available story map on their website explaining the importance of northern peatlands for biodiversity and climate change mitigation.
c) While peatlands are included in the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991), no national policy specific to peatlands exists. Provincial wetland policies typically include peatlands. Manitoba's Peatlands Stewardship Act (2015) was Canada's first stand-along peatlands legislation. The Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association has supported policy initiatives and management guidelines for peatlands at the provincial level, but none of these activities were directly related to the Global Action on Peatlands.
d) Varies across Canada. Wise use of peatlands remains a priority for the Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association and is emphasized in the International Peatlands Society's Strategy for Responsible Peatland Management. In Quebec, wise use of wetlands, including peatlands, is included in climate change policy. The Peatland Ecology Research Group at Université Laval conducts projects on Sphagnum farming, best management practices, and wise use.
e) Provincial governments often form research partnerships with organizations. For instance, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry partnered with Ducks Unlimited Canada. They released a peer reviewed nutrient monitoring framework to assess the effectiveness of wetland restoration efforts in reducing phosphorus from entering Lake Erie.
The Peatland Ecology Research Group at Université Laval is also an important source of knowledge on peatlands. This research group has collaborated with private companies, including Imperial Oil Resources Ltd.
f) There is some international cooperation at the level of provincial governments and universities. Nova Scotia participated in the 2019 workshop "Exploring Synergies for Peatlands - Detecting and enhancing the global importance of peatlands in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals" organized by the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation. Université Laval's Peatlands Ecology Research Group has international partnerships with University of Bangor (Wales) and Yonsei University (South Korea). Further, Canada engages with the International Pealand Society (IPS) in seminars and conferences.

Target 13

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

13.1 Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? {1.3.3} {1.3.4} KRA 1.3.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

13.1 Additional information
› If a policy, plan or program proposal is expected to have important environmental implications, a strategic environmental assessment is required. The Cabinet Directive on the Environmental Assessment of Policy, Plan and Program Proposals sets out this requirement for submissions at the federal level. Individual departments or agencies operate on a principle of self-assessment where they assess proposals they sponsor under the guidance of the Cabinet Directive.
As of 2016, strategic environmental assessment analysis is also required to be linked to the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy's goals and targets. This includes the goal of sustainably managed lands and forests, incorporating both wetlands and their functions.
Provincial environmental assessments can also be triggered. For example, British Columbia's Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) was updated in 2019 with a provision that enables the minister to direct that an assessment is undertaken for "any policy, enactment, plan, practice or procedure of the government."

13.2 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands? {1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Some Cases

13.2 Additional information
› Federally, the new Impact Assessment Act (IAA 2019) require assessments for projects that have the most

potential for adverse environmental effects within federal jurisdiction. These include effects on fish and fish habitat, other aquatic species, or migratory birds; effects on federal lands; effects that cross-jurisdictional boundaries; effects that impact Indigenous Peoples; and changes to the environment that are linked to any federal decisions about a project, directly or incidentally. As such, potential environmental impacts to wetlands that are within federal jurisdiction are assessed, and measures to mitigate or offset the effects are considered in impact assessments for major development projects (such as new roads or extractive industry). Furthermore, the northern territories (Nunavut, Yukon, and the Northwest Territories) have integrated regulatory processes, for which requirements must be satisfied in order to obtain a licence, permit, or approval. Most development projects from key sectors are required to go through a screening, assessment, or panel review.
Since wetlands support a disproportionately high number of species, including species at risk, the federal Species at Risk Act (SARA) also sets out the obligations for the persons who wish to undertake projects that could adversely and negatively affect species at risk or their critical habitat. These persons are required by or under an Act of Parliament to ensure that an assessment of environmental effects of a project is conducted. Notably, any Responsible Authority assessing a Project under the IAA must:
• Notify the competent Minister(s) in writing of the project if the project is likely to affect a listed wildlife species or its critical habitat;
• Identify the adverse effects of the Project on the listed wildlife species and its critical habitat; and
• If the project is carried out, ensure that measures are taken to avoid or lessen those effects in a way that is consistent with any applicable recovery strategy and action plans and to monitor them.
The Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation (1991) establishes objectives used by Environment and Climate Change Canada to inform their provision of scientific and expert advice on federal environmental assessments/impact assessments.
Provinces have their own legislation that requires environmental assessments be done on projects potentially impacting wetlands and their functions. For example, Ontario’s Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act prohibits development in significant wetlands in the southern and central parts of the province. Any development adjacent to significant wetlands that could negatively affect their ecological integrity is also prohibited.

Goal 4. Enhancing implementation

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

Target 15

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

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

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

15.1 Additional information

If ‘Yes’ or ‘Planned’, please indicate the regional initiative(s) and the collaborating countries of each initiative
›

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

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

15.2 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, please indicate the name(s) of the centre(s)
› Canada has not supported the development of regional wetland training and research centres; however, Canadian researchers partner with colleagues in other countries through regional research networks.

Target 16

Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}
[Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 18]

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

Even if no CEPA plans have been developed, if broad CEPA objectives for CEPA actions have been established, please indicate this in the Additional information section below
Please select only one per square.

a) At the national level	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☑ B=No ☐ A=Yes ☐ C=In Progress
b) Sub-national level	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☑ B=No ☐ A=Yes ☐ C=In Progress
c) Catchment/basin level	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☑ B=No ☐ A=Yes ☐ C=In Progress
d) Local/site level	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☑ B=No ☐ A=Yes ☐ C=In Progress

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
› Communication, education, participation and awareness values are incorporated in broader planning activities. For example
a) The North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) provides a national mechanism for the implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. The Council’s strategic plan provides a national commitment to wetlands and includes a strategy focused on developing communications and outreach programs and materials related to the conservation of wetlands, waterfowl, and other wetland-dependent species.
b) Under the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, communication, education and stewardship are key strategies implemented by the Habitat Joint Ventures towards the conservation of wetland and upland habitat and waterfowl.
New Brunswick’s Department of Environment & Local Government has continued to develop and improve an online interactive map that depicts wetlands throughout the province. In Ontario, Conservation Authorities may provide environmental education for their local communities or curriculum-based education in agreement with local school boards. Interpretive Strategies have been developed for 23 Ontario Parks. Those with significant wetland resources have developed high-level significance statements and corresponding interpretive themes to guide the continued development and delivery of interpretive programs and products that focus on wetlands. In British Columbia, the Okanagan Basin Water Board promotes wetland communication, participation and awareness in the Okanagan River Basin.
The Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario 2017-2030 developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry recognizes communication, education, participation, and awareness activities across the province through increased knowledge and partnerships.
c) Conservation Authorities in Ontario promote awareness of the importance of wetlands in their own conservation areas and may be involved in wetland restoration projects funded locally or provincially.
The Great Lakes Wetlands Conservation Action Plan (1994) has several strategies to increase public awareness and commitment to protecting wetlands and continues to publicize the value of wetlands to society, to water, and to wildlife in order to encourage wetland conservation.
d) Ducks Unlimited Canada operates several programs across the country that seek to inform and educate youth and schools about wetlands including their 'Wetlands Centres of Excellence' program.

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

a) at Ramsar Sites

Please select only one option
☑ E=Exact Number (centres)

› 21
☐ F=Less than (centres)

›

☐ G=More than (centres)

›
☐ C=Partially
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

16.2 How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii
b) at other wetlands
Please select only one option
☐ E=Exact Number (centres)

›
☐ F=Less than (centres)

›
☐ G=More than (centres)

›
☐ C=Partially
☑ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

16.2 Additional information

If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks
› a) Ramsar Sites with some form of an education/visitor centre include: Baie de l'Île-Verte; Cap-Tourmente; Fraser River Delta; Grand Codroy Estuary; Lac Saint-François; Lac Saint Pierre; Last Mountain Lake; Mary's Point; Matchedash Bay; Mer Bleue Conservation Area; Oak Hammock Marsh; Old Crow Flats; Peace-Athabasca Delta; Point Pelee; Quill Lakes; Shepody Bay; Tabusintac Lagoon and River Estuary; and Whooping Crane Summer Range.
b) Many other wetland interpretation centres are established across Canada; however, no estimate of the number of these centres exists.
For example, the British Columbia Waterfowl Society conducts teaching about wetlands, coastal wildlife, and related habitat issues at George C. Reifel Migratory Bird Sanctuary. Ducks Unlimited Canada works in partnership with government and non-profit groups with similar conservation objectives, including the Kortright Centre for Conservation in Ontario and the Bow Habitat Station in Alberta.
A number of interpretation areas at federal Protected Areas (e.g. the Vaseux-Bighorn National Wildlife Area) and National Parks also exists.

16.3 Does the Contracting Party {4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii
Please select only one per square.

a) promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
b) specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management?	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes

16.3 Additional information

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved
› a) For most jurisdictions, public consultation is an integral part of the policy development and regulatory process, including environmental assessments. It is also encouraged in management planning with a public comment period on draft management plans. Participation is also encouraged through community-based watershed planning activities. Four Canadian Habitat Joint Ventures (Eastern, Prairie, Canadian Intermountain, and Pacific Birds) integrate stakeholder participation into the decision-making process to achieve North American Waterfowl Management Plan goals. Each joint venture program operates through a joint venture advisory board whose members include federal, provincial and territorial governments, and environmental non-governmental organizations.
At the provincial level, in Ontario, the Environmental Bill of Rights allows the public the opportunity to participate in decisions that could impact Ontario's air, water, land, or wildlife. Ontario Parks also consults with stakeholders extensively with respect to planning and management of sites. Saskatchewan's Water Security

Agency has responsibility to involve local land managers in drainage applications and watershed planning. The Water Security Agency is making increased use of local Conservation and Development groups and Watershed Associations to plan and manage drainage projects and mitigation.
b) Many Ramsar Sites involve local stakeholders in site management. Several sites are under co-management regimes, while others have established management committees that are made up a diverse group of partners (e.g. Hay-Zama Lakes, McConnell River, Old Crow Flats, Polar Bear Pass, Queen Maud Gulf, and St. Clair National Wildlife Area). Others engage local organizations and stakeholders directly in management (Columbia River Wetlands, Fraser River Delta, and Minesing Wetlands), stewardship and mitigation of impacts from surrounding land uses (Grand Codroy Estuary, Long Point) and protection of surrounding lands (Malpeque Bay, Musquodoboit Harbour Outer Estuary, Mary's Point, Shepody Bay, and Tabusintac Lagoon and River Estuary). Several sites involve stakeholders by seeking advice/input or through formal consultation related to management planning or environmental assessment (Oak Hammock Marsh, Point Pelee National Park, and Last Mountain Lake).
The involvement of local stakeholders is also critical to Ramsar Site selection. Canada will only support a site nomination where there is concurrence from the province or territory and all landowners as outlined in the 'Nomination and Listing of Wetlands of International Importance in Canada' procedures manual and support from other stakeholders is encouraged. For example, under the current process related to designation, federal, provincial, regional and municipal government support is to be sought in addition to the engagement and support of Indigenous communities and other stakeholders.

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

Please select only one option

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

16.4 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has
› There is no National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee in Canada. The Canadian Wildlife Service at Environment and Climate Change Canada acts as an expert science and advisory agency working with a range of partners.

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

Please select only one option

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

16.5 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP13; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has
› The North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) was established in 1990 to provide a national mechanism for the implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and to take a leadership role in wetlands policy and awareness. The North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) provides leadership to the Canadian Habitat and Species Joint Ventures to help achieve North American Waterfowl Management Plan goals. It also serves as the national coordinating committee for developing and implementing national level wetland policies and programs in Canada.
The North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) held nine meetings since COP13. Its membership includes representatives from Environment and Climate Change Canada (1), the Canadian North American Waterfowl Management Plan Committee (1), Habitat and Species Joint Ventures (7), non-governmental organizations (6) and provinces and territories (4).
In addition, the Canadian Wetlands Roundtable, a partnership of environmental non-governmental organizations, industry and government, was established in 2014 and focuses on developing and implementing a national wetlands conservation strategy for Canada through collaborative policy development and communication activities for effective wetland habitat conservation in Canada.

16.6 Are other communication mechanisms (apart from a national committee) in place to share Ramsar implementation guidelines and other information between the Administrative Authority and a), b) or c)

below? {4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi:
Please select only one per square.

a) Ramsar Site managers	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
b) other MEA national focal points	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes
c) other ministries, departments and agencies	☐ D=Planned ☐ C=Partially ☐ B=No ☑ A=Yes

16.6 Additional information

If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please describe what mechanisms are in place
› a) Ramsar activities are communicated on an ad hoc basis through the Ramsar Site managers’ network. The North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) also provides a mechanism for the communication of current guidelines and tools.
b) Communication between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and other MEA national focal points occurs as a function of the day-to-day obligations of reciprocal information exchanges.
c) There are a number of committees through which Ramsar-related information may be shared between the Administrative Authority and other relevant federal, provincial and territorial ministries, departments and agencies, such as the Canadian Wildlife Directors Committee and the federal, provincial, territorial Biodiversity Steering Group.

16.7 Have Ramsar-branded World Wetlands Day activities (whether on 2 February or at another time of year), either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out in the country since COP13? {4.1.8}

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

16.7 Additional information

› World Wetlands Day falls during mid-winter in Canada. Many sites and organizations therefore do not host activities as site accessibility is limited. Many organizations will promote World Wetlands Day through social media or in school. For example
• The Delta Marsh Ramsar Site had intended to do a 'bio blitz' in 2020 but due to the COVID-19 global pandemic, this event was cancelled. It is a plan for the future.
• Ducks Unlimited Canada participated in a World Wetlands Day workshop at Mount Royal College in Red Deer, Alberta in 2019 and 2020.
• In Newfoundland and Labrador, World Wetlands Day is discussed in schools.
• The ecohydrology research group at the University of Waterloo in Ontario has been hosting a research symposium on World Wetlands Day for the last 8 years.

16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP13 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9}

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.8 Additional information

If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this
› Each year (2018, 2019, 2020) the North American Waterfowl Management Plan partners in Canada publish “Habitat Matters,” a report presenting the annual accomplishments under the program. The report highlights success stories around the country showcasing Joint Venture projects for each region.
Many environmental organizations throughout Canada also promote the importance of wetlands. Examples include:
• Continued public involvement in Nature Conservancy of Canada’s initiatives through the Conservation Volunteers and Conservation Interns programs, as well as the Nature Talks series.
• New Brunswick Nature Trust released a pamphlet in 2018 on the importance of wetlands.

• Ontario Parks launched its Discovery School Program at Piney Park, but the program has since expanded to other provincial parks. In collaboration with Canadian Geographic, Ontario Parks released a floor map of Ontario Parks in 2020, along with 15 corresponding lesson plans for elementary and high school teachers. These lesson plans will be distributed to approximately 600 schools over the next 3 years.
• At Point Pelee Ramsar site, a Bio Blitz was organized in 2019, which included information on species at risk in the site and assistance with identification.
• Youth activities are regularly held at Peace-Athabasca Delta. Community Based Monitoring Groups ran Fish Camps for youth in the summers of 2018 and 2019. 3 additional summer youth camps were held in the nearby town of Fort Chipewyan in 2019.
• Canadian Wetlands Roundtable launched a new website: www.wetlandsroundtable.ca.

Target 17

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

17.1a Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2018, 2019 and 2020? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ Z=Not Applicable

17.1b If 'No' in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment
› Ramsar contributions have been paid in full for 2018, 2019, and 2020.

17.2 Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to non-core funded Convention activities? {4.2.2} KRA 4.2.i
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

17.2 Additional information

If 'Yes' please state the amounts, and for which activities
› $43,993 in 2018 was provided to support COP13 preparations to strengthen international collaboration in the implementation of the Ramsar Convention. $50,000 in 2018 was also provided to travel for delegates on the Development Assistance Committee list and/or list of Small Island Developing States to attend COP13.
The Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences of Laval University provided $20,000 in 2020 in the form of teaching release to allow the Canadian Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) National Focal Point to be more involved in the technical report and briefing notes of STRP.

17.3 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only ('donor countries')]: Has the agency provided funding to support wetland conservation and management in other countries? {3.3.1} KRA 3.3.i
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ Z=Not Applicable

17.3 Additional information

If 'Yes', please indicate the countries supported since COP12
› Global Affairs Canada and its partners support various initiatives that directly and indirectly relate to wetland conservation and management in developing countries. Canada is the sixth-largest donor to the Global Environment Facility and is providing CAD $228.79 million in core funding for the 2018-2022 period. In addition, Canada recently supported initiatives in South America and West Africa that protect coastal ecosystems and watersheds. An initiative in Peru, for instance, works with local communities to preserve and maintain six priority watersheds in the Amazon and Andes regions. Canada is also delivering on its commitment to invest CAD $2.65 billion over five years (2016-2021) to support climate resilient efforts in developing countries, and funding from this envelope will support urgent adaptation projects through the Least Developed Countries Fund, and protection of coastal ecosystems through the Oceans Risk and Resilience Action Alliance. Canada has also committed CAD $65 million to support the World Bank's PROBLUE Fund, which supports the sustainable development of marine and coastal resources in healthy oceans.

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

Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant
☐ Z=Not Applicable

17.4 Additional information
› Global Affairs Canada's international development assistance initiatives have to undergo an environmental analysis through their mandatory Environmental Integration Process. Through this process, environmental experts examine the level of environmental risk for each initiative and recommend mitigation measures to lower this risk. In addition, the experts propose actions to capitalize on the initiative's potential opportunities for achieving environmental results.

17.5 [For Contracting Parties that have received development assistance only ('recipient countries')]: Has funding support been received from development assistance agencies specifically for in-country wetland conservation and management? {3.3.3}
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ Z=Not Applicable

17.5 Additional information

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

17.6 Has any financial support been provided by your country to the implementation of the Strategic Plan?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ Z=Not Applicable

17.6 Additional information

If "Yes" please state the amounts, and for which activities
› No direct funding has been provided to implement the strategic plan; however, actions in Canada contribute to implementing the Strategic Plan through the wise use of wetlands, specifically through actions of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and funding programs like the Canada Nature Fund.

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

18.1 Are the national focal points of other MEAs invited to participate in the National Ramsar/Wetland Committee? {3.1.1} {3.1.2} KRAs 3.1.i & 3.1.iv
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

18.1 Additional information
› Canada does not have a National Ramsar Committee, however, the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) acts as a national wetland committee and is comprised of federal, provincial, territorial and non-governmental organization representatives.
National focal points of other MEAs are not invited to participate as it is beyond the mandate of the Council. The federal co-chair of the Council serves to make sure that other MEAs participate in wetland-related discussions as required.

18.2 Are mechanisms in place at the national level for collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO)? {3.1.2} {3.1.3} KRA 3.1.iv
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially

☐ D=Planned

18.2 Additional information

› Canada has a number of mechanisms at the federal level to ensure there is collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the national focal points of other UN, global and regional bodies. These mechanisms include coordination groups among senior management (e.g. Director General Committee on International Affairs at Environment and Climate Change Canada) and interdepartmental fora (e.g. Federal Biodiversity Committee) for sharing information and developing policy on various MEAs.

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

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

Please select only one option

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

18.3 Additional information

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

›

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

18.4 Additional information

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

› Under the North American Waterfowl Management Plan there are regional networks between Canadian, United States and Mexican partners for knowledge sharing specifically related to wetlands that support waterfowl.

Canada is a member of the Arctic Council, an intergovernmental forum for cooperation, coordination and interaction among Arctic States with involvement of Indigenous communities.

The Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network facilitates communication and sharing of technical resources among a network of sites in North and South America. The Canadian Shorebird National Working Group represents Canada on the Network.

Ducks Unlimited Canada is involved in twinning and knowledge sharing internationally. For example, Oak Hammock Marsh Ramsar Site is linked as a sister marsh with a similar wetland in Israel.

Additionally, Hay-Zama Lakes has been twinned with Dalai Lake in Mongolia, China.

The Agricultural Wetland Research Network through the International Institute for Sustainable Development has research and information sharing partnerships with institutions in Israel, Paraguay and Mexico.

The University of Saskatchewan is working with national and international partners to investigate hydrological and ecological responses in wetlands to changing environmental conditions for Northern climates as part of the changing cold regions network through participation in international projects.

There are also numerous knowledge-sharing networks which exist across various organizations and academia. Examples include:

• The International Joint Commission is a Canada-US partnership that supports wetland characterization projects in the Great Lakes Basin.

• Parks Canada partners with the United States and Mexico to study and restore coastal salt marsh habitats.

• University of Saskatchewan is part of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Strategic Grant Resiliency Network, which coordinates research teams across Canada to develop a framework for managing landscape ecosystem services, including wetlands.

• University of Waterloo is part of the Canadian hub in the Global Peatland Initiative.

• In Alberta, the Land Stewardship Centre, in partnership with the Beaver Hills Biosphere Reserve Association, has undertaken a pilot project to inform a Proof of Concept that can support the multiple benefits of restoring and maintaining wetlands.

• Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) has several partnerships with Canadian universities, as well

as a new Canada-China framework for peatland restoration and management. The goal is to use Canadian expertise to assist in the conservation of peatlands in northern China.
• Researchers from University of Victoria, Laval University, University of Waterloo, and University of Windsor are part of a working group led by German researchers on the mapping and assessing the knowledge base of ecological restoration which largely involves wetlands for Canada.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

18.5 Additional information

› Many websites make information available on Canada's wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites. Canada.ca hosts information about Ramsar Convention including information about Ramsar Sites that are designated on federal crown lands.
Many governments (federal, provincial, territorial and municipal), non-governmental organizations, academia and private organizations maintain websites that provide resources and information on Canada's wetlands and Ramsar Sites. Some examples include:
• Birds Canada published information about their wetland restoration work at Long Point (Ramsar site) through their BirdWatch magazine
• The government of British Columbia makes information on wetlands and Ramsar sites available through https://bcwetlands.ca/.
• Nova Scotia has an online, publicly available provincial wetland inventory at https://novascotia.ca/natr/wildlife/habitats/wetlands.asp. Its wetland policy, as well as general information on wetlands, is also available at http://www.novascotia.ca/nse/wetland/
• Through Ontario's Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, A Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario (2017-2030) is publicly available. It describes the Ramsar Convention, providing details on its significance and key commitment to identify globally significant wetlands and lists those recognized in Ontario.
• Saskatchewan's HABISask website identifies Ramsar sites in the province.
• Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) has an online interactive map of DUC-owned wetlands. DUC also regularly shares information through its website, print magazine, and annual reports.
• Université Laval's Peatland Ecology Research Group's website presents information on wetlands and the projects carried out by the group (http://www.gret-perg.ulaval.ca/).
• The High Arctic Bylot Island research station is co-managed by Laval University, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (UQTR) and Université du Québec à Rimouski (UQAR). Recently, the research station released an informative website about Arctic wetlands in collaboration with Laval University.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned
☐ Z=Not Applicable

18.6 Additional information

› Canada is in the process of updating mapping and inventory information regarding wetland systems. Large transboundary wetland systems have been identified, but no extensive transboundary wetland system list has been published.
According to the International Joint Commission, for those transboundary regions that fall under its purview, most transboundary wetlands between Canada and the United States have been identified, however, characterization between watersheds is uneven.
Additionally, within the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence River Basin, Canada and the United States have identified five binational areas of concern that contain varying amounts of coastal/riverine wetlands (St. Mary's River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River and the St. Lawrence River).

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

Please select only one option

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

18.7 Additional information

If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place
› Four Canadian Habitat Joint Ventures integrate planning, science, governance, partnerships, and management to achieve North American Waterfowl Management Plan goals in Canada. A science-based implementation plan is created to address local, regional and continental goals for each Joint Venture. Joint Venture partners effectively cooperate to research, monitor and evaluate waterfowl populations, and deliver habitat conservation programs at a regional level. This partnership also cooperatively manages shared wetlands.
There are many other cooperative/inter-jurisdictional wetland management bodies that exist:
• The International Joint Commission (IJC) is a Canada-US partnership that is responsible for managing water resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region, including wetlands.
• Outside of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region, the province of Ontario has very few wetlands that span multiple jurisdictions.
• There is significant inter-jurisdictional cooperation in the Atlantic region. For example, coastal wetlands are managed cooperatively by Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Atlantic provincial governments.
• The Prairie Provinces Water Board is a partnership between Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta for collaboration on water and wetland issues.
• Yukon has inter-provincial/territorial partnerships with British Columbia, Alberta, and the Northwest Territories, as well as international ones with the United States.

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

Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned
☐ Z=Not Applicable

18.8 Additional information

› The North American Waterfowl Management Plan is an international partnership between Canada, the United States and Mexico with the goal of conserving and protecting wetland and upland habitats and associated waterfowl populations. Canada implements the plan through four regional Habitat Joint Ventures made up of a variety of cooperative public and private partners.
The North American Waterfowl Management Plan was revised in 2012, and updated in 2018, as a new 'call to action' identifying an integrated vision and defining goals and measurable objectives for waterfowl populations, habitat and people. A separate Action Plan provides further guidance for implementation (http://nawmp.wetlandnetwork.ca/nawmp-revision-2012/).
There is also provincial participation such as
• Nova Scotia participates in the Priority Places for Species at Risk initiative under the Canada Nature Fund. This initiative includes all species at risk, including wetland-dependant migratory species. Nova Scotia is also part of the Atlantic Migratory Game Bird Technical Committee.
• Ontario Parks participates in the binational Great Lakes Colonial Waterbird Working Group and the provincial multi-stakeholder Coastal Wetland Restoration Working Group.
• The International Joint Commission indirectly participates in conservation of wetland-dependant migratory species. For example, the St. Clair-Detroit River System Initiative seeks to conserve and restore aquatic habitat and wetlands.

Target 19

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

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

Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

19.1 Additional information

› No assessment of national or local training needs for the implementation of the Convention has been made. Networks are in place to share information through continued communication with Ramsar Site managers and the Administrative Authority. Opportunities also exist for information sharing through the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Canada) and the Canadian Wetlands Roundtable.

19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

19.2 Additional information

If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials
› Wetland conservation and wise use issues are included in provincial and territorial formal education programs to varying degrees.

19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP13? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv
a) at Ramsar Sites
Please select only one option
☐ E=Exact number (opportunities)

›
☐ F=Less than (opportunities)

›
☐ G=More than (opportunities)

›
☐ C=Partially
☑ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP13? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv
b) at other wetlands
Please select only one option
☐ E=Exact number (Opportunities)

›
☐ F=Less than (Opportunities)

›
☐ G=More than (Opportunities)
☐ C=Partially
☑ X=Unknown
☐ Y=Not Relevant

19.3 Additional information

including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training
› a) at Ramsar Sites
No official training opportunities were reported for the past 3 years at Ramsar Sites nor was there a request for training opportunities from the Site managers.
However, some site managers did receive training related to their regional requirements and continued knowledge of local areas. For example, site managers at Cap Tourmente (Quebec) collaborate with the Centre of Excellence on Wetlands projects in the region, which aims to educate and sensitize students, their parents and teachers to wetland conservation.
b) at other wetlands
While no official training opportunities or information for wetland site managers were identified. Some academia facilities do offer training related to wetlands. For example, the Peatland Ecology Research Group at Laval University gives a 2-day peatland restoration workshop to peatland managers in the horticultural peat industry across Canada. The Centre for Boreal Research (at Northern Alberta Institute of Technology) offers yearly several seminars, workshops and field tours targeted to wetland restoration practitioners.

19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned
☐ Z=Not Applicable

19.4 Additional information

If ‘Yes’, please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring
› The preparation of the 3-year Ramsar Report provides a mechanism for communication and updates to evaluate the progress among government agencies, non-government organizations and others regarding the status of wetland conservation and management in Canada.

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

Goal 1

Target 1: Wetland benefits

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

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 1: Wetland benefits - National Targets

›

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Planned activity

›

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 1: Wetland benefits - Additional Information

›

Target 2: Water Use

Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone. {Reference to Aichi Targets 7 and 8], [Sustainable Development Goal 6, Indicator 6.3.1]

Target 2: Water Use - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 2: Water Use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 2: Water Use - National Targets

›

Target 2: Water Use - Planned activity

›

Target 2: Water Use - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 2: Water Use - Additional Information

›

Target 3: Public and private sectors

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

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 3: Public and private sectors - National Targets

›

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Planned activity

›

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 3: Public and private sectors - Additional Information

›

Target 4: Invasive alien species

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

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 4: Invasive alien species - National Targets

›

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Planned activity

›

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 4: Invasive alien species - Additional Information

›

Goal 2

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites

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

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - National Targets

›

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Planned activity

›

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 5: Ecological character of Ramsar Sites - Additional Information

›

Target 7: Sites at risk

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

Target 7: Sites at risk - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 7: Sites at risk - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 7: Sites at risk - National Targets

›

Target 7: Sites at risk - Planned activity

›

Target 7: Sites at risk - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 7: Sites at risk - Additional Information

›

Goal 3

Target 8: National wetland inventories

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

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 8: National wetland inventories - National Targets

›

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Planned activity

›

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 8: National wetland inventories - Additional Information

›

Target 9: Wise Use

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

Target 9: Wise Use - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 9: Wise Use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 9: Wise Use - National Targets

›

Target 9: Wise Use - Planned activity

›

Target 9: Wise Use - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 9: Wise Use - Additional Information

›

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge

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

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - National Targets

›

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Planned activity

›

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 10: Traditional Knowledge - Additional Information

›

Target 11: Wetland functions

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

Target 11: Wetland functions - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 11: Wetland functions - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 11: Wetland functions - National Targets

›

Target 11: Wetland functions - Planned activity

›

Target 11: Wetland functions - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 11: Wetland functions - Additional Information

›

Target 12: Restoration

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

Target 12: Restoration - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 12: Restoration - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 12: Restoration - National Targets

›

Target 12: Restoration - Planned activity

›

Target 12: Restoration - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 12: Restoration - Additional Information

›

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability

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

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - National Targets

›

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Planned activity

›

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 13: Enhanced sustainability - Additional Information

›

Goal 4

Target 15: Regional Initiatives

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

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - National Targets

›

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Planned activity

›

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 15: Regional Initiatives - Additional Information

›

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use

Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}. [Reference to Aichi Targets 1 and 18].

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - National Targets

›

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Planned activity

›

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals
Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021
›

Target 16: Wetlands conservation and wise use - Additional Information

›

Target 17: Financial and other resources

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

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 17: Financial and other resources - National Targets

›

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Planned activity

›

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 17: Financial and other resources - Additional Information

›

Target 18: International cooperation

International cooperation is strengthened at all levels {3.1}

Target 18: International cooperation - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 18: International cooperation - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 18: International cooperation - National Targets

›

Target 18: International cooperation - Planned activity

›

Target 18: International cooperation - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 18: International cooperation - Additional Information

›

Target 19: Capacity Building

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

Target 19: Capacity Building - Priority

Please select only one option

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

Target 19: Capacity Building - Resourcing

Please select only one option

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

Target 19: Capacity Building - National Targets

›

Target 19: Capacity Building - Planned activity

›

Target 19: Capacity Building - Outcomes achieved by 2021

Outcomes achieved by 2021 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals

Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2021

›

Target 19: Capacity Building - Additional Information

›

Section 5: Optional annex to enable Contracting Parties to provide additional voluntary information on designated Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites)

Guidance for filling in this section

1. Contracting Parties can provide additional information specific to any or all of their designated Ramsar Sites.
2. The only indicator questions included in this section are those from Section 3 of the COP14 NRF which directly concern Ramsar Sites.
3. In some cases, to make them meaningful in the context of reporting on each Ramsar Site separately, some of these indicator questions and/or their answer options have been adjusted from their formulation in Section 3 of the COP14 NRF.
4. Please include information on only one site in each row. In the appropriate columns please add the name and official site number (from the Ramsar Sites Information Service).
5. For each 'indicator question', please select one answer from the legend.
6. A final column of this Annex is provided as a 'free text' box for the inclusion of any additional information concerning the Ramsar Site.

A final column of this Annex is provided as a 'free text' box for the inclusion of any additional information concerning the Ramsar Site.

Canada

Baie de l'Isle-Verte (362)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder

involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Beaverhill Lake (370)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes

☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Cap Tourmente (214)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Chignecto (320)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through

existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Columbia Wetlands (1463)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Creston Valley (649)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

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

Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Delta Marsh (238)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No

☑ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
› 11.3 and 11.4 based on draft management planning

Dewey Soper Migratory Bird Sanctuary (249)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
› 11.3 and 11.4 based on draft management planning

Fraser River Delta (243)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Grand Codroy Estuary (364)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Hay-Zama Lakes (242)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Lac Saint Pierre (949)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially

☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Lac Saint-François (361)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Last Mountain Lake (239)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

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

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Long Point (237)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Malpeque Bay (399)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Mary's Point (236)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes

☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Matchedash Bay (866)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

McConnell River (248)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Mer Bleue Conservation Area (755)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
› 11.3 and 11.4 based on draft management planning

Minesing Swamp (865)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

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

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Musquodoboit Harbour (369)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Oak Hammock Marsh (366)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with

eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Old Crow Flats (244)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Peace-Athabasca Delta (241)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Point Pelee (368)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Polar Bear Pass (245)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No

☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
› 11.3 and 11.4 based on draft management planning

Polar Bear Provincial Park (360)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site

›

Queen Maud Gulf (246)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
› 11.3 and 11.4 based on draft management planning

Quill Lakes (365)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No

☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Rasmussen Lowlands (247)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option

☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Shepody Bay (363)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No

☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Southern Bight-Minas Basin (379)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Southern James Bay (367)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☑ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

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

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

St. Clair (319)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Tabusintac Lagoon and River Estuary (612)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with

eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☑ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›

Whooping Crane Summer Range (240)

5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (i.e. sites with eitheraformal management plan or management via other relevant means where they exist e.g through existing actions for appropriate wetland management)? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

5.7 Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?
Please select only one option

☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☐ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☑ C=Partially
☐ D=Planned

11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ C=Partially
☐ Z=No Management Plan

16.3a Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

16.6a Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?
Please select only one option
☑ A=Yes
☐ B=No
☐ D=Planned

Any additional comments/information about the site
›