

National planning tool for the implementation of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

(And the approved format for National Reports to be submitted for the 8th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties, Spain, 2002)

file 1

Institutional information

Contracting Party: GERMANY

Full name of designated Ramsar Administrative Authority: Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

Name and title of the head of the designated Ramsar Administrative Authority: Jürgen Trittin

Mailing address and contact details of the head of the institution:

**Alexanderplatz 6
D-10178 Berlin
Germany**

Telephone: +49-1888-305 0

Facsimile: +49-1888-305 4375

Email: service@bmu.de

Name and title (if different) of the designated national focal point (or “daily contact” in the Administrative Authority) for Ramsar Convention matters: Dr. Fritz Dieterich

Mailing address and contact details of the national focal point:

**Godesberger Allee 90
D-53175 Bonn
Germany**

Telephone: +49-228-305 2620

Facsimile: +49-228-305 2697

Email: dieterich.fritz@bmu.de

Name and title of the designated national focal point for matters relating to the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP): Dr. Knut Haarmann

Mailing address and contact details of the national STRP focal point:

**Bundesamt für Naturschutz <Federal Office for Nature Conservation, BfN>
Konstantinstr. 110
D-53179 Bonn**

Germany

Telephone: +49-228-8491 111

Facsimile: +49-228-8491 119

Email: haarmannk@bfm.de

Name and title of the designated national government focal point for matters relating to the Outreach Programme of the Ramsar Convention: **Hanno Henke**

Mailing address and contact details of the national focal point:

Bundesamt für Naturschutz <Federal Office for Nature Conservation, BfN>

Konstantinstr. 110

D-53179 Bonn

Germany

Telephone: +49-228-8491 238

Facsimile: +49-228-8491 108

Email: henkeh@bfm.de

Name and title of the designated national non-government (NG) focal point for matters relating to the Outreach Programme of the Ramsar Convention: **Dr. Johan Mooij**

Mailing address and contact details of the national focal point:

Biologische Station im Kreis Wesel

Freybergweg 9

D-46483 Wesel

Germany

Telephone: +49-281-9625213

Facsimile: +49-281-9625222

Email: johan.mooij@bskw.de

Note – Not all actions from the Convention Work Plan 2000-2002 are included here, as some apply only to the Bureau or Conferences of the Contracting Parties. As a result, the numbering system that follows contains some gaps corresponding to those actions that have been omitted.



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 1

TO PROGRESS TOWARDS UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONVENTION

Operational Objective 1.1: To endeavour to secure at least 150 Contracting Parties to the Convention by 2002.

Actions – Global Targets

1.1.1 Recruit new Contracting Parties, especially in the less well represented regions and among states with significant and/or transboundary wetland resources (including shared species), [CPs, SC regional representatives, Bureau, Partners]

- **The gaps remain in Africa, central Asia, the Middle East and the Small Island**

Developing States. Refer to Recommendation 7.2 relating to Small Island Developing States.

- **Global Target - 150 CPs by COP8**
- **These are the countries which at present are not CPs of the Convention:**
Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Cook Islands, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Federated States of Micronesia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nigeria, Niue, Oman, Palau, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, St Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Is your country a neighbor of, or does it have regular dealings or diplomatic-level dialogue with, one or more of the non-Contracting Parties listed above? (This list was correct as of January 2000. However, accessions to the Convention occur on a regular basis and you may wish to check with the Ramsar Bureau for the latest list of non-CPs.) **Yes** If **No**, go to Action 1.1.2.

If **Yes**, have actions been taken to encourage these non-CPs to join the Convention? **No**

If **Yes**, have these actions been successful? -

If **No**, what has prevented such action being taken? **It is primarily the responsibility of neighbouring countries to persuade non-CPs to join the Convention. At best, a geographically remote CP – as in this case – should provide assistance in this respect.**

Proposed national actions and targets: **In accordance with national implementation of the 1997-2002 strategy plan, diplomatic relations should be used to encourage membership of the Ramsar Convention amongst southern European states (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Moldavia) in particular.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The Federal Foreign Office**

1.1.2 Promote membership of Ramsar through regional meetings and activities, and through partners' regional offices. [SC regional representatives, Bureau, Partners]

- **These efforts are to continue and to focus on the above priority regions and the Small Island Developing States.**
- **The current member and permanent observer States of the Standing Committee are Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Costa Rica, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Slovak Republic, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad & Tobago, and Uganda**

Is your country a member of the Standing Committee? No If No , go to Action 2.1.1.
If Yes , have actions been taken to encourage the non-CPs from your region or subregion to join the Convention? No reply
If Yes , have these actions been successful? -
If No , what has prevented such action being taken? -
Proposed national actions and targets: -
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: -



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 2

TO ACHIEVE THE WISE USE OF WETLANDS BY IMPLEMENTING AND FURTHER DEVELOPING THE RAMSAR WISE USE GUIDELINES

Operational Objective 2.1: To review and, if necessary, amend national or supra-national (e.g., European Community) legislation, institutions and practices in all Contracting Parties, to ensure that the Wise Use Guidelines are applied.

Actions - Global and National Targets
<p>2.1.1 Carry out a review of legislation and practices, and indicate in National Reports to the COP how the Wise Use Guidelines are applied. [CPs]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This remains a high priority for the next triennium. The <i>Guidelines for reviewing laws and institutions</i> (Resolution VII.7) will assist these efforts. • Global Target – For at least 100 CPs to have comprehensively reviewed their laws and institutions relating to wetlands by COP8.
Has your country completed a review of its laws and institutions relating to wetlands? No
<p>If No, what are the impediments to this being done?</p> <p>Nature conservation objectives, which include the protection of wetlands, are legally anchored in the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG>, which serves as a binding framework act for the <i>Länder</i>. Within the framework of these provisions, the <i>Länder</i> adopt their own nature conservation acts, which they may supplement with additional provisions. Nature conservation legislation is constantly under review and for this reason can never be complete and finalised.</p> <p>The following examples illustrate how wetland conservation issues were taken into account when revising individual acts and ordinances:</p> <p>- The new § 30 “Legally protected biotopes” (formerly § 20c of the BNatSchG) of the amendment to the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG> has added to wetland conservation by including additional waterbody and wetland zones in the scope of</p>

statutory protection. As such, all biotypes occurring in Germany which are defined as wetlands under the Ramsar Convention have now been included in the framework act. The *Länder* may adopt additional provisions in this respect.

- The amendment to the National Parks Act in Schleswig-Holstein almost doubled the area of the *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig Holstein> National Park, which includes the wetland of international importance of the same name. Other measures include the creation of protected zone for Barnacle Geese (*Branta leucopsis*).

- The National Parks Act in Lower Saxony for the *Niedersächsisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Lower Saxony> National Park, which includes a wetland of international importance of the same name, has included additional areas in the national park and has upgraded the buffer zone, i.e. the protection provisions for these areas have become more stringent.

- Republication of the “Thuringen Nature Conservation Act” in 1999: the provisional Thuringen Nature Conservation Act has been extended to include several key provisions, particularly in the sections on landscape planning and interference.

If a review is **planned**, what is the expected timeframe for this being done? -

If the review has been **completed**, did the review result in amendments to laws or institutional arrangements to support implementation of the Ramsar Convention? **No reply**

If **No**, what are the impediments to these amendments being completed? -

If **Yes**, and changes to laws and institutional arrangements were made, please describe these briefly. -

Proposed national actions and targets:

- As protected biotopes were extended to include additional wetland types and improvements were achieved primarily in the areas of interlinked biotopes, regulations on interference, and good agricultural practice following the entry into force of the amendment to the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG>, the next step is to monitor and analyse the actual impacts. The same applies analogously to the amended acts for the *Niedersächsisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Lower Saxony> and *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig Holstein> National Parks.

- To ensure further and continuous efforts by the Federal Government and the governments of the individual *Länder* to improve the relevant statutory provisions for the implementation of landscape planning, regulation of interference, environmental impact assessments, compatibility testing, and contract-based nature conservation.

- To make further progress with the procedures to implement environmental and nature conservation provisions.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

- The supreme nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*
- All regional and local authorities

2.1.2 Promote much greater efforts to develop national wetland policies, either separately or as a clearly identifiable component of other national conservation planning initiatives, such as National Environment Action Plans, National Biodiversity Strategies, or National Conservation Strategies. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **The development and implementation of National Wetland Policies continues to be one of the highest priorities of the Convention, as does the integration of wetland conservation and wise use into broader national environment and water policies. The *Guidelines for developing and implementing National Wetland Policies (Resolution VII.6)* will assist these efforts.**
- **Global Target - By COP8, at least 100 CPs with National Wetland Policies or, where appropriate, a recognized document that harmonizes all wetland-related policies/strategies and plans, and all CPs to have wetlands considered in national environmental and water policies and plans. The *Guidelines for integrating wetland conservation and wise use into river basin management (Resolution VII.18)* will assist these efforts.**

Does your country have **in place** a National Wetland Policy (or similar instrument) which is a comprehensive statement of the Government's intention to implement the provisions of the Ramsar Convention? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this being put in place? **In Germany, the protection of wetlands is an integral aspect of nature conservation as a whole (cf. also 2.1.1).**

If the development of such a Policy is **planned**, what is the expected timeframe for this being done? -

Has your country taken its obligations with respect to the Ramsar Convention into consideration in related policy instruments such as National Biodiversity Strategies, National Environmental Action Plans, Water Policies, river basin management plans, or similar instruments? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to doing so? -

If **Yes**, please provide brief details.

At national level, various sectoral biodiversity strategies (including the national forestry strategy and the national biodiversity strategy in the area of development cooperation) make allowance for the protection of biotopes in those areas where wetlands occur.

At regional level, sub-programmes exist for rivers and lakes (such as the International Commissions for the protection of waters – cf. also 2.2.2), for seas (for the Baltic Sea: the Helsinki Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea – HELCOM; for the North Sea: the OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic; for the Wadden Sea: the Trilateral Wadden Sea Plan (WSP)), and for selected areas of environmental protection (sewage disposal

plans, sewage treatment plants, flood alleviation measures, groundwater protection etc.). All these plans and programs also incorporate wetland protection requirements as defined by the Ramsar Convention.

Below are a few examples relating to rivers and lakes:

The Moselle and the Saar (Action Programmes by the International Commissions for the Protection of the Moselle and the Saar – IKSMS), the Rhine (“Action Programme for the Rhine” and “Rhine 2020 – Programme for the Sustainable Development of the Rhine and Schedule of Work to 2005” by the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine against Pollution – IKSR), the Elbe (action programme by the International Commission for the Protection of the Elbe – IKSE), the Oder (immediate action programme by the International Commission for the Protection of the Oder against Pollution – IKSO), the Danube (Strategic Action Plan by the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube – IKSD), the Danube between Neu-Ulm and Donauwörth (“Overall Ecological Assessment of Donauried” by the Bavarian State Minister for Regional Development and Environmental Affairs), the Neckar (IKoNE – Integrative concept for the Neckar catchment area of Baden-Württemberg) and Lake Constance (International Commission for the Protection of the Waters of Lake Constance – IGKB).

Has your government reviewed and modified, as appropriate, its policies that adversely affect intertidal wetlands (COP7 Resolution VII.21)? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, what were the conclusions of this review? and what actions have been taken subsequently? **The Trilateral Wadden Sea Plan (WSP) is continually reviewed and optimised in respect of concrete proposals on vessel safety by a follow-up enquiry into the “Pallas” disaster. Recommendations in this respect were adopted at the 9th Trilateral Government Conference for the Protection of the Wadden Sea on 31 October 2001. The ministerial declaration (see enclosure) contains numerous proposals to improve vessel safety. Further extensive improvements to the ecological, chemical and volumetric status of the waterbodies will arise within the context of implementing the Water Framework Directive of 23 October 2000.**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue constructive cooperation between the three Wadden Sea states (Netherlands, Germany, Denmark).**
- **To implement the proposed measures to improve vessel safety**
- **To implement the Water Framework Directive**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Government**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***
- **Specialist authorities of the Federal Government and *Länder***

Operational Objective 2.2: To integrate conservation and wise use of wetlands in all Contracting Parties into national, provincial and local planning and decision-making on land use, groundwater management, catchment/river basin and coastal zone planning, and all other environmental planning and management.

Actions - Global and National Targets
<p>2.2.2 Promote the inclusion of wetlands in national, provincial and local land use planning documents and activities, and in all relevant sectoral and budgetary provisions. [CPs]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving integrated and cross-sectoral approaches to managing wetlands within the broader landscape and within river basin/coastal zone plans is another of the Convention's highest priorities in the next triennium. Global Target - By COP8, all CPs to be promoting, and actively implementing, the management of wetlands as integrated elements of river basins and coastal zones, and to provide detailed information on the outcomes of these actions in the National Reports for COP8.
<p>Is your country implementing integrated river basin and coastal zone management approaches? Yes</p>
<p>If No, what are the impediments to this being done? -</p>
<p>If integrated management approaches are being applied in part of the country, indicate the approximate percentage of the country's surface area where this is occurring and to which river basins and coastal areas this applies. 80-100%</p>
<p>If Yes, are wetlands being given special consideration in such integrated management approaches? Yes</p>
<p>If No, what are the impediments to this being done? -</p>
<p>Has your country undertaken any specific pilot projects to implement the <i>Guidelines for integrating wetland conservation and wise use into river basin management</i> (COP7 Resolution VII.18).? No</p>
<p>If Yes, please describe them briefly. -</p>
<p>Proposed national actions and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To give greater priority to conservation aspects over use aspects - To forge more links between flood alleviation aspects and the protection of biotopes. - To implement more widespread renaturation measures for riparian forests within the framework of flood alleviation measures. - To protect waterbodies and riparian zones (§ 31 of the Amendment to the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG>) - To continue with the riverbank projects.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **International Commissions for the Protection of Waters**
- **The Federal Government**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***

Operational Objective 2.3: To expand the Guidelines and Additional Guidance on Wise Use to provide advice to Contracting Parties on specific issues not hitherto covered, and examples of best current practice.

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.3.1 Expand the Additional Guidance on Wise Use to address specific issues such as oil spill prevention and clean-up, agricultural runoff, and urban/industrial discharges in cooperation with other bodies. [CPs, STRP, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - Following COP7, the Bureau, with other appropriate collaborators, will produce a series of Wise Use handbooks, based on the outcomes of Technical Sessions at COP7.**
- **(added by the Ramsar Bureau pursuant to Resolution VII.14 *Invasive Species and wetlands*) CPs are requested “to provide the Ramsar Bureau with information on databases which exist for invasive species, information on invasive species which pose a threat to wetlands and wetland species, and information on the control and eradication of invasive wetland species.”**

Does your country **have** resource information on the management of wetlands in relation to the following which could be useful in assisting the Convention to develop further guidance to assist other CPs :

- oil spill prevention and clean-up? **Yes**
- agricultural runoff? **Yes**
- urban/industrial discharges? **Yes**
- invasive species? **Yes**
- other relevant aspects such as highway designs, aquaculture, etc.? **Yes – e.g. in the areas of tourism, leisure and sport, as well as waste disposal**

In each case, if the answer was **Yes**, has this information been forwarded to the Ramsar Bureau for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre (see 2.3.2 below)? **No**

Studies and information on wetlands management with reference to various forms of intervention and use, such as safety measures to protect water from oil contamination or waste disposal measures, have been published in the technical documentation and are therefore available to specialist authorities as well as universities and associations. Where necessary, copies are also available to other interested parties.

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue to examine the effects of various forms of interference and possible**

practical measures for damage limitation or rehabilitation of an impaired wetland site, where necessary.

- To carry out monitoring programmes in wetlands of international importance.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The Federal Government, particularly the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

- The Federal Institute for Hydrology

- The Federal Environmental Agency

- The Federal Office for Nature Conservation

- The Federal Board of Shipping and Hydrography et al.

- The regional governments of the *Länder*, particularly the environmental ministries of the *Länder* and subordinate technical institutions

- Universities

- Nature conservation and environmental protection organisations

2.3.2. Publicize examples of effective application of existing Guidelines and Additional Guidance on Wise Use. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- Promoting and improving the availability of such resource materials is a priority under the *Convention's Outreach Programme (Resolution VII.9)***
- Global Target - By COP8, to have included in the Wise Use Resource Centre 500 appropriate references and publications as provided to the Bureau by CPs and other organizations.**

Further to 2.31. above, has your country, as urged by the Outreach Programme of the Convention adopted at COP7 (Resolution VII. 9), **reviewed** its resource materials relating to wetland management policies and practices? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this being done? **Cf. point 2.3.1**

If **Yes**, have copies of this information been forwarded to the Ramsar Bureau? **No reply**

If **No**, what has prevented this being done? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **Cf. point 2.3.1**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: **Cf. point 2.3.1**

Operational Objective 2.4: To provide economic evaluations of the benefits and functions of wetlands for environmental planning purposes.

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.4.1 Promote the development, wide dissemination, and application of documents and methodologies which give economic evaluations of the benefits and functions of wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Given the guidelines available for this activity (see below: *Economic Valuation of Wetlands* handbook), this will be an area of higher priority in the next triennium.**
- **Global Target - By COP8, all CPs to be incorporating economic valuation of wetland services, functions and benefits into impact assessment and decision-making processes related to wetlands.**

Does your government **require** that economic valuations of the full range of services, benefits and functions of wetlands be prepared as part of impact assessments and to support planning decisions that may impact on wetlands? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this being done?

Within the context of the provisions regulating interference, Germany attaches high importance to the functional identity of compensatory measures. When tackling the consequences of intervention, monetary approaches are seen as a last resort if the impaired values and functions cannot be compensated directly by rehabilitation of the affected biotopes. For this reason, valuation is generally based indirectly on the anticipated costs of rehabilitation.

If this applies in some, but not all cases, what is the expected timeframe for this to be required in all cases? -

If **Yes**, has the inclusion of economic valuation into impact assessment resulted in wetlands being given special consideration or protection. **No reply**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To reinforce the principle of the “welfare effect” of nature conservation: to highlight more clearly the economic value of wetlands to the general public.**
- **To publish suitable examples with a socio-economic approach.**
- **To give greater consideration to wetland sites when determining compensatory measures.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **All regional and local authorities (Federal Government, *Länder*, regions, districts, local governments)**
- **Nature conservation organisations**
- **Research institutes, universities**
- **Economic research institutes**

Operational Objective 2.5: To carry out environmental impact assessments (EIAs) at wetlands, particularly of proposed developments or changes in land/water use which have potential to affect them, notably at Ramsar sites, whose ecological character “is likely to change as the result of technological developments, pollution or other human interference” (Article 3.2 of the Convention).

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.5.2 Ensure that, at Ramsar sites where change in ecological character is likely as a result of proposed developments or changes in land/water use which have potential to affect them, EIAs are carried out (with due consideration of economic valuations of wetland benefits and functions), and that the resulting conclusions are communicated to the Ramsar Bureau and fully taken into account by the authorities concerned. [CPs]

- **Global Target - In the next triennium, CPs will ensure that EIAs are applied to any such situation and keep the Bureau advised of the issues and the outcomes of these EIAs.**

Has an EIA been carried out in **all** cases where a change in the ecological character of a Ramsar site within your country was likely (or possible) as a result of proposed developments or changes in land/water use? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this from occurring?

In Germany, the environmental impact assessment is based on a (federal) law regulating environmental impact assessments as well as regional provisions of the individual *Länder*. The German EIA provisions are based on the European EIA Directive in the version promulgated in Amendment Directive 97/11/EEC. This prescribes the performance of an environmental impact assessment for certain public and private projects which may have a substantial impact on the environment. It covers commercial and industrial projects, infrastructure projects (e.g. traffic projects, tourism and leisure facilities) as well as agriculture, forestry and fishery projects associated with an intensification of use or other major environmental impacts (such as the use of waste land or semi-natural land for intensive farming or intensive fish farming with the dumping or discharge of substances into overground watercourses). For certain types of projects, the necessity of an environmental impact assessment depends upon whether certain threshold values have been exceeded, and also on the results of an investigation into each individual case. The decisive threshold values represent a limit whereby no significant environmental impacts are generally anticipated provided this limit is not exceeded, even in ecologically sensitive locations. Where investigations into individual cases are required, certain criteria must be used as a basis, including the ecological sensitivity of the affected areas. In this context, it is particularly important to consider whether the project may impact a wetland site. The project should not be considered in isolation; instead, the assessment should make allowance for cumulative effects with other projects in the common area of impact.

Those projects requiring an environmental impact assessment are listed in the German EIA provisions, in exactly the same way as the EIA Directive of the European Community. Although this is a very extensive list of projects, all of which are major

undertakings with typically substantial environmental impacts, in exceptional cases we cannot rule out the possibility of adverse environmental impacts occurring on Ramsar sites or other wetland areas as a result of projects not covered by this list. Furthermore, the Environmental Impact Assessment is not a suitable mechanism for evaluating diffuse environmental impacts from varied sources which cannot be clearly assigned to individual perpetrators or activities.

Where wetlands of international importance are also designated Natura 2000 sites, allowance must also be made for the statutory EU provisions of Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Habitat Directive. This states that all plans and projects not directly linked to administration of the area or required for such a purpose should be examined to determine whether they could significantly impair the area, either individually or in conjunction with other plans or projects. In such cases, it is necessary to examine compatibility with the preservation targets specified for that region.

If **Yes**, has this EIA, or have these EIAs, given due consideration to the full range of environmental, social and economic values of the wetland? (See also 2.4.1 above) **No reply**

AND: Have the results of the EIA been transmitted to the Ramsar Bureau? **No reply**

If **No**, what has prevented this from occurring? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **Cf. point 2.5.3**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: **Cf. point 2.5.3**

2.5.3 Carry out EIAs at other important sites, particularly where adverse impact on wetland resources is likely, due to a development proposal or change in land/water use. [CPs]

- Global Target - By COP8, all CPs to require EIAs under legislation for any actions which can potentially impact on wetlands and to provide detailed reports on advances in this area in their National Reports for COP8.**

Are EIAs required in your country for **all** cases where a wetland area (whether a Ramsar site or not) may be adversely impacted due to a development proposal or change in land/water use? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? **Cf. point 2.5.2**

If **Yes**, are such EIAs required to give due consideration to the full range of environmental, social and economic values of the wetland? (See COP7 Resolution VII.16, also 2.4.1 & 2.5.2 above.) **No reply**

Are EIAs “undertaken in a transparent and participatory manner which includes local stakeholders” (COP7 Resolution VII.16)? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue the previous practice based on the new**

statutory provisions.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The European Commission, the European Council**
- **The Federal Government**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***

2.5.4 Take account of Integrated Environmental Management and Strategic Environmental Assessment (at local, provincial and catchment/river basin or coastal zone levels) when assessing impacts of development proposals or changes in land/water use. [CPs]

(Refer to 2.5.3 above) In addition to the assessment of the potential impact of specific projects on wetlands, has your country **undertaken** a review of all government plans, programmes and policies which may impact negatively on wetlands? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this from occurring? **Information relating to planned measures, programmes or projects which may also affect wetland areas is available from the responsible institutions of the Federal Government and the *Länder*. We do not see any urgent need to create a complete overview. Furthermore, there is no adequate legal basis available for the collation, quality and evaluation of data.**

If **Yes**, has this review been undertaken as part of preparing a National Wetland Policy or similar instrument? (refer 2.12 above) **No reply**

Or as part of other national policy or planning activities? **No reply**

Proposed national actions and targets: -

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Government, in particular the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***
- **Supplementary to this: Nature and environmental conservation organisations**

Operational Objective 2.6: To identify wetlands in need of restoration and rehabilitation, and to implement the necessary measures.

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.6.1 Use regional or national scientific inventories of wetlands (Recommendation 4.6), or monitoring processes, to identify wetlands in need of restoration or rehabilitation. [CPs, Partners]

- **The completion of such inventories is a continuing area of priority for the Convention.**

- **Global Target - Restoration/rehabilitation inventories to be completed by at least 50 CPs by COP8.**

Has your country **completed** an assessment to identify its priority wetlands for restoration or rehabilitation? (COP7 Resolution VII.17) **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from being done? -

If this has been done for only part of the country, please indicate for which areas or river basins. -

If **Yes** (that is, an assessment has been **completed**), have actions been taken to undertake the restoration or rehabilitation of these priority sites? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from being done? -

If **Yes**, please provide details.

In Germany, many renaturation projects were undertaken by the Federal Government and the *Länder* during the period under review, and it would be impossible to list them all here. Below are a few examples.

Projects aimed at the rehabilitation of semi-natural biotopes are funded by the Federal Government and *Länder* as “development and trial projects in the area of nature conservation and landscape management”. For the period under review, these included the following projects involving wetland areas:

- **Measures to protect the creek mussel (*unio crassus*) (Lower Saxony)**
- **Raising of the water level over a wide area in a lowland moor and in a coastal lowland region near the Baltic Sea (Schleswig-Holstein)**
- **Rewetting of high-lying salt meadows on the Wurster coast (Lower Saxony)**
- **Semi-natural formation of the river meadow on the *Unterer Haselauf* <section of the River Hase> (Lower Saxony)**
- **Recreation of typical water biotopes in the agricultural landscape (Lower Saxony)**
- **Marketing of hay and protection of water meadows in the *Dummeniederung* <lowlands of the River Dumme> (Lower Saxony)**
- **Revitalisation of an alluvial plain of the River Ise used for agricultural purposes (Lower Saxony)**
- **Development of riparian forest and grassland in the *Berkelaue* <water meadows of the River Berkel> (North-Rhine Westphalia)**
- **Regeneration of typical water meadow sites (Lower Saxony/North-Rhine Westphalia)**
- **Trialling of a watercourse and species conservation concept (Hesse)**
- **Renaturation and agricultural use of river valley meadows on the Upper Rhine (Hesse)**
- **Renaturation of a section of stream of the Rive Oster (Saarland)**

- Regeneration of biotic communities typical of lowland moor areas (Bavaria)
- Recreation of a habitat for meadow-breeding birds in the *Osterfeiner Moor* (Lower Saxony)

Furthermore, during the period 1998-2000, a number of projects with nationwide representative significance (major nature conservation and riverbank projects) received subsidies from federal funds which helped to optimise the following wetland sites:

- *Meerbruch/Steinhuder Meer* <Lake Steinhude> (Lower Saxony)
- *Flum/Fehntjer Tief* (Lower Saxony)
- *Isar* estuary (Bavaria)
- *Lutter* (Lower Saxony)
- *Murnauer Moos* (Bavaria)
- *Nuthe-Nieplitz-Niederung* (Brandenburg)
- *Schalsee-Landschaft* (Schleswig-Holstein/Mecklenburg-Upper Pomerania)
- *Fischerhuder Wümmeniederung* (Lower Saxony)
- *Ill* (Saarland)
- *Drömling* (Saxony-Anhalt)
- *Peenetal / Peene-Haaf-Moor* (Mecklenburg-Upper Pomerania)
- *Unteres Odertal* <section of the Oder Valley> (Brandenburg)
- *Ahr 2000* <River Ahr> (North-Rhine Westphalia)
- *Ruwer* watercourse system (Rhineland-Palatinate)
- *Hammeniederung* (Lower Saxony)
- *Presseler Heidewald- und Moorgebiet* <heathland and peatbogs near Pressel> (Saxony)
- *Uckermärkische Seen* <Uckermark lakes> (Brandenburg)
- *Teichgebiete Niederspree-Hammerstadt* <pond landscapes> (Saxony)
- *Waldnaab-Aue* <water meadow> (Bavaria)
- *Obere Treene* <section of the River Treene> (Schleswig-Holstein)
- *Spreewald* <Spreewald Forest> (Brandenburg)

Furthermore, measures to recreate wetland areas have also been implemented by a number of regional programmes in the individual *Länder*, including the programme for the renaturation of watercourses in Schleswig-Holstein and the “Aktion Blau” campaign in Rhineland-Palatinate.

For example, the peatland protection concept in Mecklenburg-Upper Pomerania and related subsidy guidelines envisage the redevelopment of 75,000 ha of bogs over the next

20 years, based on an overall map of the boglands and with special designation of the focal points for renaturation. These comprehensive measures will also be eligible for subsidies from EU funds. Above and beyond this, the EU also subsidises various other projects, including the regeneration of *Rambower Moor* to protect the bittern in the *Brandenburgische Elbtalaue* <water meadow in the Elbe Valley, Brandenburg> biosphere reserve within the context of a LIFE project. The EU and the state of Bavaria also funded protection and development measures for bittern habitats as part of a LIFE project on the “*Doberschützer Wasser*” region. In Benninger Ried (Bavaria), funding is provided by the EU and the Bavarian Nature Conservation Fund, *inter alia*, for measures to recreate the natural water balance and eliminate stocks of pine not appropriate to location. Formerly species-rich water meadows in the *Saale* estuary (Saxony-Anhalt) have been renatured with the aid of donations from the WWF. Some 1,000 ha of lowland moor on the *Trebel* watercourse (Mecklenburg-Upper Pomerania) have likewise been rehabilitated.

Proposed national actions and targets:

- To step up renaturation measures in high-risk areas (e.g. peatbogs, riparian forests) in urgent need of rehabilitation.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The regional governments of the *Länder*
- The Federal Government
- International commissions for the protection of waters

2.6.2 Provide and implement methodologies for restoration and rehabilitation of lost or degraded wetlands. [CPs, STRP, Bureau, Partners]

- There is considerable information resource on this subject, although it is not as readily accessed as desirable.
- Global Target - The addition of appropriate case studies and information on methodologies, etc., to the Convention’s Wise Use Resource Centre (refer to 2.3.2 above also) will be a priority in the next triennium.

Refer to 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. Does your country **have** resource information on the restoration or rehabilitation of wetlands? **Yes**

If **Yes**, has this been forwarded to the Ramsar Bureau for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre and for consideration by the STRP Expert Working Group on Restoration?
No

If this material has not been forwarded to the Bureau, what has prevented this from occurring?
Appropriate documentation is already available from the responsible authorities which can be made available to interested parties if necessary.

Proposed national actions and targets: **To improve the collation and distribution of key information relating to the renaturation of wetlands.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Government, particularly the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***
- **Nature conservation organisations**
- **The national Ramsar committee**

2.6.3 Establish wetland restoration / rehabilitation programmes at destroyed or degraded wetlands, especially in association with major river systems or areas of high nature conservation value (Recommendation 4.1). [CPs]

- **The Convention will continue to promote the restoration and rehabilitation of wetlands, particularly in situations where such actions will help promote or retain the ‘health’ and productivity of waterways and coastal environments.**
- **Global Target - By COP8, all CPs to have identified their priority sites for restoration or rehabilitation and for projects to be under way in at least 100 CPs.**

Refer to 2.6.1 above.

Operational Objective 2.7: To encourage active and informed participation of local communities, including indigenous people, and in particular women, in the conservation and wise use of wetlands.

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.7.1 Implement Recommendation 6.3 on involving local and indigenous people in the management of wetlands. [CPs, Bureau]

- **Global Target - In the next triennium, the implementation of the Guidelines on local communities’ and indigenous people’s participation (COP7 Resolution VII.8) is to be one of the Convention’s highest priorities. By COP8, all CPs to be promoting local stakeholder management of wetlands.**

Is your government **actively** promoting the involvement of local communities and indigenous people in the management of wetlands? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? -

If **Yes**, describe what special actions have been taken (See also 2.7.2, 2.7.3 and 2.7.4 below) (COP7 Resolution VII.8).

Various campaigns and measures are being carried out, particularly in wetlands of international importance, to inform and involve the location population in the ongoing debates. Measures include the following:

- **The Ammersee conferences of the *Ampermoos* protection organisation (Lake**

Ammersee)

- Legislative procedures to amend the Act on the Protection of the *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig Holstein> (National Parks Act – NPG)
- Participation procedure for the possible nomination of the *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig Holstein> as a UNESCO international cultural legacy
- Citizens' meetings and public information events (e.g. *Unterer Inn, Haiming – Neuhaus* <section of the River Inn between Haiming and Neuhaus> and *Krakower Obersee* <Lake Krakow> (both within the framework of LIFE), *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>, *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>, *Unterer Havel/Gülper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe>, *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>, *Rhein Eltville – Bingen* <River Rhine between Eltville and Bingen>, *Dümmer, Diepholzer Moorniederung* <moorlands at Diepholz>, *Wattenmeer* <Wadden Sea>).
- Exhibitions, pamphlets and general public relations work (e.g. *Unterer Havel/Gülper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe>, *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>, *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>, *Lech-Donau-Winkel* <areas between the Rivers Danube and Lech>, *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>, *Niederelbe Barnkrug – Otterndorf* <section of the River Elbe between Barnkrug and Otterndorf>, *Bodensee: Mindelsee & Wollmatinger Ried* <Wollmatinger Ried and Mindelsee sectors of Lake Constance>).
- Interpretation of the national park plan (*Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>) or new nature conservation area ordinances (*Helmestausee Berga/Kelbra* <reservoir on the River Helme>)
- Creation of a hotline (*Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>).

When preparing the overall ecological assessment of the Donauried area (*Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>), and the watercourse maintenance plans for Lake Starnberg and Lake Chiemsee, and when implementing the Trilateral Wadden Sea Plan, the local population has been and still is involved in the ongoing discussions.

Another opportunity for active involvement concerns participation in the concrete implementation of the protection measures e.g. by means of extensive land management practices. In almost all wetlands of international importance, broad sections of the land are managed in the interests of nature conservation, whereby the farmers receive financial compensation from the regional programmes of the *Länder*, either in the form of hardship compensation or in the form of contract-based nature conservation based on the EU agricultural environment programmes (cf. also 2.7.2).

Proposed national actions and targets:

To continue and intensify public relations work, and the direct involvement of the local population in management and measures in the area of contract-based nature

conservation.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- All regional and local authorities
- Nature conservation organisations
- Managers of protected areas

2.7.2 Encourage site managers and local communities to work in partnership at all levels to monitor the ecological character of wetlands, thus providing a better understanding of management needs and human impacts. [CPs]

- **The Convention's Outreach Programme (COP7 Resolution VII.9) seeks to give such community participation higher priority as an education and empowerment tool of the Convention.**

Does your government **actively encourage or support** site managers and local communities in monitoring the condition (ecological character) of Ramsar sites and other wetlands? (Also refer to Operational Objective 5.1.) **Yes**

If **No**, what prevents this from occurring? -

If **Yes**, does this include both site managers and local communities, where they are not the same people? **Yes. In particular, voluntary managers of the areas make a valuable contribution towards monitoring the ecological status. These may be private individuals or regional nature conservation organisations. Some of them receive some form of remuneration or reimbursement of travel expenses in exchange for the duties they perform (including mapping, waterfowl counts). For example, this is the case in the wetlands of international importance at *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg> and *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>. In other areas, full-time monitoring staff are funded from the resources of the individual *Länder* (including, for example, administration of the *Westhavelland* nature park/Brandenburg nature monitor for *Unterer Havel/Gölper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe in Brandenburg>, the nature conservation stations in Lower Saxony, the biological stations in North-Rhine Westphalia, and other areas with national park status).**

AND, where such monitoring occurs, are the findings being used to guide management practices? **Yes**

If **No**, what prevents this from happening? -

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue to provide financial assistance to voluntary managers of conservation areas, with whom management agreements concerning wetlands of international importance are signed (e.g. for *Bodensee: Mindelsee* <Mindelsee sector of Lake Constance>).**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

All regional and local authorities, particularly the nature conservation authorities of the Länder

2.7.3 Involve local communities in the management of wetlands by establishing wetland management committees, especially at Ramsar sites, on which local stakeholders, landowners, managers, developers and community interest groups, in particular women's groups, are represented. [CPs, Partners]

- **Global Target - Ramsar site management committees operating in at least 100 CPs, and including non-government stakeholder representation.**

Are there wetland site management committees **in place** in your country? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to such being established? -

If **Yes**, for how many sites are such committees in place? **At least 24**

AND: How many of these are Ramsar sites? **14**

AND: Of these committees, how many include representatives of local stakeholders? **7**

AND: Of these, how many have women's groups represented? -

Proposed national actions and targets:

Initiation of Wetland Site Committees in other wetlands of international importance

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The regional governments of the Länder, specialist nature conservation institutions

- Managers of protected areas

- Nature conservation organisations

2.7.4 Recognize and apply traditional knowledge and management practice of indigenous people and local communities in the conservation and wise use of wetlands. [CPs]

- **Refer to 2.7.1 above.**
- **Global Target - This will be addressed in the next triennium, possibly in partnership with the Convention on Biological Diversity and Convention to Combat Desertification, which have already initiated work in this area.**

Has your government **made any special efforts** to recognize and see applied traditional knowledge and management practices? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from occurring? -

If **Yes**, please provide details of how this traditional knowledge was recognized and then put

into practice.

In parts of the wetland of international importance *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>, various research projects have been undertaken to record and analyse traditional management methods with the aid of surveys and site mapping. The pre-requisites for practical implementation include land acquisition by the *Land* and contract-based nature conservation. Both measures are currently underway.

A similar approach has also been selected in the following wetlands of international importance: *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>, *Krakower Obersee* <Lake Krakow>, *Dümmer* and *Bodensee: Mindelsee* <Mindelsee sector of Lake Constance>, with a view to determining appropriate landscape management methods.

By analysing the archive documents from the Fifties and Sixties, information on methods of use (pastures, mowing pastures, fertiliser dosages, types of fertiliser) in the lowlands of the Havel has been compiled. Moreover, employees at the Water Management Office have also collated information on water levels at that time, which had a decisive influence on the mode of management.

Traditional maintenance and management measures for the salt meadows on the “*Halligen*” are implemented in the *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig Holstein> via the “*Hallig* <marsh islands> Programme”, for example.

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue the current practice**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*

Operational Objective 2.8: To encourage involvement of the private sector in the conservation and wise use of wetlands.

Actions - Global and National Targets

2.8.1. Encourage the private sector to give increased recognition to wetland attributes, functions and values when carrying out projects affecting wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - In the next triennium, the efforts to work in partnership with the private sector will be further increased and the Bureau will seek to document and make available case studies on some of the more effective and innovative approaches. By COP8, the target is to have private sector support for wetlands conservation in more than 100 CPs.**

Have **special efforts been made** to increase the recognition of wetland attributes, functions and values among the private sector in your country? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If Yes, describe these special efforts. **In many wetlands of international importance, preservation of the ecological status necessitates extensive management or maintenance measures in accordance with nature conservation requirements. Implementation is guaranteed by hardship compensation programmes and contract-based nature conservation, which provides local farmers in particular with financial support (cf. also 2.7.1). Contract-based nature conservation is practised, for example, in the following wetlands of international importance: *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>, *Unteres Odertal* <section of the Oder Valley near Schwedt>, *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>, *Wattenmeer* <Wadden Sea>, the lowlands of *Unterer Havel/Gölper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe>, *Peitzer Teichgebiet* <series of fishponds near Peitz>, the *Helmestausee Berga Kelbra* <reservoir on the River Helme>, *Kraker Obersee* <Lake Krakow>, *Unterer Niederrhein* <part of the Lower Rhine> and *Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg* <barrage weir on the River Weser at Schlüsselburg>. The conclusion of lease agreements with nature conservation clauses – whereby the farmers either pay no rent at all or only a nominal charge – also serves the same purpose (e.g. *Diepholzer Moorniederung* <moorlands at Diepholz>, *Dümmer*, *Niederelbe Barnkrug – Otterndorf* <section of the River Elbe between Barnkrug and Otterndorf>, and *Steinhuder Meer* <Lake Steinhude>). Moreover, they may be eligible for premiums (premium for breeding cows, extensification premium) for their semi-natural farming methods.**

AND: Have these efforts been successful? **Yes**

If No, why not? -

If Yes, how do you judge this success? Financial support for management or monitoring? Active involvement in management or monitoring? (Refer to 2.8.3 below) Application of Ramsar's Wise Use principles by private sector interests? (Refer to 2.8.2 below)? Other criteria? **The involvement of the local population and users (particularly farmers) through contract-based nature conservation programmes and hardship compensation is a good means of involving these individuals in the maintenance and sustainable use of wetland areas, which in turn fosters acceptance of nature conservation.**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue with the current practice**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The regional governments of the *Länder*

2.8.2 Encourage the private sector to apply the Wise Use Guidelines when executing development projects affecting wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - In the next triennium the application of this tool for promoting Wise Use will be a priority under the Convention. By COP8, the target is to have more than 50 CPs which have completed reviews of their incentive measures.**

Refer to 2.8.1 above. Has your government **completed** a review of its “existing, or evolving, policy, legal and institutional frameworks to identify and promote those measures which encourage conservation and wise use of wetlands and to identify and remove measures

which discourage conservation and wise use” (COP7 Resolution VII.15)? **No**

If **No**, what has been the impediment to this being done? **The protection and balanced use of wetland areas is taken into account in all projects within the framework of the opportunities available (e.g. in accordance with the provisions on landscape planning and interference control in the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG>). In the case of smaller wetland sites (e.g. within the framework of the overall ecological assessment of Donauried for the wetland of international importance *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>, or as part of an expert report on interference factors for *Starnberger See* <Lake Starnberg>) as well as in the case of certain sub-aspects (e.g. efficiency controls on selected areas of land, e.g. in order to ascertain the effects of contract-based nature conservation in the wetland of international importance *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>), particular attention is paid to an assessment of potential impairments to ecological quality.**

Moreover, a general national sustainability strategy is currently under development at Federal Government level.

If **Yes**, what actions have been taken to introduce “incentive measures designed to encourage the wise use of wetlands, and to identify and remove perverse incentives where they exist” (COP7 Resolution VII.15). -

AND: Have these actions been effective? **No reply**

If **No**, why not? -

If **Yes**, please describe how. -

AND if **Yes**, COP7 Resolution VII.15 requested Parties to share these “experiences and lessons learned with respect to incentive measures and perverse incentives relating to wetlands, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable use of natural resources generally, by providing these to the Ramsar Bureau for appropriate distribution and to be made available through the Wise Use Resource Centre of the Convention’s Web site”. Has this been done? **No reply**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue with studies to monitor the efficiency of nature conservation measures.**
- **To continue with measures to promote sustainable use.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Government**
- **The regional governments of the *Länder***

2.8.3 Encourage the private sector to work in partnership with site managers to monitor the ecological character of wetlands. [CPs]

- **This action will be promoted further in the next triennium.**

Refer to 2.7.2 above. In addition, have **any special efforts** been made to encourage the private sector involvement in monitoring? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, describe these special efforts.

Management experts are employed on a full-time and voluntary basis (managers of protected areas, nature conservation monitors, biologists, landscape managers etc.) in almost all wetlands of international importance. This is based on the implementation of nature conservation legislation.

In the wetlands of international importance *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg> and *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>, volunteers who are involved in counting the water fowl receive expenses. In other areas, expenses are not reimbursed.

AND: How successful has this been? **Very successful. Over the years, cooperation between full-time staff and volunteers has become an important part of wetland monitoring.**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue the involvement of the private sector in area management and for monitoring wetlands of international importance.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The regional governments of the *Länder* and subordinate specialist authorities**
- **The Federal government**

2.8.4 Involve the private sector in the management of wetlands through participation in wetland management committees. [CPs]

- **Global Target - As indicated under 2.7.2 and 2.7.3 above, the establishment of cross-sectoral and stakeholder management committees for wetlands, and especially Ramsar sites, will be a priority in the next triennium.**

Refer to 2.7.3 above



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 3

TO RAISE AWARENESS OF WETLAND VALUES AND FUNCTIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD AND AT ALL LEVELS

Operational Objective 3.1: To support and assist in implementing, in cooperation with partners and other institutions, an international programme of Education and Public Awareness (EPA) on wetlands, their functions and values, designed to promote national EPA programmes.

Actions - Global Targets**3.1.1 Assist in identifying and establishing coordinating mechanisms and structures for the development and implementation of a concerted global programme of EPA on wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]**

Refer to Operational Objectives 3.2 and 3.3 below

3.1.2 Participate in the identification of regional EPA needs and in the establishment of priorities for resource development. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

Has your country **taken any action** to help with the identification of regional EPA needs and in the establishment of priorities for information/education resource development? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, please provide details, and as appropriate, provide samples to the Ramsar Bureau for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre's clearing house for Wetland Communications, Public Awareness, and Education (CEPA) (COP7 Resolution VII.9). **Public relations work takes a variety of different forms (lectures, excursions, newspaper articles, brochures and leaflets, scientific publications etc.), both locally and as part of general nature conservation activities. Furthermore, in many cases, public relations work is not carried out solely for one area as a wetland of international importance, but is instead practised within the context of the activities relating to the area's status as a national park or nature park, or as part of an EU LIFE project (i.e. designation as an area of common interest). We would also refer you to the German Wetland CEPA Action Plan.**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue educational and public relations work specifically for wetlands as part of nature conservation work and ensure the optimisation thereof.**
- **To intensify cooperation between the locally oriented information centres in wetlands of international importance and museums, zoos and botanical gardens, universities, regional nature conservation academies and other educational establishments with regard to public relations work.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The regional governments of the *Länder* and their specialist authorities**
- **Organisations acting as suppliers of information and area managers**
- **Information centres in the wetlands of international importance**

3.1.3 Assist in the development of international resource materials in support of national EPA programmes [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

Refer to 3.1.2 above also. Has your country **taken any action** to assist with the development

of international wetland CEPA resource materials? Yes
If Yes , please provide details, and as appropriate, provide samples to the Ramsar Bureau for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre's clearing house for Wetland CEPA (COP7 Resolution VII.9).
Germany subsidises various international nature conservation projects (e.g. via the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit – GTZ), which also includes public relations work in the affected wetland sites. One such example is a recently launched project in the coastal regions of Mauretania, which includes the formulation of strategies for environmental education, awareness and communication, as well as publicity campaigns.
If No , what has prevented this from happening? -
Proposed national actions and targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To continue to promote suitable projects - To give greater consideration to CEPA aspects within the context of project subsidies
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety - The Federal Ministry for Technical Cooperation <BMZ> with the support of the administrations and technical institutions of the <i>Länder</i> - Project organizers such as the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit <GTZ>
3.1.4 Support international programmes that encourage transfer of information, knowledge and skills between wetland education centres and educators (e.g., Wetland International's EPA Working Group, Global Rivers Environment Education Network (GREEN), Wetland Link International). [CPs, Bureau, Partners]
Refer to 3.2.4 also. Does your country support any international programmes that encourage transfer of information, knowledge and skills among wetland education centres and educators? No
If No , what are the impediments to this occurring? A lack of resources to complete this task
If Yes , please provide details. -
Is your country specifically supporting the Wetlands Link International initiative (COP7 Resolution VII.9)? No
If No , what is preventing this from happening? We have not yet recognised the need
If Yes , please provide details. -
AND indicate which Wetland Centres (refer 3.2.3 below), museums, zoos, botanic gardens, aquaria and educational environment education centres (refer 3.2.4) are now participating as

part of Wetlands Link International. -
Proposed national actions and targets: - To promote publication of the tasks and opportunities of Wetlands Link International
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: The various players involved in wetland protection

Operational Objective 3.2: To develop and encourage national programmes of EPA on wetlands, targeted at a wide range of people, including key decision-makers, people living in and around wetlands, other wetland users and the public at large.

Actions - Global and National Targets
3.2.1 Encourage partnerships between governments, non-governmental organizations and other organizations capable of developing national EPA programmes on wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global Target - By COP8 to see the global network of proposed CP and non-government focal points for Wetland Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) in place and functioning effectively in the promotion and execution of the national Outreach Programmes in all CPs. To secure the resources to increase the Bureau's capacity for implementing the Outreach Programme.
Did your Government inform the Ramsar Bureau by 31 December 1999 of the identity of its Government and Non-Government Focal Points for wetland CEPA (COP7 Resolution VII.9)? No
If No , what has prevented this from occurring? No Government Focal Point had been specified by that date
Has your country established an "appropriately constituted Task Forces, where no mechanism exists for this purpose (e.g., National Ramsar Committees), to undertake a review of national needs, capacities and opportunities in the field of wetland CEPA and, based on this, to formulate its National Wetland CEPA Action Plans for priority activities which consider the international, regional, national and local needs" (COP7 Resolution VII.9). Yes/No
If No , what has prevented this from occurring? A comprehensive national CEPA plan for wetlands above and beyond the existing German Wetland CEPA Action Plan is not deemed necessary, since its components are embedded in national environmental education in general, and nature conservation education specifically. The creation of a separate task force in addition to the National Ramsar Committee involved in the creation of the German Wetland CEPA Action Plan was not deemed necessary.
If Yes , please provide details of the organizations, ministries, etc., represented on this Task Force. See above.
AND: Has a National Wetland CEPA Action Plan been finalized by 31 December 2000?

No.
If No , what has prevented this from occurring? The collation of basic information has proved to be more time-consuming than originally anticipated. The German Wetland CEPA Action Plan was sent to the Ramsar Bureau on 3 September 2001. The plan was additionally transmitted by e-mail in the form of a PDF file on 21 September 2001.
If Yes , is the Action Plan being implemented effectively? No reply
If No , what is preventing this from occurring? -
If Yes , what are the priority target groups of the Action Plan and the major activities being undertaken? -
AND: Has a copy of this plan been provided to the Ramsar Bureau? No reply
Proposed national actions and targets: To concretise the tasks and objectives formulated in the German Wetland CEPA Action Plan (“IV. Recommendations for Priority Actions”).
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: All the players involved in wetland conservation (National Ramsar Committee); in particular: - The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety / the Federal Office for Nature Conservation - The nature conservation authorities of the <i>Länder</i>

3.2.2 On the basis of identified needs and target groups, support national programmes and campaigns to generate a positive vision of wetlands and create awareness at all levels of their values and functions. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - see 3.2.1 above.**

3.2.3 Encourage the development of educational centres at wetland sites. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - The Convention will aim to have more than 150 active education centres (and similar venues - see 3.2.4 below) promoting the principles of the Convention by COP8 and to ensure that all CPs have at least one such centre.**

Has your country **encouraged** the establishment of educational centres at wetland sites? **Yes**

If **No**, what has been the impediment to such action being taken? -

If **Yes**, how successful has this been?

Many nature conservation centres, the biological stations and similar facilities act as educational centres in wetland areas. As such, 21 out of 29 wetlands of international importance in Germany are equipped with educational centres.

AND: How many such centres are in place? and at what sites?

Educational centres exist in 21 wetlands of international importance:

- *Wattenmeer* <Wadden Sea>: National parks buildings, information offices in three wetlands of international importance
- *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <section of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>: Educational centres in Bleckede, Dannenberg and Dömitz at national, local government or organisation level
- *Niederelbe Barnkrug – Otterndorf* <section of the River Elbe between Barnkrug and Otterndorf>
- *Steinhuder Meer* <Lake Steinhude>
- *Diepholzer Moorniederung* <moorlands at Diepholz>
- *Dümmer*
- *Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg* <barrage weir on the River Weser at Schlüsselburg>
- *Unterer Niederrhein* <section of the Lower Rhine>
- *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster>
- *Unteres Odertal* <section of the Oder Valley>
- *Ostseeboddegewässer Westrügen/Hiddensee/Zingst* <Baltic Sea inlets known as Bodden>
- *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>
- *Galenbecker See* <Lake Galenbeck>
- *Bodensee: Wollmatinger Ried* <Wollmatinger Ried sector of Lake Constance>
- *Bodensee: Mindelsee* <Mindelsee sector of Lake Constance>
- *Lowlands of Unterer Havel/Gölper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe>
- *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>
- *Unterer Inn, Haiming – Neuhaus* <section of the River Inn between Haiming and Neuhaus>
- *Rhein, Eltville – Bingen* <River Rhine between Eltville and Bingen>

How many centres are being established? and at what sites? **1; at the wetland of international importance *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>.**

How many centres are being planned? and at what sites? **1; at the wetland of international importance *Elbaue Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>.**

Of the sites in place, how many are participating as part of Wetlands Link International (Refer

3.1.4 above)? and at which sites are they? **None.**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **For educational centres to participate in Wetlands Link International.**
- **To exchange addresses and intensify cooperation between existing educational centres in wetlands of international importance, with the aim of achieving an improved exchange of information and expertise**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The regional governments of the *Länder***
- **Nature conservation associations as managers of conservation areas**

3.2.4 Work with museums, zoos, botanic gardens, aquaria and environment education centres to encourage the development of exhibits and programmes that support non-formal EPA on wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - see 3.2.3 above**

Do **all** museums, zoos, botanical gardens and similar facilities in your country **have exhibits** and/or programmes that support non-formal wetland CEPA? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring?

Within the framework of their respective tasks, the museums, zoos and botanical gardens etc. also make allowance for the problems of wetlands. Due to the differing focal points of such institutions, however, this does not apply to all of them.

If such exhibits or programmes are in place for some facilities, how many and what types of facilities are they? **No detailed overview is available, due to the large number and diversity of players involved. In addition to several supra-regional projects, these generally concern smaller nature conservation information centres which are either located within the wetlands of international importance or in the immediate vicinity (e.g. in the wetland of international importance *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>). Homeland museums such as that in the lowlands of *Unterer Havel/Gölper See* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe> in Brandenburg or the *Dümmer Museum* also stage exhibitions on the local wetland region.**

If **Yes**, how many facilities does this apply to and how many of these are participating as part of Wetlands Link International (Refer 3.1.4 above)? and which facilities are they? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **cf. point 3.2.3**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: **cf. point 3.2.3**

3.2.5 Encourage the inclusion of modules related to wetlands in the curricula at all levels of education, including tertiary courses and specialized training courses. [CPs, Bureau,

<p>Partners]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global Target - By COP8, to see wetland issues incorporated into curricula in over 100 CPs.
<p>In your country are there modules related to wetlands in the curricula at all levels of education, including tertiary courses and specialized training courses? Only in some institutions</p>
<p>If No, what is preventing this from occurring? -</p>
<p>If this is the case for some levels of education, or some parts of the country, please provide details.</p> <p>Environmental education, which includes the topic of “wetlands” as well as other ecology and nature conservation-related issues, is included on the general school curriculum and is taught as part of general studies and biology. Within the context of project work, this material is also taught at further education colleges using selected teaching examples. At universities, the wetlands issue is included in degree courses such as biology, geography, engineering etc.</p>
<p>If Yes, have samples of this curriculum material been provided to the Ramsar Bureau for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre? No</p>
<p>Proposed national actions and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To step up nature conservation studies (also with reference to wetlands) within the context of advanced biology teaching. - To step up the teaching of species knowledge within the context of school and university education. - To give greater consideration to wetland issues in the curricula of all suitable educational courses.
<p>Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:</p> <p>The regional governments of the <i>Länder</i> (educational and scientific authorities)</p>

Operational Objective 3.3: To improve the Ramsar Bureau’s communications activities and to develop a Convention Communications Strategy, capable of further promoting the Convention and its wider application, and of raising awareness of wetland values and functions.

<p>Actions - Global and National Targets</p>
<p>3.3.1 Review the Bureau’s communications activities, especially those related to the creation and functioning of regional and national communication networks; develop new material and use of technology, and improve existing material. [Bureau]</p>
<p>Refer to 3.2.1 “To secure the resources to increase the Bureau’s capacity for implementing the Outreach Programme.”. Has your government provided any voluntary contributions to increase the Bureau’s capacity for implementing the Outreach Programme? Yes</p>

<p>If Yes, please provide details.</p> <p>In the past, the German government enabled the Ramsar circular to be published in German.</p>
<p>Proposed national actions and targets:</p> <p>To recommence the funding of selected concrete projects, depending on the funds available.</p>
<p>Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:</p> <p>All players involved in wetland protection.</p>

<p>3.3.4 Seek the support of an electronic communications carrier to provide and maintain an electronic mail network and electronic bulletin board/ mailing lists linking the Contracting Parties, Standing Committee members, the STRP, the Bureau, and partner organizations. [All]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global Target - By COP8, to gain a sponsor(s) for the Convention's Web site, to ensure that all CPs have Internet access, to increase the use of French and Spanish in the Ramsar Web site, and to see over 300 Ramsar site managers also communicating with the Bureau, and each other, via the Internet.
<p>The Standing Committee and Bureau will consider the issue of a sponsor for the Convention's Web site, and increased presence of French and Spanish materials on the Web site.</p> <p>With respect to Ramsar site managers, has your government taken steps to provide for Internet links for these people? No</p>
<p>If No, what are the impediments to this action being taken? The initiative to link via Internet was left up to the individual area managers.</p>
<p>If Yes, how many Ramsar site managers have Internet access? -</p>
<p>AND: Which Ramsar sites have this facility? -</p>
<p>Proposed national actions and targets: To establish a network</p>
<p>Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Federal Government - The regional governments of the <i>Länder</i> - Nature conservation organisations - Area managers



Please go to file 2.

National planning tool for the implementation of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

(And the approved format for National Reports to be submitted for the 8th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties, Spain, 2002)



file 2

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 4

TO REINFORCE THE CAPACITY OF INSTITUTIONS IN EACH CONTRACTING PARTY TO ACHIEVE CONSERVATION AND WISE USE OF WETLANDS

Operational Objective 4.1: To develop the capacity of institutions in Contracting Parties, particularly in developing countries, to achieve conservation and wise use of wetlands.

Actions - Global and National Targets
4.1.1 Review existing national institutions responsible for the conservation and wise use of wetlands. [CPs]
Has your country reviewed the national institutions responsible for wetland conservation and wise use and the “designated national Administrative Authority for the Convention to ensure [that] these have the necessary resources to support the increasing demands being placed upon them by the growing expectations of the Convention” (COP7 Resolution VII.27)? No
If No , what is the impediment to this being done? At the present time, the escalating requirements of the Ramsar Convention cannot be met in full, because although Germany recognises the importance of the Ramsar Convention within the context of international nature conservation, it is not a top priority. In particular, substantial human and financial resources have already been earmarked for implementation of the Habitat Directive and the Birds Directive and creation of the Natura 2000 network, both of which ultimately make a significant contribution towards fulfilling the objectives of the Ramsar Convention.
If Yes , what were the conclusions and outcomes of the review? (Refer to 4.1.2 also). -
Proposed national actions and targets: To monitor the efficiency of the relevant authorities and to strengthen/improve this where necessary
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: - The Federal Government - The regional governments of the <i>Länder</i>

4.1.2 On the basis of such a review, identify and implement measures to:

- **increase cooperation and synergy between institutions;**
- **promote the continued operation of these institutions;**
- **provide appropriately trained staff, in adequate numbers, for these institutions. [CPs]**
- **Global Target - By COP8, to see coordinating mechanisms in place in all CPs, and more particularly to see National Ramsar Committees including government and non-government stakeholder representatives, in place in more than 100 CPs. In addition, by COP8, all CPs that have reported the existence of NRCs at COP7 to have evaluated their effectiveness (COP7 Resolution VII.27).**

Refer also to 8.1.9. Does your country have a National Ramsar Committee or similar body?
Yes

If **No**, what has prevented the establishment of such a committee? -

If **Yes**, is the committee cross-sectoral, including representatives of appropriate government ministries and non-government expert and stakeholder groups? **Yes**

What is the composition of this Committee?

The National Ramsar Committee, which was created in 1993 and is managed by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, is composed of representatives of the following authorities and organisations:

- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The Federal Office for Nature Conservation**
- **The Nature Conservation Ministries of the Federal *Länder***
- **Nature conservation organisations**
- **Associations of land users**
- **Private ecological research institutions**

Has there been an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Committee? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? **The resources were not available**

If **Yes**, did the review show the Committee was proving to be effective? **No reply**

If **No**, why not? -

Refer also to 7.2.1 with reference to coordinating the implementation of international conventions.

Proposed national actions and targets: **To strengthen the National Ramsar Committee in a number of different ways, including the following:**

- **By ensuring the active involvement of all representatives**

- By undertaking a critical review of its own function and effectiveness
- By encouraging constructive, fruitful cooperation

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: **All members of the National Ramsar Committee, particularly the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**

Operational Objective 4.2: To identify the training needs of institutions and individuals concerned with the conservation and wise use of wetlands, particularly in developing countries, and to implement follow-up actions.

Actions - Global and National Targets

4.2.1 Identify at national, provincial and local level the needs and target audiences for training in implementation of the Wise Use Guidelines. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - By COP8, to have training needs analyses completed in more than 75 CPs.**

Has a training needs analysis been completed? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? **The careful handling of natural resources is inherent in all training courses relating to the environment, agriculture and nature conservation. Training is constantly adapted in line with the latest state of the art. At the present time, work is underway to establish an advanced training course for the profession of “Qualified Nature and Landscape Manager”.**

If **Yes**, have the results of this analysis been used to provide direction for training priorities in the future? **No reply**

If **No**, why not? -

If **Yes**, how has this been done? -

AND: What impact has this had on the national training effort? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue the process of constant improvement and reinforcement**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The regional governments of the *Länder***
- **Associations**

4.2.2 Identify current training opportunities in disciplines essential for the conservation and wise use of wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - By COP8, to have reviews of training opportunities completed in more than 75 CPs.**

Has your country completed a review of the training opportunities which exist therein? Yes
If No , what are the impediments to this being done? -
If Yes , have the results of this review been used to provide direction for training priorities in the future? No
If No , why not? The existing training facilities for employees in wetlands of international importance and other conservation areas are felt to be adequate. Generally speaking, biologists and landscape managers with an adequate knowledge of ecological correlations and an understanding of the principles of conservation and sustainable use are employed as managers of protected areas or by the nature conservation organisations responsible for those areas. Other skills such as negotiating skills and how to deal effectively with users and the local population are learnt on the job. Rangers are also employed in certain wetlands of international importance for monitoring purposes and for educating the public etc. The Nature Conservation Academies of the <i>Länder</i> hold on-going courses to train volunteers to assist the nature conservation authorities. Moreover, the nature conservation organisations also offer short courses and the support of experienced mentors for individuals deployed in the managed areas.
If Yes , how has this been done? -
AND: What impact has this had on the national training effort? -
Has this information on training opportunities been provided to the Ramsar Bureau for inclusion in the Directory of Wetland Manager Training Opportunities? (Refer to 4.2.3 below also) No
Proposed national actions and targets: To monitor, evaluate and improve the available training tools
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: - The regional governments of the <i>Länder</i> (including specialist institutions) - Associations

4.2.3 Develop new training activities and general training modules, for application in all regions, concerning implementation of the Wise Use Guidelines, with specialized modules covering [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - To launch a major wetland manager training initiative under the Convention, possibly in partnership with one or more of the Convention's International Organization Partners, which can promote and take advantage of these new training tools. Refer also to 4.2.4 below regarding the *Wetlands for the Future Initiative*.**

Following its review of training needs and opportunities, has your country developed any new training activities, or training modules? **Yes**

If **Yes**, please provide details.

In March 1998, an ordinance regulating the profession of “Qualified Nature and Landscape Manager” was adopted as the basis for a uniform nationwide advanced training course. As well as landscape management issues, the curriculum of this advanced training course also includes communicative components, which are seen as important pre-requisites for promoting the acceptance of nature conservation amongst the general public.

AND: Has information on these training activities and modules been provided to the Ramsar Bureau for inclusion in the Directory of Wetland Manager Training Opportunities and the Wise Use Resource Centre? (Refer to 4.2.2 above also) **No**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- To relay information to the Ramsar Bureau about the advanced training course for the profession of “Qualified Nature and Landscape Manager”.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

4.2.4 Provide opportunities for manager training by: personnel exchanges for on-the-job training; holding pilot training courses at specific Ramsar sites; siting wetland manager training facilities at Ramsar sites; obtaining and disseminating information about training courses for wetland managers around the world. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - Refer to 4.2.3 above. Also to seek the resources from donors or interested CPs to establish *Wetlands for the Future Initiatives* for the Asia-Pacific, Eastern European, and African regions.**

Refer to 4.2.1, 4.2.2, and 4.2.3 above. Has training been provided for wetland managers:

- Through personnel exchanges for on-the-job training? **No**,
- Holding pilot training courses at specific Ramsar sites? **No**,
- Siting wetland manager training facilities at Ramsar sites? **No**,
- Obtaining and disseminating information about training courses for wetland managers? **Yes. Information about training opportunities and courses is available from all educational facilities of the *Länder* relating to nature conservation as well as nature conservation organisations**

Has your country provided resources to support the establishment of *Wetlands for the Future* style programmes in any part of the world? (COP7 Recommendation 7.4) **No**

If **Yes**, please provide details. -

Proposed national actions and targets:

To promote relevant projects depending on the resources available.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- Ministries at Federal and regional <Land> level

- Associations

4.2.6 Exchange information, technical assistance and advice, and expertise about the conservation and wise use of wetlands, also with regard to South-South cooperation. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

Refer to 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 4.2.1-4 above. Has your country specifically undertaken activities as indicated here which could be deemed to be South-South cooperation? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? **Does not apply to Germany**

If **Yes**, please provide details. -

Proposed national actions and targets: -

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: -



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 5

TO ENSURE THE CONSERVATION OF ALL SITES INCLUDED IN THE LIST OF WETLANDS OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE (RAMSAR LIST)

Operational Objective 5.1: To maintain the ecological character of Ramsar sites.

Actions - Global and National Targets

5.1.1 Define and apply the precise measures required to maintain the ecological character of each listed site, in the light of the working definitions of ecological character adopted at the 6th COP (1996) and amended by by Resolution VII.10 of COP7. [CPs]

- **Global Target - By COP8, each CP will seek to ensure that the measures required to maintain the ecological character of at least half of the Ramsar sites have been documented.**

Have the measures required to maintain the ecological character of Ramsar sites in your country been documented? **Yes/No**

If **No**, what has prevented this being done?

Management plans (generally in the form of management and development plans) are available for selected wetlands of international importance, but these only list measures only for the nature conservation areas contained therein (including for example *Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg* <barrage weir on the River Weser at Schlüsselburg> , *Diepholzer Moorniederung* <moorlands at Diepholz>, *Niederelbe, Barnkrug – Otterndorf* <section of the River Elbe between Barnkrug and Otterndorf>, and *Rhein Elville* –

Bingen <River Rhine between Eltville and Bingen>. As such, documentation of the measures is incomplete.

If **Yes**, has this documentation been developed as part of management planning and associated action at the sites? **Yes**

AND: Has a copy been provided to the Ramsar Bureau? **No**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- To relay suitable models, management and maintenance/development plans to the Ramsar Bureau.

- To prepare appropriate documentation for those wetlands of international importance which currently lack any such documentation (e.g. *Lech-Donau-Winkel* <area between the Rivers Danube and Lech>, *Mühlenberger Loch* <bay on the left bank of the River Elbe> – cf. also 5.2.3), where applicable in conjunction with the designation of such areas as Natura 2000 sites.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The regional governments of the *Länder* (including specialist institutions)

5.1.2 Conduct regular internal reviews to identify potential changes in ecological character, with input from local communities and other stakeholders; take remedial action and/or nominate the site for the Montreux Record. [CPs]

- Refer to 2.5.2 - In the COP7 National Reports, 35 CPs reported Ramsar sites where some change in ecological character had occurred or was likely to occur in the near future. This was true for 115 sites in 33 CPs, and two other CPs stated that changes had occurred to all or some of their sites. In COP7 Resolution VII.12, these CPs were urged to consider nominating these sites to the Montreux Record.**
- Global Target – In the period up to COP8, promote the application and benefits of the Montreux Record as a tool of the Convention through disseminating reports and publications on the positive outcomes achieved by a number of countries which have now removed sites from the Record.**

Refer to 2.7.2 and 2.8.3 also. Are regular internal reviews undertaken to identify factors potentially altering the ecological character of Ramsar sites? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? -

If **Yes**, have these reviews detected situations where changes in ecological character have occurred or may occur? **Yes**

If **Yes**, for how many sites was this case, which sites were they, and what actions were taken to address these threats? **In 3 wetlands of international importance, adverse changes in ecological character is either anticipated, or has already been ascertained:**

1. *Mühlenberger Loch* <bay on the left bank of the River Elbe>: The Hamburg Airbus factory is being expanded on around ¼ of this Ramsar site, as a result of which the tidal

flats will need to be refilled and this wetland of international importance will be reduced in size. The EC Commission's official opinion on the planned expansion stated that the anticipated adverse impacts on the protected area are justified, due to compelling factors in the interests of the general public.

2. Galenbecker See <Lake Galenbeck>: The ecological character of the lake has deteriorated continuously in the past. Nutrient discharges from adjacent, intensively farmed land, carp farming and waste from battery farming (hens) which is discharged into the lake without adequate purification, have resulted in the hypertrophication of the lake.

AND: Were these sites where change in ecological character was detected, or may occur, added to the Montreux Record? **No**

If **No**, why not? **The responsible authorities of the *Länder* are endeavouring to find a solution to this problem, e.g. in the form of equalisation/substitution for infringements of this kind.**

Proposed national actions and targets:

To review the possibility of adding the *Galenbecker See* <Lake Galenbeck> wetland of international importance to the Montreux Record.

The *Mühlenberger Loch* <bay on the left bank of the River Elbe> wetland of international importance was the subject of a Ramsar Advisory Mission, which is not yet complete.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The supreme nature conservation authorities of the *Länder***
- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**

5.1.3 Review and regularly update the Montreux Record (Resolutions 5.4, 5.5, and VI.1). [CPs, STRP, Bureau]

- **Global Target - CPs with Ramsar sites in the Montreux Record, and for which Ramsar Advisory Missions (RAMs) have been completed prior to COP7, are expected to have taken the actions necessary to warrant their removal from the Record before COP8.**

For those CPs with a site, or sites, included in the Montreux Record, and for which RAMs (previously Management Guidance Procedures, MGPs) have been completed, have all actions recommended by the RAM been undertaken for each site? **No reply**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? -

If **Yes**, have these actions resulted in a restoration of the ecological character? **No reply**

AND: If **Yes**, has the site been removed from the Montreux Record following the completion

of the necessary questionnaire (COP6 Resolution VI.1)? **No reply**

Proposed national actions and targets: -

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: -

Operational Objective 5.2: To develop and implement management plans for all Ramsar sites, consistent with the Convention's Guidelines on Management Planning and emphasizing involvement of local communities and other stakeholders.

Actions - Global and National Targets

5.2.3 Ensure that, by the 8th COP (2002), management plans or other mechanisms are in preparation, or in place, for at least half of the Ramsar sites in each Contracting Party, beginning with pilot programmes at selected sites with input from local communities and other stakeholders. [CPs, Partners]

- **Global Target - By COP8, management plans will be in preparation, or in place, for at least three-quarters of the Ramsar sites in each CP and all CPs will seek to ensure that these are being implemented in full.**

Do all the Ramsar sites in your country have management plans **in place**? **No**

If **No**, how many sites do not have management plans in place and which sites are they?

Management plans are lacking for a total of 10 wetlands of international importance. Specifically, these concern the following areas:

- *Elbaue, Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>

- *Ismaninger Speichersee mit Fischteichen* <reservoir and fishponds at Ismaning>

- *Lech-Donau-Winkel* <area between the Rivers Danube and Lech>

- *Mühlenberger Loch* <bay on the left bank of the River Elbe>

- *Unteres Odertal, Schwedt* <section of the Oder valley near the town of Schwedt>

- *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>

- *Chiemsee* <Lake Chiemsee>

- *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>

- *Starnberger See* <Lake Starnberg>

- *Peitzer Teichgebiet* <series of fishponds near Peitz>

If plans are being prepared for some sites, please indicate which sites these are.

- *Elbaue, Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>

- *Unteres Odertal, Schwedt* <section of the Oder valley near the town of Schwedt>

- *Ostufer Müritz* <eastern shore of Lake Müritz>
- *Chiemsee* <Lake Chiemsee>
- *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>
- *Starnberger See* <Lake Starnberg>
- *Peitzer Teichgebiet* <series of fishponds near Peitz>

For those sites where management plans are in place, how many of these are being implemented fully, and which sites are they?

Generally speaking, it should be noted that the management plans and maintenance/development plans are continually reviewed and adapted in line with the ever-changing conditions. As such, the planning task is an on-going one which changes constantly.

- *Niedersächsisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Lower Saxony>
- *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig-Holstein>
- *Hamburgisches Wattenmeer* <part of the Wadden Sea in Hamburg>
- *Bodensee: Wollmatinger Ried & Mindelsee* <Wollmatinger Ried & Mindelsee sections of Lake Constance>
- *Unterer Inn* <section of the River Inn>: A management plan which includes this wetland of international importance has been prepared and is currently being implemented as part of the LIFE project.
- *Steinhuder Meer* <Lake Steinhude>
- *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster>
- *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>: The Bavarian government has commissioned a full ecological report on the Donauries region, the catchment area of which also includes this wetland of international importance. The report formulates the objectives, models, measures and recommended usage on which development of this wetland of international importance should be based. However, implementation has yet to begin.
- *Niederung der Unteren Havel/Gülpersee* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe in Saxony-Anhalt>
- *Krakower Obersee* <Lake Krakow>
- *Galenbecker See* <Lake Galenbeck>: A management plan is being drawn up within the context of a LIFE project.
- *Helmestausee / Kelbra* <reservoir on the River Helme>

Where plans are not in place, or not being fully implemented, what has prevented this from being done?

- *Elbaue, Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between

Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>: A management plan is underway as part of a development plan to designate the “Elbe riverine landscape” area as a biosphere reserve under § 14a of the Federal Nature Conservation Act <BNatSchG>. Completion of the plan is scheduled for 2003 at the earliest.

- *Lech-Donau-Winkel* <area between the Rivers Danube and Lech>: There are no plans to formulate a management plan for this area initially. The site is very small (230 ha). There are plans to enlarge it and include the surrounding riparian forests. Once this has been done, it would seem expedient to prepare a maintenance and development plan.

In the case of the following wetlands of international importance, maintenance and development plans have only been prepared for the nature conservation areas within these regions:

- *Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg* <barrage weir on the River Weser at Schlüsselburg>

- *Diepholzer Moorniederung* <moorlands at Diepholz>

- *Dümmer* (including management plan for the Ochsenmoor sub-region)

- *Niederung der Unteren Havel/Gülpersee* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe in Brandenburg> (within the context of the riverbank project currently being planned)

- *Niederelbe, Barnkrug – Otterndorf* <section of the River Elbe between Barnkrug and Otterndorf>

- *Unterer Niederrhein* <part of the Lower Rhine>

- *Rhein Eltville – Bingen* <River Rhine between Eltville and Bingen>

Proposed national actions and targets:

- To formulate and/or review area-wide management plans for wetlands of international importance in accordance with the Guidelines of Management Planning.

- To continue and adapt the plans in line with the changing local conditions and scientific/technical progress.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*

5.2.4 Promote the establishment and implementation of zoning measures related to larger Ramsar sites, wetland reserves and other wetlands (Kushiro Recommendation 5.3). [CPs, Partners]

For those sites where it is warranted, are zoning measures being used to regulate the activities allowed in different parts of the wetlands? **Yes/No**

If **No**, what is preventing these from being implemented? **For the comparatively large wetland of international importance *Unterer Niederrhein* <part of the Lower Rhine>**,

there is no overall concept involving all the responsible administrative bodies, which is a pre-requisite of zoning.

If **Yes**, for which sites are these in place? **3 wetlands of international importance in the *Wattenmeer* <Wadden Sea>; and *Ostsee Boddengewässer* <an area of the Baltic Sea> at *Westrügen-Hiddensee-Zingst*.**

AND: Are they proving a successful management tool? **Zoning in the three wetlands of international importance in the *Wattenmeer* <Wadden Sea> is stipulated in the respective National Park laws of the *Länder* of Lower Saxony, Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein, and is therefore known to the general public and the local population. This makes implementation of the protective measures easier. It also forms the basis for compromises in the tourism sector and the fishing industry, amongst other things.**

Have you provided the Ramsar Bureau with information regarding such cases of zoning for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre? **Yes**

Proposed national actions and targets:

In accordance with recommendation C.5.3, larger Ramsar sites are to be divided into interference-free, i.e. usage-free, core zones and surrounding buffer zones, whilst smaller wetlands of international importance should be considered core zones in their entirety. In such cases, the surrounding area assumes the role of a buffer. Where possible, this recommendation should be met in all wetlands of international importance.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*.

5.2.5 Promote the establishment and implementation of strict protection measures for certain Ramsar sites and other wetlands of small size and/or particular sensitivity (Recommendation 5.3). [CPs, Partners]

- This aspect of Ramsar site management was not considered in the COP7 National Reports and will have to be reviewed in time for COP8.**
- Global Target - Provide for consideration at COP8 detailed information on the implementation of strict protection measures at small and/or sensitive sites.**

For those sites where it is warranted, are strict protection measures being used to regulate the activities allowed in different parts of the wetlands? **Yes**

If **No**, what is preventing these from being implemented? -

If **Yes**, for which sites are these in place? **Most wetlands of international importance contain sub-regions which are subject to strict protection measures because they have the status of a nature conservation area. Explicit reference is made to this fact at the following Ramsar sites in the form of signs etc. (see below):**

- *Bodensee: Wollmatinger Ried & Mindelsee* <Wollmatinger Ried & Mindelsee sectors of Lake Constance>

- *Chiemsee* <Lake Chiemsee>
- *Niederung der Unteren Havel/Gölpersee* <part of the River Havel/Lake Gülpe>
- *Ostufer Müritzk* <eastern shore of Lake Müritzk>
- *Rhein Eltville – Bingen* <Hesse section of the River Rhine between Eltville and Bingen>
- *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster>
- *Unterer Inn* <section of the River Inn> between Haiming and Neuhaus
- *Unterer Niederrhein* <part of the Lower Rhine>
- *Weserstaustufe Schlüsselburg* <barrage weir on the River Weser at Schlüsselburg>

AND: Is this proving to be a successful management tool?

Strict protection for sub-regions, indicated by signs prohibiting entry or guiding visitors around sensitive areas, are both effective and expedient for the optimum development of wetland areas. By ensuring that certain areas remain untouched, the quality and attractiveness of a protected area are enhanced.

Have you provided the Ramsar Bureau with information regarding such cases for possible inclusion in the Wise Use Resource Centre? **No**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To create more visitor guidance concepts**
- **To designate more core zones and/or zones with absolute protection**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*

Operational Objective 5.3: To obtain regularly updated information on wetlands of international importance, in accordance with the approved standard format.

Actions - Global and National Targets

5.3.1 Ensure that the maps and descriptions of Ramsar sites submitted to the Ramsar Database by the Contracting Parties at the time of designation are complete, in the approved standard format of the Information Sheet on Ramsar Wetlands, and provide sufficient detail to be used for management planning and monitoring of ecological character. [CPs, Bureau, Wetlands International]

5.3.2 Ensure that missing or incomplete data sheets and/or maps of listed sites are submitted as a matter of priority and in the shortest possible time, as a means to enhance the relevance and use of the Ramsar Database. [CPs]

- **Global Target – By the end of 1999, for there to be no Ramsar sites for which appropriate sites descriptions and maps are still required.**

If yours is one of the CPs referred to in COP7 Resolution VII.12 as not having provided a Ramsar (Site) Information Sheet in the approved format, with a suitable map, in one of three working languages of the Convention, has this now be rectified? **No**

If **No**, what is preventing this from being done?

The affected *Länder* have yet to complete the Ramsar Information Sheets

5.3.3 Ensure that data sheets on Ramsar Sites are regularly updated, at least for every second meeting of the COP, so that they can be used for reviewing the achievements of the Convention, for future strategic planning, for promotional purposes, and for site, regional and thematic analysis (Resolution VI.13). [CPs, STRP, Bureau, Wetlands International]

- **Global Target - By the end of 1999, for there to be no Ramsar sites designated before 31 December 1990 for which updated site descriptions are still required.**

If yours is one of the CPs referred to in COP7 Resolution VII.12 as not having provided an updated Ramsar (Site) Information Sheet for sites designated before 31 December 1990, has this now be rectified? **No**

If **No**, what is preventing this from being done? **The affected *Länder* have yet to update the Ramsar Information Sheets**

Proposed national actions and targets:

To ensure that the Ramsar Information Sheets are updated by the affected *Länder*

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*

Operational Objective 5.4: To keep under review the content and structure, as well as the hardware and software, of the Ramsar Database, in order to ensure that it retains its relevance in light of evolving information and communication technology.

Actions - Global and National Targets

5.4.1 Assess data currently available in the database and identify any gaps in the data provided by Contracting Parties. [CPs, STRP, Bureau, Wetlands International]

Refer to 5.2.2, 5.2.3, and 5.2.4 above.

5.4.4 Support the establishment of national wetland databases compatible with the Ramsar Database and develop a common protocol to facilitate exchange and interaction. [CPs, Partners]

- **Global Target - By COP8, to have national wetland databases in over 50 CPs which are accessible globally.**

Refer also to 6.1.1 and 6.1.2. Does your country have a national wetland database? **No**

If **No**, what is preventing such a database being established? **There are no suitable resources**

available
If Yes , is this database generally available for reference and application by all ministries and stakeholders? No reply
If No , why not? -
AND: Is it available through the Internet? (COP7 Resolution VII.20) No reply
If Yes , please provide details. -
If No , why not? -
AND: Is it available on CD-Rom? (COP7 Resolution VII.20) No reply
If Yes , please provide details. -
If No , why not? -
Proposed national actions and targets: To continue with our efforts to create the necessary resources to initiate a national wetlands database.
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: All players involved in wetland protection, particularly the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety and the nature conservation authorities of the <i>Länder</i> in cooperation with associations.



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 6

TO DESIGNATE FOR THE RAMSAR LIST THOSE WETLANDS WHICH MEET THE CONVENTION'S CRITERIA, ESPECIALLY WETLAND TYPES STILL UNDER-REPRESENTED IN THE LIST AND TRANSFRONTIER WETLANDS

Operational Objective 6.1: To identify those wetlands that meet the Ramsar criteria, and to give due consideration to their designation for the List.

Actions - Global and National Targets
6.1.1 Develop, regularly update -- especially in the case of Africa -- and disseminate regional wetland directories, which identify potential Ramsar sites. [CPs, Partners]
Refer to 6.1.2 and 6.2.1. Does there exist for your country a directory or similar listing of sites which are potential Ramsar sites? Yes
If No , what are the impediments to such a list of sites being prepared? -

If **Yes**, when was it prepared and was it prepared taking into consideration the *Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance* (COP7 Resolution VII.11)? **A list of proposals with potential Ramsar candidates was drawn up by the nature conservation organisations back in 1993. Moreover, several years ago, Schleswig-Holstein, Lower Saxony and Saxony-Anhalt drew up lists of proposals for designating additional wetlands of international importance. Since 2001, a publication entitled “Important Bird Areas and Potential Ramsar Sites in Europe” by BirdLife International has been available as an up-to-date list of potential sites.**

AND: How many potential Ramsar sites are identified within the important sites directory for your country? **20/159**

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To review potential wetlands of international importance on the basis of the currently valid Ramsar criteria.**
- **To examine the possibilities for retrospective designation of other areas which meet the current criteria.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The regional governments of the *Länder*

6.1.2 Establish, update and disseminate national scientific inventories of wetlands which identify potential Ramsar sites and wetlands of provincial or local importance in the territory of each Contracting Party. [CPs, Partners]

- **Global Target - By COP8, to have national wetland inventories completed by over 50 CPs and the information housed in databases (Refer to 5.4.4) which are accessible globally**

Does there exist a comprehensive national inventory (as opposed to a directory of important sites; see 6.1.1 above) for your country? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to such an inventory being prepared? **There are no suitable resources available**

If only some parts of the country have had inventories completed, please indicate which parts these are.

Regional overviews exist for areas with lakes and river systems. Numerous maps in the individual *Länder* provide information on parts of Germany’s wetland inventory, including for example watercourses and lakes in Bavaria (processed largely in Bavaria via the national staging zone concept for waders and waterfowl), lake inventories for Brandenburg, bogs in Mecklenburg-Upper Pomerania and Bavaria, biotope inventories in Lower Saxony, and waterfowl habitats in Schleswig-Holstein.

AND: What is the likely timeframe for completing the national inventory? **No information is available at the present time (see above).**

If a national inventory has already been completed, when was it finalized? -
AND: Is the information housed where it is accessible to stakeholders and the international community? (COP7 Resolution VII.20) No reply
If No , what are the impediments to this occurring? -
Has national/subnational inventory information been provided to the Ramsar Bureau (if it is not accessible through the Internet)? No
Proposed national actions and targets: To continue our efforts to create the necessary resources for preparation of a national wetland inventory.
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: - The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety - The nature conservation authorities of the <i>Länder</i>

6.1.4 Support the work of Wetlands International and IUCN in updating information on population sizes of waterfowl and other taxa, and utilize these data in identification of potential Ramsar sites. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]
Does your country regularly gather waterbird population data? Yes
If No , what prevents this from happening? -
If Yes , is this information provided to Wetlands International? Yes
If No , why not? -
Proposed national actions and targets: To continue with the current practice
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: - The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety - The nature conservation authorities of the <i>Länder</i> with subordinate specialist institutions - Associations

Operational Objective 6.2: To increase the area of wetland designated for the List of Wetlands of International Importance, particularly for wetland types that are under-represented either at global or national level.

Actions - Global and National Targets
6.2.1 Promote the designation for the Ramsar List of an increased area of wetland, through listing by new Contracting Parties, and through further designations by current Contracting Parties, in particular developing countries, in order to ensure the listing of a representative range of wetland types in the territory of each Contracting Party and in

each Ramsar region. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - As proposed in the Strategic Framework, the short-term target of the Ramsar List should be to achieve the designation of 2000 sites, in accordance with the systematic approach advocated therein, by the time of COP9 in the year 2005. In addition, by COP8 the target is to have at least 20 CPs that are applying a systematic approach to site selection nationally.**

Refer also to 6.1.1, 6.1.2, and 6.2.3. Has your country taken a systematic approach to identifying its future Ramsar sites (as promoted in the *Strategic Framework for the List – COP7 Resolution VII.11*)? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this being done? -

If **Yes**, has this included considerations to ensure the designation of a representative range of wetland types? **No**

If **No**, why not? **The proposal lists for potential Ramsar candidates are already several years out-of-date and need to be updated. There are no appropriate resources available for this purpose at present.**

If **Yes**, has this resulted in the designation of a representative range of wetland types? **No reply**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To create the necessary resources in order to prepare a representative selection of wetlands of international importance.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder***

6.2.3 Give priority attention to the designation of new sites from wetland types currently under-represented on the Ramsar List, and in particular, when appropriate, coral reefs, mangroves, sea-grass beds and peatlands. [CPs]

- **Global Targets - The long-term targets are set by the *Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance* (COP7 Resolution VII.11). Based on this, short-term targets for each wetland type will be derived [by the STRP].**

Further to 6.2.1 above: If your territory includes under-represented wetland types, has special attention been given to identifying suitable sites for designation? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from occurring? -

If **Yes**, has this included designations of wetlands including:

- coral reefs? **No**
- mangroves? **No**
- seagrass beds? **No**
- peatlands? **No**

- intertidal wetlands? (COP7 Resolution VII.21) **No**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue our efforts to identify under-represented wetland types (bogs).**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*

6.2.4 Pay particular attention to the designation of new sites currently enjoying no special conservation status at national level, as a first step towards developing measures for their conservation and wise use. [CPs]

- **This question was not considered in the National Reports for COP7. It will be included for consideration in the NRs for COP8.**
- **Global Target - All CPs to consider this approach to ensuring the long-term conservation and wise use of wetlands that are subject to intense human use.**

Has your country designated wetland sites for the Ramsar List which previously had no special conservation status? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, please provide details. **Parts of many wetlands of international importance did not enjoy conservation status until after they had been designated as wetland sites, as a result of which land protection was improved over a large area: *Elbaue, Schnackenburg – Lauenburg* <certain areas of the River Elbe between Schnackenburg and Lauenburg>, *Donauauen & Donaumoos* <section of the River Danube with water meadows and peat bogs>, *Lech-Donau-Winkel* <area between the Rivers Danube and Lech>, *Ammersee* <Lake Ammersee>, *Starnberger See* <Lake Starnberg>, *Ismaninger Speichersee mit Fischteichen* <reservoir and fishponds at Ismaning>, *Peitzer Teichgebiet* <series of fishponds near Peitz> and *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster>.**

AND: Are there plans for further such designations? **Yes**

If **No**, why not? -

If **Yes**, please elaborate. **Land protection in wetlands of international importance will be further improved where expedient and enforceable.**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To review the designation of additional wetlands of international importance which are not yet adequately protected.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: **The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder*.**

6.2.5 Consider as a matter of priority the designation of transfrontier wetland sites. [CPs]

- **The issue of transfrontier or shared wetlands is addressed in the *Guidelines for international cooperation under the Ramsar Convention (COP7 Resolution VII.19)* and the *Guidelines for integrating wetlands into river basin management (COP7 Resolution VII.18)*.**
- **Global Target - By COP8, for there to be over 50 transfrontier wetland sites designated under the Convention.**

For those CPs which ‘share’ wetlands with other CPs, have all suitable sites been designated under the Convention? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented this action being taken? **The necessary agreement processes have not yet been completed.**

If **Yes**, are there arrangements in place between the CPs sharing the wetland for the cooperative management of the site? **No reply.**

If **No**, what has prevented such arrangements from being introduced? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **To improve cooperation in the area of transfrontier wetlands of international importance**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**
- **The nature conservation authorities of the *Länder***



GENERAL OBJECTIVE 7

TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND MOBILIZE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR WETLAND CONSERVATION AND WISE USE IN COLLABORATION WITH OTHER CONVENTIONS AND AGENCIES, BOTH GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL

Operational Objective 7.1: To identify international and/or regional needs for managing shared wetlands and shared catchments, and develop and implement common approaches.

Actions - Global and National Targets

7.1.1 Identify transfrontier wetlands of international importance (including those within shared catchment/river basins), and encourage preparation and implementation of joint plans for such sites, using a “catchment approach” (Recommendation 5.3). [CPs, Partners]

Refer to 6.2.5 above.

7.1.2 Encourage twinning of transfrontier wetlands, and of other wetlands with similar characteristics, and use successful cases for illustrating the benefits of international

cooperation. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Both the *Guidelines for international cooperation under the Ramsar Convention (COP7 Resolution VII.19)* and the *Convention's Outreach Programme (COP7 Resolution VII.9)* promote site twinning as a mechanism for accelerating the flow of knowledge and assistance and promoting training opportunities.**
- **Global Target - By COP8 to have in place over 100 Ramsar site twinning arrangements. The Bureau will keep a record of which sites are twinned and make this available through the Convention's Web site.**

Does your country have Ramsar sites twinned with those in other CPs? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, please note how many such twinning arrangements are in place and indicate which sites are involved. **There are a total of six twinning arrangements involving the following wetlands of international importance:**

- **Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation and Guinea Bissau**

- **Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation and English Nature / The Wash, North Norfolk Coast**

- **The *Schleswig-Holsteinisches Wattenmeer* National Park <part of the Wadden Sea in Schleswig-Holstein> and the "Taimyr" protected area in Russia**

- **The *Vorpommersche Boddenlandschaft* National Park and the Lahemaa national park in Estonia**

- **The biological Station at *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster> and the Danube delta (Rumania)**

- **The biological station at *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster> and Kamanos (Lithuania)**

- **The biological station at *Rieselfelder Münster* <former irrigated fields of the city of Münster> and Djoudj national park (Senegal)**

The *Unteres Odertal* National Park <section of the Oder Valley> and the "Biebrza" national park in Poland are in contact with one another

AND: Do these arrangements involve:

- sharing of information resources? **Yes**
- transfer of financial resources? **Yes/No**
- exchanges of personnel? **Yes/No**
- other activities? **Yes**

Proposed national actions and targets:

To continue and intensify international contacts and twinning agreements between wetland organisations

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The regional governments of the *Länder*

The Federal government

Operational Objective 7.2: To strengthen and formalize linkages between Ramsar and other international and/or regional environmental conventions and agencies, so as to advance the achievement of shared goals and objectives relating to wetland species or issues.

Actions - Global and National Targets

7.2.1 Participate in, or initiate, consultations with related conventions to foster information exchange and cooperation, and develop an agenda for potential joint actions. [SC, Bureau]

- **Global Target - A Joint Work Plan between the Ramsar Convention and the Convention to Combat Desertification which encourages cooperative implementation of both at the international, national and local levels.**

Refer also to 4.2.1. Does there exist a mechanism (such as an inter-ministry committee) at the national level with the charter of coordinating/integrating the implementation of international/regional conventions/treaties to which your country is a signatory? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to such a mechanism being introduced? -

If **Yes**, describe the mechanism and the conventions/treaties it is expected to consider. **According to the Rules of Procedure, work on environmental and nature conservation agreements is agreed at the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. The Conferences of Environmental Ministers and Heads of Department and the Working Group of the Federal States on Nature Conservation (LANA) are available for contacts with the *Länder*.**

AND: Has the mechanism proven to be effective? **Yes**

If **No**, why not? -

If **Yes**, please elaborate. **Measures aimed at the national implementation of international environmental and nature conservation agreements are discussed and resolved between the Federal Government and the *Länder* within the context of the aforementioned bodies.**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue and further develop the process of exchange and cooperation.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- The Federal Government (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety)

- The regional governments of the *Länder*

7.2.2 Prepare project proposals together with other conventions and partner organizations, and submit them jointly to potential funding agencies. [CPs, SC, Bureau, Partners]

For eligible countries, have there been project proposals prepared and submitted to funding agencies which were intended to assist with implementation of the Ramsar Convention? **Yes**

If **No**, what has prevented this from happening? -

If **Yes**, were such proposals successful in gaining funds? **Yes**

Proposed national actions and targets: **No further activities are required at present. To resume funding activities within the framework of the available resources, where necessary.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Government (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety)**

- **The regional governments of the *Länder***

7.2.3 Strengthen cooperation and synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity, in particular as regards inclusion of wetland concerns in national biodiversity strategies, and planning and execution of projects affecting wetlands. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - To see the Joint Work Plan implemented in full and resulting in cooperative implementation of both Conventions at the international, national and local levels.**

Further to 7.2.1 above: Has there been a review **completed** of the Joint Work Plan between Ramsar and Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to establish the areas of priority for cooperative implementation of these Conventions? **No**

If **No**, what has prevented such a review being done? **Work on the national strategy is not yet complete**

If **Yes**, what are the areas established as priorities for national cooperation between Ramsar and CBD implementing agencies/focal points? -

Proposed national actions and targets:

- **To continue working on the national strategy**

- **To ensure the involvement and exchange of experts in the appropriate bodies.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

- **The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**

- **The Federal Office for Nature Conservation**

7.2.4 Develop cooperation with the World Heritage Convention and UNESCO's

Programme on Man and the Biosphere (MAB), especially as regards wetlands designated as World Heritage sites, Biosphere Reserves and/or Ramsar sites. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - A Memorandum of Cooperation with the Man and the Biosphere Programme, leading to Joint Work Plans with the MAB Programme and with the World Heritage Convention which encourages cooperative implementation of both at the international, national and local, levels.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above.

7.2.5 Enhance Ramsar's contribution to international cooperation on shared wetland species, notably through cooperative arrangements with the Convention on Migratory Species, flyway agreements, networks and other mechanisms dealing with migratory species (Recommendation 6.4). [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- ***The Guidelines for international cooperation under the Ramsar Convention propose an increase in the joint efforts between Ramsar and CMS (COP7 Resolution VII.19)***
- **Global Target - A Joint Work Plan between the Conventions which encourages cooperative implementation of both at the international, regional and national and local levels.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above.

7.2.6 Develop Ramsar's contribution to wildlife trade issues affecting wetlands, through increased interaction with CITES. [Bureau]

- ***The Guidelines for international cooperation under the Ramsar Convention propose an increase in the joint efforts between Ramsar and CITES (COP7 Resolution VII.19)***
- **Global Target - A Memorandum of Cooperation with CITES, leading to a Joint Work Plan between the Conventions which sees cooperative implementation of both at the international, national and local levels.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above

7.2.7 Initiate links with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, in view of the potential impacts on wetlands of climate change. [CP, Bureau]

- **Global Target - A Memorandum of Cooperation with UNFCCC, leading to a Joint Work Plan between the Conventions which encourages cooperative implementation of both at the international, national and local levels.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above.

7.2.8 Extend cooperation with conventions and agencies concerned with conservation and wise use of wetlands at regional level, and in particular: with the European Community, as regards application of its Habitats Directive to wetlands, and adoption and application of measures like the Habitats Directive for wetlands outside the states of the European Union; with the Council of Europe (Bern) Convention on the conservation

of European wildlife and natural habitats as regards the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy; with the Barcelona Convention and Mediterranean Action Plan in relation to the MedWet initiative; with the Western Hemisphere Convention; with UNEP programmes, in particular the Regional Seas Conventions; and with the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). [CPs, Bureau]

- **Global Target - With the European Commission and SPREP, develop and sign a Memorandum of Cooperation and prepare and implement a Joint Work Plan. For Medwet, secure the long-term funding base for this important initiative and continue to develop new programmes of regional action. For the others referred to, and others which are appropriate, develop an appropriate working relationship.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above.

7.2.9 Develop relationships with other specialized agencies that deal with wetland-related issues, such as the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) and the World Water Council (COP7 Resolution VI.23). [Bureau]

- **Global Target - To progress to closer working relations with these and other relevant initiatives, as appropriate.**

Refer to 7.2.1 above.

Operational Objective 7.3: To ensure that the development assistance community, and multinational corporations, follow improved wetland practices such as the Wise Use Guidelines in developing countries and countries whose economies are in transition.

Actions - Global and National Targets

7.3.2 Work with multilateral and bilateral development agencies and multinational corporations towards a full recognition of wetland values and functions (Recommendation 4.13), and assist them to improve their practices in favor of wetland conservation and wise use taking account of the *Guidelines for Aid Agencies for Improved Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Wetlands*, published by OECD's Development Assistance Committee (Recommendation 6.16). [Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - At the Bureau level, to consider ways and means to increase its ability to work more systematically in this area, so as to increase the level of donor agency support for wetland conservation and wise use activities, and to see an increasing number of multinational corporations adopting voluntary codes of conduct for protecting wetlands.**

While this action is directed at the Bureau principally, CPs also have a role to play in this area; refer to 7.4.2 below with respect to bilateral development agencies. For the multilateral donors: Is your government represented on the governing bodies or scientific advisory bodies of the multilateral donors, or the GEF? **Yes**

If **Yes**, has this person/agency/ministry been briefed on the obligations of your country under the Ramsar Convention, and the relevant expectations raised of each CP by the Strategic Plan

and COP decisions? **Yes**

-

7.3.3 Interact with multilateral development agencies and through bilateral development programmes, to assist developing countries in meeting their Ramsar obligations, and report on actions taken and results achieved (Recommendation 5.5). [CPs]

Refer to 7.4.2 to 7.4.6 below.

Proposed national actions and targets: **Specific Initiatives had been supported together with the Wetlands International and River Basin Initiative via the Project "Implementing the Biodiversity Convention" on developing planning tools to support training and capacity building for wetland management in developing countries (CD-ROM WETSHARE). However, Wetland International did not manage to finish the project in due time and only developed a concept; wetland conservation training modules will be available, as stated by WI, by the end of the year, through the River Basin Initiative.**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ)

Operational Objective 7.4: To obtain funds to fulfil obligations contracted under the Convention, notably for developing countries and countries whose economies are in transition.

Actions - Global and National Targets

7.4.1 Allocate funds for conservation and wise use of wetlands in the budget of each Contracting Party. [CPs]

- **Global Target - By COP8, to see allocations for wetlands made by all CPs and also for specific wetland programmes in more than 40 CPs.**

Does your government allocate funds for wetland conservation and wise use activities? **Yes**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this happening? -

If **Yes**, is this:

- As a separate allocation to a Wetlands Programme (or similar)? **No**
- As part of a broader allocation for the environment? **Yes**
- As part of the programmes maintained by a range of Ministries? **Yes**

AND: What mechanisms are in place for determining priorities and coordinating the expenditure of these funds? **No specific funds are allocated by BMZ only in terms of broader allocations for the environment, please note that there are still no national wetland funds mechanisms in place which are supported by German Development Co-operation. There are no specific mechanisms in place for determining priorities and**

coordinating the expenditure of these specific funds. While it is true that some projects, supported by GTZ, have components directed to wetland conservation, it should be noted that, within the framework of financial co-operation, the KfW also supports projects in this regard. Whenever possible, these components are linked to national policies, biodiversity plans and others.

Is it linked to a National Wetland Policy, Biodiversity Plan, Catchment Plan or something similar? **No**

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue with the current practice**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The Federal Government, particularly the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (together with the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit).

7.4.2 Include projects for conservation and wise use of wetlands in development plans funded by development assistance agencies, and ensure the latter consult the Ramsar administrative authority in each Contracting Party. [CPs]

- **Global Target - To see this trend continue such that all eligible CPs are receiving donor support for a range of major wetland-related projects by the time of COP8. In particular, to see this support being provided, as appropriate, for the priority areas of policy development, legal and institutional reviews, inventory and assessments, the designation and management of Ramsar sites, training and communications.**

If your country has a bilateral development assistance programme, does it allocate funds for wetland-related projects on a regular basis? **No**

If **No**, what are the impediments to this occurring? **To date, medium-term or long-term support in the field of wetlands has not been a subject for development aid.**

If **Yes**, are these projects subjected to rigorous impact assessment procedures, which take account of the full environmental, social and economic values of wetlands? **No reply**

If **No**, why not? -

If **Yes**, is the Ramsar Administrative Authority consulted during the screening and assessment phases of the projects? **No reply**

If **No**, why not? -

AND: Is there a formal consultative process in place (such as a National Ramsar Committee) which ensures that the development assistance agency is fully aware of the Ramsar Convention obligations of the country with respect to international cooperation? **No reply**

If **No**, why not?

If **Yes**, please elaborate. -

Proposed national actions and targets:

On a midterm or long-term basis there will be no specific bilateral assistance programme for wetland conservation on a regular basis due to the focus on poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Whenever possible projects are embedded into a broader development perspective, taking into account social and economic values.

The Global Target to have funds earmarked for wetland projects by COP 8 (November 2002) cannot be seen as achievable. See annotations above.

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The Federal Government

7.4.4 Mobilize direct funding support from multilateral and bilateral development assistance agencies to assist developing countries and countries whose economy is in transition, in the conservation and wise use of wetlands and in implementation of the present Strategic Plan. [CPs. Bureau]

- **Global Target - By COP8 for all the bilateral donors from appropriate CPs to have funds earmarked for wetland projects, and for all of these CPs to have in place mechanisms for consultation between the development assistance agency and their Ramsar Administrative Authority.**

Refer to 7.4.2 above



**GENERAL OBJECTIVE 8
TO PROVIDE THE CONVENTION WITH THE REQUIRED INSTITUTIONAL
MECHANISMS AND RESOURCES**

Operational Objective 8.1: To maximize achievement of Ramsar’s mission and objectives by evaluating and, if necessary, modifying the Convention’s institutions and management structures.

Actions - Global and National Targets

8.1.9 Promote the establishment of National Ramsar Committees to provide the opportunity for input from, and representation of, governmental and non-governmental organizations, key stakeholders, indigenous people, the private sector and interest groups, and land use planning and management authorities (Recommendation 5.13). [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

Refer to 4.1.2.

8.1.10 Review the designated national focal point in each Contracting Party, with a view to increasing involvement in the work of the Convention from all agencies concerned

with the conservation and wise use of wetlands. [CPs]

Refer to 4.1.1

Operational Objective 8.2: To provide the financial resources required to carry out Ramsar activities.

Actions - Global and National Targets

8.2.1 Pay invoiced contributions to the Convention's core budget in full, and promptly at the beginning of each calendar year. [CPs]

- **Global Target - During this triennium to achieve full and timely payment of all dues by all CPs. The SC to prepare a proposal on sanctions for non-payment for consideration at COP8 (COP7 Resolution VII.28).**

Is your country completely up to date with its annual contributions to the core budget of the Convention? **Yes**

If **No**, what is the impediment to this being done? -

Proposed national actions and targets: **To continue the financial payments**

Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action:

The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

8.2.4 Give priority to funding for training programmes, education and public awareness work, development of the Ramsar Database, and the Convention's Communications Strategy. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

- **Global Target - To secure the resources needed to establish regional training initiatives (like *Wetlands for the Future*) in other regions, to allow the Bureau to progress the implementation of the Outreach Programme, and to support the proposed developments for the Ramsar Sites Database into a fully online and Web-based promotional and planning tool of the Convention.**

Refer to 3.3.1 (Convention Outreach Programme), 4.2.4 (Wetlands for the Future).

Operational Objective 8.3: To maximize the benefits of working with partner organizations.

Actions - Global and National Targets

8.3.1 Strengthen cooperative planning mechanisms with the partners and improve communications and information exchange, including exchange of staff. [CPs, Bureau, Partners]

Refer to 3.2.1 and 4.1.2. Does your country include representatives of the Convention's official International Organisation Partners (BirdLife International, IUCN, WWF, Wetlands

International) on its National Ramsar Committees or similar bodies, where they exist? Yes
If No , what prevents this from occurring? -
Proposed national actions and targets: To continue cooperation with the partner organisations
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

Operational Objective 8.4: To secure at least one million US dollars per annum for the Ramsar Small Grants Fund for Wetlands Conservation and Wise Use (Resolutions 5.8 and VI.6) and to allocate these funds effectively.

Actions - Global and National Targets
8.4.1 Develop a strategy for securing at least one million US dollars annually for the Ramsar Small Grants Fund, to be approved by the first full meeting of the Standing Committee after the 6th COP (1996) and proceed immediately to its implementation. [Bureau, SC, CPs, Partners]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global Target - To establish a mechanism to ensure one million US dollars annually for the Ramsar Small Grants Fund (COP7 Resolution VII.28).
Refer also to 8.2.4. For developed countries, do you provide additional voluntary contributions to support the Small Grants Fund? Yes
If No , what prevents this from happening? -
If Yes , is an irregular or regular voluntary contribution? Irregular
Proposed national actions and targets: To continue with the current practice
Ministry, agency/department, or organization responsible for leading on this action: The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

