

General Comments						
Country	Role	Subject	Task	Comment	Suggested text	STRP Response
Australia	AA (NFP)	Costs implications of DRs		Similarly to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure requiring that cost implications of draft resolutions be made available to Contracting Parties in advance of consideration of draft resolutions, the implications of draft resolutions for the STRP should be made available in advance of consideration of draft resolutions. If this occurs, final Resolutions are more likely to reflect the resource capacity of STRP and result in a manageable program of work to refine into a work plan. The work plan is clearly heavily weighted to peatlands – while peatlands are important and have critical current issues, the STRP work plan should retain balance across issues.		Comment noted. With respect to peatlands, please see paragraphs 9-10 of SC52-10, the report of the STRP Chair.
Australia	AA (NFP)	SP references		I note that while tasks identify associated SP goals and targets, there are only two SP targets that identify a role for STRP – SP 3.12 and 4.14.		Comment noted. While it is correct that the STRP is identified in targets 3.12 and 4.14, para 15 of Res. XII.2 calls the STRP, among others, to implement the Strategic Plan.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Lit review		I note the inclusion in the literature review of work Australia has undertaken in this area, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, 2012, Literature Review of the Economic Value of Ecosystem Services that Wetlands Provide.		Source added to the literature review.
Canada	AA (NFP)	SP references		Res. XII.5 Annex 3 lays out the thematic work areas and matches them with the Strategic Plan goals and targets. For example, thematic work area 1 is matched with SP goals and targets 2.5, 2.7, 3.10, 4.14. However, in the draft work plan, with the exception of 4.14, none of these goals/targets are listed in the SP goal and target column under thematic work area 1. Same trend holds for all work areas. Might be worth examining/confirming whether or not the tasks identified will help achieve the specific SP targets listed in Res. XII.5 Annex 3 in addition to those listed in the work plan.		The Strategic Plan's goals and targets have been reviewed and aligned with those in Annex 3 of Res. XII.5.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Prioritization		Is there a way to prioritize these tasks? Should the highest priorities be assigned to tasks that are a direct result of a Resolution request for information in advance of COP13 and other tasks that are not linked to a resolution (tasks 1.3, 1.6, 1.6, 2.3, and 4.3) should be lower priority.		Comment noted. Priorities have been recommended by the STRP (after consulting with the Secretariat) based on the five thematic work areas in Annex 3 of Res. XII.5, the Fourth Strategic Plan, requests in COP12 Resolutions, in light of available resources and time.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Timetables and planning		Is it possible to estimate the level of effort required or timelines in the work plan to get a sense of how much work is expected from each task (e.g. the 6 tasks may include 1 big one and remainder may be relatively low effort). Or maybe separate tasks that will involve a product vs tasks that are advice to someone or something and meetings, etc.		Revisions have been made to separately address in the work plan advisory tasks that would not necessarily lead to a tangible output. Additionally, the proposed outputs provide an indication of the amount of effort required. Outputs such as the SoWWS report and Ramsar Technical Reports would require more time and effort than producing shorter outputs such as Briefing Notes and Policy Briefs.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Target audiences		With respect to target audiences. In para 54 of Resolution XII.5 there is reference to two target audiences for the guidance materials (policymakers and practitioners) that will be developed. In the draft work plan, a couple times Contract Parties are mentioned separately from these two groups (e.g., task 1.7, 2.5). Also, sometimes practitioners are site managers and other times it is not specified who the practitioners are (for example see task 1.7 and 2.2) so my question is when site managers are mentioned specifically, will the output will be specific to Ramsar sites? Also, is the target audience of “policy makers” just policy makers from Contracting Parties or other policy makers? See task 1.7 .		Target audiences have been reviewed and modified, where appropriate, to ensure consistency.

Canada	AA (NFP)	Type of outputs		does everyone understand the difference between these items [BNs, RTRs, Policy briefs] and what is included in each type?		<p>Ramsar Technical Reports (RTRs): These provide technical discussions with detailed reviews and methodologies in the form of guidelines. Up to 40 pp. Target audience: practitioners</p> <p>Briefing Notes: These are shorter and more action oriented overviews of specific topics where Parties have made ad hoc requests for guidance, or to raise awareness about emerging trends/issues. Up to 10 pp. Target audience: practitioners</p> <p>Policy briefs: These would be a new output in response to the mandate of Resolution XII.5 to better target policy makers. They are brief documents summarising key STRP technical publications, containing sound evidence and technical advice phrased in clear, jargon-free language, as well as policy relevant (not policy prescriptive) responses. Up to 2-6 pp. Target audience: policy makers.</p>
France	STRP NFP			As the STRP National Focal Point I have nothing to add to the draft work plan. The tasks seem to respond to the needs of practitioners on the ground. They are not just centred on Europe, but covered a wide array of situations around the world. I look forward to re-reading the draft tasks if you wish to receive advice.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	TWAs		All thematic work areas are covered with varying number (3 to 8) of tasks, that address both on-the-ground practical issues as well as higher-level political issues and guidance. The tasks are somewhat biased to the latter, but I think this is a good Ramsar approach. Also, many tasks are done in co-operation with other organizations, which is a cost-effective way. From a Finnish point of view, we can find many nationally important and applicable tasks, especially those related to the economic valuation of wetlands, and peatland restoration and climate issues.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	Target audiences		Both audiences in Resolution XII.5 (paragraph 54): are covered. There is a strong effort towards the policymakers, which is good.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	SP references		The goals and targets of the Fourth Strategic Plan are sufficiently covered. Many of the task arise from direct requests from COP 12 resolutions.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	Needs at the regional, national and site levels:		In the proposed work plan especially tasks related to the economic valuation of wetlands, and peatland restoration and climate issues are nationally important for Finland and we welcome the work plan.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	Number of tasks		There are 25 tasks to be completed in total in a short time, so I do not think that any additional tasks should be proposed for the ongoing triennium.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	Peatlands focus		There seems to be a bias towards peatland issues at the cost of some other wetland types. This, however stems directly from the numerous requests from Res XII.11 and other COP 12 resolutions and is therefore justified.		Comment noted
Finland	STRP NFP	Tasks covering trends and policymaking		There are also a number of important tasks with wide coverage over the state and trends of all wetlands and policymaking.		Comment noted

Jamaica	AA			Jamaica, through its Administrative Authority (AA), the National Environment and Planning Agency has reviewed the Scientific and Technical Review Panel Draft Work Plan for the 2016-2018 triennium and offers no major amendment or recommendation for the document. Jamaica however stands ready to assist the STRP with input for the development of the various publication, especially those targeting emerging issues impacting wetlands of the Caribbean region. The AA also looks forward the publication of the various documents which are expected to provide guidance on emerging issues such as Ecosystems based Adaptation for Disaster Risk Reduction, Ecosystems Services Assessment and Valuation and Best Practices for Wetland Restoration.		Comment noted
Japan	AA (NFP)	Tasks mandates	1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.3	My comments are about Tasks which are not based on any resolution, namely Task 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 4.2, 4.3 and 5.3. Are they based on any SC decision? Or do they have special reason to be done? If not, I think that they should be removed from the list. However, Task 4.2 (Review and analysis of Ramsar Advisory Missions (RAMs) Reports) may be retained taking into consideration the relationship of budget implementation. I would appreciate it if you could consider my comments.		All tasks have been reviewed to ensure links to Resolutions are explicit.
Japan	STRP NFP	Revised work plan availability		When will the revised work plan be available to Parties?		The revised work plan will be available online on the Convention's website by 13 March 2016
Japan	STRP NFP	Webinars		The webinars on the STRP TWAs were a good opportunity to better understand the tasks		Comment noted
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Prioritization of tasks		We suggest that an explanation of how the priorities were established be provided and that timelines for implementation be included, at least for the high priority tasks.		The STRP Chair's report to SC 52 explains that tasks were developed and prioritized based on: the thematic areas in Res. XII.5 (Annex 3), COP12 Resolutions requests, the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan, availability of resources, as well as comments received during the consultation process.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Lit review; translation		Likewise, we suggest that more visibility be given to the literature survey in the web portal since it is difficult to find such information in the Ramsar portal. For those valuable documents which are not translated into Spanish, we suggest to prioritize their translation.		The literature review is available online on the STRP page of the Convention's website in the three Convention languages.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Peatlands focus		The work plan appears to give priority to the production of outputs related to peatlands (1.7; 2.6; 5.3- alone for peatlands!), compared to other types of wetlands. While we understand that there is less information on peatlands, especially on tropical peatlands, than on other wetland types, we suggests that funds are raised by those Parties most interested in developing peatland related research and that such tasks be more focussed on the climate change thematic work area.		We have amended the draft work plan so that the three remaining proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11. (A fourth peatland-related task appears under the advisory tasks.) For additional information, see para 9. of SC52-10, the report of the STRP Chair. The STRP welcomes clarification and instruction from the Standing Committee on which peatland-related tasks should move forward.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Webinars		We suggest that the STRP proposes online seminars for many other topics in the work plan in cooperation with the CEPa programme.		Webinars have been proposed for the following tasks: 1.2, 2.3, 2.6, 4.2. We welcome recommendations for additional webinar topics.

New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Prioritization		<p>Tasks that we consider to be the highest priority for the STRP during the next triennium are: From the Draft Work Plan:</p> <p>1) The flagship publication on the State of the World's Wetlands (Task 1.1); 2) The simplified Ramsar Site management manual, including monitoring guidance (Task 2.4).</p> <p>In addition (not currently identified specifically in the Work Plan because not part of TWAs – but nevertheless a critically significant role of STRP):</p> <p>1) Supporting COP13 – in particular through assisting with the preparation of Draft Resolutions, in response to requests by Contracting Parties. Sufficient resourcing (time as well as other) needs to be assured for this important STRP role.</p>		<p>Higher priority status has been retained for SoWWS (previously task 1.1, now included in the STRP's advisory functions). The simplified Ramsar Sites management manual (previously task 2.4) has been moved to the advisory functions of the Panel as well, as it is a task to be largely carried out by the Secretariat in coordination with the CEPA programme, communications team and the STRP.</p> <p>Supporting the COP with the preparation of DRs has been included in the advisory functions of the Panel (this would include COP13). The Secretariat will work with the STRP Chair to ensure that sufficient resources and time are adequately devoted for this critical function.</p>
New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Proposed new task (Risks to ecological character of Ramsar Sites)		<p>We note that the Draft STRP Work Plan includes very few tasks that address the threats to the ecological character of Ramsar Sites. This topic relates directly to Target 5 and Target 7 of the Strategic Plan (maintaining or restoring Ramsar Site ecological character & addressing threats that create risks of change to ecological character) and to STRP TWA1 and/or TWA2.</p> <p>It is recommended therefore, that a new high priority task is added to the STRP Work Plan: an assessment, and report to COP13, of the regional and global potential threats to the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, based on analysis of RIS.</p> <p>One of the key reasons for developing the new RIS format, and of Contracting Parties adopting it, is that it enables a consistent approach for regional and global analysis of the threats to the world's Ramsar Sites. Technical analysis of the RIS relating to Ramsar sites is however complex, and initially should be undertaken as a joint project between the STRP and Secretariat, with assistance of others (e.g. IOP) as relevant.</p>		<p>Comment noted. An assessment of risks to ecological character of Ramsar Sites, based on an analysis of the RSIS, can be incorporated into the SoWWS report.</p>
New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Wetland Restoration for biodiversity purposes	2.1, 2.2, 5.1	<p>We recommend that the Work Plan more fully reflects Res. XII.5 in terms of delivering on the Strategic Plan Target 3.12 (Restoration in degraded wetlands), and in particular for restoring "wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation"[emphasis ours]. This can be achieved by collating summaries/case studies of good examples of Ramsar Site restoration from each region and including them when implementing Tasks 2.1 (Management toolkit) and 2.2 (Ecosystem based adaptation for DDR) as well as Task 5.1 (Promoting best practices in wetland restoration). Additional note: We recommend that the wording of TWA5 reverts to the wording that was adopted by COP12, Annex 3 of Res. XII.5: "Climate change and wetlands: innovative methodologies for wetlands restoration".</p>		<p>The language and scope for tasks 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 have been modified to better address restoration, as requested in Res. XII.2, XII.5 and XII.11.</p> <p>The title of the Thematic Work Area has been modified to accurately reflect the language in Res. XII.5 (Annex 3).</p>

New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Recognition of traditional practices and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities	3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 2.1, 3.10	<p>We recommend that recognition of traditional practices and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities be more explicitly addressed in the Work Plan.</p> <p>This concept is reflected:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) in the title of TWA1 as adopted at COP12, explicitly “recognizing traditional practices of indigenous peoples and local communities”; 2) in Res XII.5 (Paragraph 13): “recognising the traditional and local knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, as one of the knowledge bases of the Scientific and technical Review Panel work”; 3) in Target 3.10 of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 - 2024; 4) by IPBES <p>But it is only mentioned once (tangentially) in the Work Plan (in Task 3.2). In addition, reference to Target 3.10 of the Strategic Plan is completely absent in the current draft Work Plan.</p> <p>[We] are aware that this is a challenging field of work, but as a first step several State Parties (including NZ) who are gaining more experience in this, could be asked to provide appropriate case studies. Such case studies should explicitly be incorporated, and mentioned in the Work Plan, for Tasks 3.2 and 3.3 (protocol and tool kit for assessing multiple values), Task 3.4 (Case studies on ‘wetland valuation and wise use) and Task 2.1 (Ramsar wetland sites management toolkits). Target 3.10 of the Strategic Plan should be added in the appropriate column in the Work Plan for those tasks.</p> <p>NZ may be able to provide case studies of working with iwi (= indigenous people in our NZ context) and with Mātauranga Māori (indigenous knowledge system in NZ context) for use under TWA2 and TWA3 as relevant, during implementation of the Work Plan.</p>		<p>References to traditional practices and knowledge of indigenous people and communities have been made more explicit in tasks: 1.2, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.2. Please see paragraph 11 of SC52-10, the report of the STRP Chair for additional information.</p> <p>New Zealand's offer to provide case studies is welcome and appreciated.</p> <p>The literature review does not address whether the identified guidance specifically addresses ILK systems (with the exception of Ramsar Resolution VII.8: Guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities’ and indigenous people’s participation in the management of wetlands, which explicitly addresses this matter). Since this was the first iteration of the literature review and it is intended to be a living document (to be regularly updated), it would be possible to further review the identified guidance to find out whether it covers ILK matters. This could be undertaken as part of the advisory functions of the STRP in collaboration with the Secretariat.</p>
Portugal	STRP NFP	Availability to contribute to STRP work		<p>I am available to work and engaged in any of the work groups that you may find useful. My area of expertise is on restoration of freshwater ecosystems and I am involved in the IPBES as expert for the ECA assessment and the LDR assessment. It may be interesting to be engaged in working-group 1 and the working group on restoration.</p>		<p>Comment noted. We appreciate the offer and have added your name to the proposed work plan.</p>
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Focus of work plan and outputs		<p>The Swedish EPA (Swedish AA for the Ramsar convention) supports the general picture of the draft work plan, but has some comments and added information that may be of use. In the annexed file suggested changes are shown with track-changes. By us strongly supported and already suggested prioritisation is marked with green and not mentioned in the comments below.</p> <p>In general we think that STRP should focus its efforts on issues that can be of help for wise use of wetlands and supporting argumentation for different kind of fund raising and against further exploitation rather than technical advice on specific Ramsar related administration such as R-METT that may neither be the most cost-effective way nor the best for monitoring the conservation values and the sites ecological status.</p> <p>We would also like to encourage the STRP to write policy briefs, handbooks and technical reports etc.. using foot notes to the scientific reference so that it will be easy to know what the different facts and data in the publication are based upon, without having to read all the publications in the reference list.</p>		<p>Former task 2.4-Simplified Ramsar Site management manual, which included reference to the R-METT has been included as part of the advisory functions of the Panel, as it is a task to be largely carried out by the Secretariat in coordination with the CEPA programme, communications team and the STRP. The STRP will work with the Secretariat to ensure the bibliographic references are easily accessible to the reader and that are in line with internal publication and design guidelines.</p>

Sweden	AA (NFP)	Proposed new task		The Swedish EPA would like to suggest that the STRP works with a publication on flood regulation and during which circumstances different wetlands types in different state in different parts of the world are contributing to flood regulation or not, and how much.		Comment noted. Due to resources and time constraints the STRP was not able to include this task. However, it will be ultimately up to the Standing Committee to decide if and which additional tasks to include in the plan.
UK	AA (NFP)	Synergies		It would be useful if the overall format could flag the potential for various elements to be undertaken collaboratively with other MEAs and/or where there is a direct relationship to such work already being undertaken.		Comment noted.
UK	AA (NFP)	Wetlands and health gap		The health and wetlands work that Ramsar has developed seems to be missing from the STRP work plan. It seems a shame not to capitalise on work already done, and we should be building on this work as it is such a cross-cutting and overarching issue. UK considers this to be of quite high importance, given that the [consultation email sent], and Resolution XII.5 (paragraph 54), both highlight the importance of policy makers from other sectors, including health and sanitation.		Comment noted. A task on management of mosquito disease vectors in wetlands has been added as task 2.5.
UK	STRP NFP	Wetlands and health gap		Concerned to see no mention of wetland disease issues. We know from previous HPAI H5N1 experience that disease outbreaks can be a direct driver of wetland destruction, and killing of waterbirds (in that instance). It is important that STRP is in a position to react responsively to such situations (not necessarily HPAI) as they develop. Hopefully this is seen as part of the general advice function of STRP – which I actually don't see recorded in this document.		Comment noted. A task on management of mosquito disease vectors in wetlands has been added as task 2.5.
UK	STRP NFP	Process		At COP12, the EU made an intervention to the effect that they regretted the lack of a detailed draft STRP work programme as had been considered and adopted by Parties at COPs 10 and 11. The fact that a detailed work programme for STRP is still being developed eight months after COP12 suggests indeed that the current process is an inefficient way of proceeding. I hope STRP can develop and submit a draft work programme for submission to COP13. Following discussion and adoption by all Parties at COP, that would allow work for the following triennium to commence immediately (as in the past) rather than wasting a significant amount of available time developing a prioritised plan as at present.		The task descriptions have been revised to provide additional detail as appropriate. As the procedures in Res.XII.5 are now in place and a draft work plan for the next triennium should be produced in advance of the COP, there should not be delays in the process.
USA	AA (NFP)	Procedures, Lit. review		We greatly appreciate the work of the STRP members on the draft work plan so far. We welcome the draft work plan of the STRP being sent out to all STRP national focal points for feedback as required in Resolution XII.5. We realize that the processes described in the Parties' guidance to the STRP are new to the STRP; however, we were nonetheless surprised that the STRP essentially ignored multiple components of the procedure set out by the Parties for it to follow. We expect that this request for input as well as the literature survey will be undertaken earlier in the process in the future, as called for in stage four of developing the work plan as described in Annex 1 to Resolution XII.5. This approach is intended to ensure that the Parties have the most complete information and views to inform their decision-making when the Standing Committee approves the work plan, and ideally in the next triennium this can help avoid unnecessary delays in launching the work of the STRP		Comment noted. Due to the short time frame between the appointment of STRP members (02 October 2015) and the requirement to produce a work plan during STRP19 (02-06 November 2015) in advance of SC 51, it was not possible to conduct a thorough consultation and produce a draft work plan in time for SC 51. As the procedures in Res.XII.5 are now in place and a draft work plan for the next triennium should be produced in advance of the COP, there should not be delays in the process.

USA	AA (NFP)	Number of tasks	<p>We are seriously concerned about the high number of work elements proposed and cannot accept a list this long for Parties' consideration. On a positive note, 25 is much lower than the 100+ projects in previous such work plans; however, Parties have been clear about their interest in the STRP developing a realistic work plan that Parties can afford and that the STRP can reasonably be expected to accomplish in the time available and with limited resources. We do not wish to see a scenario where we have asked the STRP to do more than it can achieve within the time available, this is not fair to team or to the Parties, whose expectations would have been unrealistically raised. Our very strong preference is to see in the revised work plan a final list with one absolute top priority project per thematic area, with each of those to the extent practicable containing outputs for both target audiences.</p> <p>Per Resolution XII.5 para 17, we would be open to considering a scenario in which the STRP provided an initial table including one project under each heading with outputs for each of the two agreed audiences – for approval by the Standing Committee with an accompanying second table with a prioritized list of up to a maximum of two more activities under each heading which – if time and resources permit – the STRP would endeavour to undertake after completion of the first set after receiving further approval from the Standing Committee. Also troubling is that there is currently no indication of the prioritization envisioned for many tasks – this needs to be included for any tasks that remain on the next iteration of this document so Parties can be informed by the STRP's views when they make their decisions in this regard.</p>		<p>A table of ten priority tasks plus the SoWWS report is being proposed in the STRP Chair's report for consideration by SC 52.</p>
USA	AA (NFP)	Placement of tasks and mandate	<p>In addition, there are numerous tasks listed here that do not belong within the table and whose removal will immediately help streamline the list, e.g., the State of the Worlds Wetlands report, which is specifically requested by Parties in Resolution XII.5 on the STRP. We consider that actions such as those included in Resolution XII.5 (e.g., the finalization of the State of the Worlds Wetlands found in para 25) should be listed outside of the thematic areas since they were specifically authorized in the STRP resolution. We consider all tasks assigned to the STRP found in other resolutions from COP-12 – which we understood from the Secretariat during the COP were all to have had standard language added to indicate that they were elements STRP would consider in developing its work plan - vice assignments that were automatically to be undertaken by the STRP.</p>		<p>Adjustments have been made to streamline the document. For example, the SoWWS report (previously task 1.1) has been removed from Thematic Work Area 1 and placed as part of the advisory functions of the STRP.</p>
USA	AA (NFP)	Break down of costs	<p>We had previously requested some cost breakdowns and we appreciate that the STRP has subsequently provided them. However, further explanations of why some of the costs appear to be exceedingly high would be useful, and what Parties would receive at different funding levels – both the figures quoted as well as the scenario under reduced funding amounts from those proposed. We found that in many instances across the table, the cost figures did not match the general costs listed at the front of the document for the outputs indicated. This needs to be corrected. If costs are lower than would be typical due to in kind services or other contributions this should be explained. In the multiple instances where costs are surprisingly high, this must be explained before the element could be seriously considered as there is a dearth of funding available for the work for the STRP, so costs must be carefully considered at every step.</p>		<p>Costings have been revised and adjusted to better reflect general costs and where possible to reduce costs. Explanations have been added to the costs for clarity purposes.</p>

USA	AA (NFP)	General Stakeholders/participating organizations		<p>We are disappointed in the lack of diversity of stakeholders participating in activities. We have an enormous list of stakeholders indicating an interest in the work of the STRP, but we see a repetition of a small set of stakeholders – some of which are listed as contributing organizations for every thematic area – and many not listed at all. We appreciate the evidence of dedication and keen interest indicated by those signing up for multiple thematic areas; however we do not believe that such an approach serves the STRP well. We would like to see a diversification of contributing organizations across the body of the work so all can have an opportunity to contribute. While we could understand seeing a higher rate of participation by IOPs, outside that group we would not expect to see the same contributing organizations listed for numerous thematic work areas – they should be limited to two or three so we can preserve space for others to engage, which we view as vital to inclusion of new and varied voices and ideas. This should be an inclusive – not exclusive – club.</p>		<p>Organizations listed in the work plan include those who indicated an interest to participate in the work of the STRP in response to the Secretariat's invitation to participate as Invited Observers (Res. XII.5, Annex 2). While all Annex 2 observers were invited to participate, not all of them responded or nominated representatives. Therefore, the STRP could only include those who expressed a desire to contribute. If Contracting Parties are dissatisfied with the range of observers, please note that Resolution XII.5 provides a mechanism for involvement of additional experts. Contracting Parties may suggest experts to participate in meetings or intersessional processes of the STRP with the approval of the STRP Chair (see Resolution XII. 5, Annex 1, paragraphs 9-10). Although the STRP budget could not cover the travel costs of such additional experts, they would be most welcomed if they can secure funding from other sources. Such experts could also participate in tasks electronically.</p>
USA	AA (NFP)	Peatlands focus		<p>There are six out of 25 proposals focused on or specially highlighting a single topic: peatlands. This is a bit surprising considering the Parties did not identify this issue as a top priority – which they did via inclusion of the five thematic areas. We will not accept more than one proposal on a single topic – there are too many important topics for the STRP to focus on and we cannot tilt the entire agenda toward a single topic. Some of the topics included (e.g., 1.7) are not even included in the topics the STRP is asked to consider in Resolution XII.11 para 24, and this is very troubling.</p>		<p>We have amended the draft work plan so that the three remaining proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11. (A fourth peatland-related task appears under the advisory tasks.) For additional information, see para 9. of SC52-10, the report of the STRP Chair. The STRP welcomes clarification and instruction from the Standing Committee on which peatland-related tasks should move forward.</p>
USA	AA (NFP)	SP references		<p>The strategic plan references are outdated and thus hard to follow – for example, 4.14 is listed multiple times in theme 1 and it references financial and other resources. We cannot tell the intent of this but as written they do not help bolster the case for why these activities should be included in the draft work plan. These need to be corrected.</p> <p>Parties identified which goals and targets from the strategic plan were meant for each of the thematic areas as a means of giving some parameters to the work from the outset. Unfortunately, in our view this framing seem to have largely been ignored in exchange for inclusions of goals/targets that do not in our view fit, which seem to have simply been inserted so as to justify work that does not belong in a given thematic area. This disregard of Parties' intentions by the STRP – whether intentional or accidental – is a serious concern.</p>		<p>Strategic Plan references have been revised and corrected.</p>

USA	AA (NFP)	Resolutions references		Similarly, some of the references to resolutions do not appear to be correct and these should also be adjusted throughout the document. One type of error we saw was the inclusion of resolutions which while perhaps related thematically, the paras listed describe work for entities other than the STRP. For example, in task 2.1 resolution XII.13 para 3 is included which specifically tasks the work of mainstreaming DRR into management plans to Parties themselves, not to the STRP, so this is misleading or misguided.		References to Resolutions have been revised and corrected.
USA	AA (NFP)	Tasks from previous triennia		In addition, there are multiple tasks which indicate their intent is to complete previously started work by STRP members in an earlier triennium. While we appreciate the interest of STRP members in finishing what they started before, they seem to fail to recognize that priorities have been changed and that incomplete work from before must unfortunately remain unfinished unless they can make a far more compelling case as to how that work fits into Parties expressly stated priorities and why if there is only one project accepted under a given thematic area this work would take highest precedence over all other ideas proposed.		Comment noted. In the interest of maximizing resources and valuable work undertaken (mindful of the limited resources of the STRP), four tasks (2.4, 2.6, 3.1, and 5.2) that were progressed during the past triennium have been proposed. However, the scope of the outputs have been adjusted to meet Contracting Parties requests and to be in line with the five thematic work areas.
USA	AA (NFP)	Overarching comment		The draft work plan in our view needs some serious revising before we can accept approving it. We appreciate that change is difficult and we look forward to the STRP adjusting to the new way of working as instructed in Resolution XII.5. We are hopeful that at the next Standing Committee meeting we will have before Parties a considerably shorter revised work plan that can be approved. In the meantime, we would like to see the STRP work on a proper literature survey. In addition, we would be comfortable with the STRP working on the items that we have identified that are specifically tasked in Resolution XII.5 and that we consider to be outside the thematic areas of the work plan, e.g., the State of the World's Wetlands.		A revised work plan is submitted to SC52 for further consideration and approval.
USA	AA (NFP)	References to Secretariat staff		Secretariat staff are not subject matter experts so this needs to be deleted.		References to Secretariat staff, which have been referenced in past STRP work plans as contact points within the Secretariat (not as subject matter experts), have been removed.
TWA 1						
Madagascar	STRP NFP	ILK		How would the tasks address traditional practices of indigenous peoples and local communities? How can the Panel ensure that the outputs in the work plan are mastered by them?		References to traditional practices and knowledge of indigenous people and communities have been made more explicit in tasks: 1.2, 2.1,3.1 and 4.2. Ensuring that outputs are mastered by indigenous peoples and local communities its outside the scope of the work of the STRP per the terms of Res. XII.5. However, the STRP will work closely with the CEPA Programme and communications team to ensure outputs are appropriately tailored to the right audience and are accessible through the Convention's website and more dynamic tools such as webinars.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	ILK		We do not see reflected in the tasks activities that are directly linked to traditional ecological knowledge nor with cultural science related to traditional practices.		References to traditional practices and knowledge of indigenous people and communities have been made more explicit in tasks: 1.2, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.2.

Canada	AA (NFP)	Costs	1.1	not sure I understand the 2 costs. If no additional funds are raised and only \$67K is available. What is the output exactly for that amount of \$ and what would be in addition for the \$250K.		The initial draft work plan contained two budgetary options, which created an ambiguity. The higher figure (CHF 250,000) contemplated fundraising and reliance on paid consultants from each Ramsar region. At this point, however, we do not anticipate such funds being voluntarily provided. Thus, we propose to proceed with a smaller figure (CHF 137,000). The STRP would draft the SoWWS report, and funds would be used for an authors meeting (CHF 20,000), and layout, design, translation, and other publication costs (CHF 67,000). Including the proposed cost for the WET Index (CHF 50,000), the total estimated cost for the SoWWS task in the amended draft work plan is CHF 137,000.
New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Suggested focus/content	1.1	[The task] would benefit from an assessment of the degree that Ramsar sites are within protected areas (similar to recent paper on NZ wetlands in reserves, see: http://newzealandecology.org/nzje/3247.pdf). Analysing differences in wetland protection between regions of the world, and for different Ramsar wetland types, would provide invaluable information for Contracting Parties and IOPs in determining the priorities for wetland conservation. This analysis would benefit from collaboration between the STRP, Secretariat and IUCN WDPA (World Database on Protected Areas).		Comment noted and suggestion will be taken into account if feasible.
Panama	STRP NFP	Scope and outputs	1.1	I think it is a very ambitious tasks given the available time. Could it be perhaps shortened to something more realistic, like for example focussing on certain regions? or if it is global in scope could it specify a specific component? Moreover if there are no sufficient funds, the fund raising alone will take some time. Regarding the outputs: here, a tangible product is considered which is an object of verification backing up the activity. It should be similar for the rest of the outputs in the document.		Comment noted. The output will be a global report.
USA	AA (NFP)	Placement of task	1.1	This activity is specifically authorized in paragraph 25 of Resolution XII.5 and therefore - while it needs to be reflected in the work plan - does not need to be included within a thematic area. In this instance it is acceptable for the target audience to be broader than that agreed otherwise in the Resolution and its annex; however (wherever in the work plan this activity is located) the reference to the target audience "targeted to specific audiences" needs to reflect those identified in Resolution XII.5.		Task moved out of the thematic work area and placed along with the advisory functions of the Panel.
UK	STRP NFP	Prioritization	1.1	This is rightly described as a flagship publication. The work to deliver this should also deliver a range of other derivative outputs as noted. Of all STRP's work this should be given highest priority		Higher priority status has been retained and once the report is produced, derived outputs would be produced, resources and time permitting.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	1.2	Providing advice reads more like an activity than an output. Something more tangible or that can serve as back up to show that the objective was accomplished should be considered.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
USA	AA (NFP)	Placement of task	1.2	This also should be removed from the work plan's thematic areas and moved elsewhere, as (a) it is not a product and (b) it is authorized by its inclusion in Resolution XII.5 Annex para 13 ix.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Focus of task and output	1.3	Tasks should focus on those delivering value to Contracting Parties – this task appears to focus on improving oversight capacity of the Secretariat rather than benefiting Contracting Parties. I suggest it should be low priority.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	1.3	I support its lower priority status as per draft work plan (i.e. not identified as higher priority)		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.

Canada	AA (NFP)	Description, target audiences and costs	1.3	Regarding the task description: Who is the STRP providing the advice? Regarding the cost: Assume no cost for this task since advice, so maybe put N/A.. Is this a time consuming task? Regarding the target audience: Are these the target audiences of the advice or the GWOS that others are leading.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	1.3	what verification object is this output supporting? It reads subjective.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
UK	STRP NFP	Linkage with other tasks missing	1.3	Missing the linkage with SOWWS. Given Parties inability to get to grips with comprehensive wetland inventory, this will realistically need to be delivered by remote sensing. Thus this is necessarily an (ultimate) component of SOWWS. Also 1.5 & 1.6.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel. Aspects of GWOS may be considered under SoWWS as well as under proposed task 1.1 - Earth Observation as a "best practice" tool for inventorying, mapping and monitoring wetlands, including Ramsar Sites.
USA	AA	Delete task	1.3	This should be deleted altogether. (a) it is not a product and (b) it is simply an example of the STRP's advisory role if it is asked for advice by GWOS proponents.		Task has been moved out of the thematic work area and to the advisory functions of the Panel.
Japan	STRP NFP	Prioritization	1.4	Was this task added to the set of priority tasks recommended by the STRP at SC 51? Are they still on the table? Because it does not have "higher" priority status in the version of the draft work plan that was circulated for consultation.		Yes, the task was recommended as a high priority task by the STRP Chair at SC 51. The task has been removed from the thematic work area and it is now being proposed as a subset of SoWWS, as a Ramsar indicator of core relevance to that task and for tracking implementation and impact of the Convention. For additional information, see paragraphs 12-13 of SC52-10, the report of the STRP Chair.
Panama	STRP NFP	Clarification	1.4	It would be recommended to explain why Latin America and the Caribbean are chosen.		The initial work on the WET Index was the first proof of concept establishing the methodology, and it only provided a trend analysis to 2008. Further investment will allow the index to be updated. Just as importantly, the first proof of concept had some geographic gaps and imbalances (most notably Latin America). Further work will help to fill these gaps to make it more representative as a global indicator, as well as enabling better sub-global/regional comparisons.
UK	STRP NFP	Prioritization	1.4	Important		Comment noted.

USA	AA (NFP)	Delete task	1.4	The WET index is part of the CBD's GBO process and thus does not need to be funded by Ramsar. This indicates that a document is out for publication and it is not clear what the further tasks would be. This needs to be deleted. It is not clear what this would be or why another convention would not be funding it, especially since the CBD has an AHTEG on this topic. Moreover, the output described is not for the two audiences described by the resolution - instead it indicates it would use the resources of the STRP to fit into multiple processes outside of Ramsar. This is not acceptable and must be deleted.		The WET Index was conceived as an indicator for the Ramsar Convention, filling a gap in the evidence base for Ramsar. Its first iteration was developed and tested by UNEP-WCMC, with funding from the Ramsar Convention and supported by in-kind time contributions from UNEP-WCMC. The WET Index does not belong to any other process and is not funded by the CBD or any other convention. We understand that it is listed in the CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) report only to flag its existence and relevance as an indicator for Aichi Target 5. To be sure, the WET Index, as an ecosystem extent indicator, is relevant to the CBD and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) processes, and an early analysis was used in the Fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-4). Nevertheless, the WET Index is and remains a Ramsar indicator of core relevance to the State of the World Wetlands and their Services to People (SoWWS) and for tracking implementation and impact of the Convention. Accordingly, in the amended draft work plan, the WET Index is now included as part of the SOWWS task.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	1.5	A policy brief seems subjective as an output. Something more tangible could be a compilation of at least X number of policy briefs in a report in a determined time.		Comment noted. The task is now considered as a sub-set of task 1.1-Earth Observation as a "best practice" tool for inventorying, mapping and monitoring wetlands, including Ramsar Sites. The output will be a Ramsar Technical Report.
USA	AA (NFP)	Methodology missing; costs clarification	1.5	This looks like a solid proposal; however we note that the methodology aspect is missing and needs to be included. It is also not clear why the costs are higher than what is listed for a policy brief - the front of the document says they cost 9,000CHF but this indicates 15,000CHF and moreover why this would be so high when JAXA has already provided all the data?		Comment noted. The task is now a sub-set of task 1.1-Earth Observation as a "best practice" tool for inventorying, mapping and monitoring wetlands, including Ramsar Sites. The output will be a Ramsar Technical Report, and the cost estimate has been revised accordingly.
USA	AA (NFP)	Methodology missing; costs clarification	1.6	This looks like a solid proposal; however we note that the methodology aspect is missing and needs to be included. It is also not clear why the costs are so high when ESA has already provided all the data?		Comment noted. The task is now a sub-set of task 1.1-Earth Observation as a "best practice" tool for inventorying, mapping and monitoring wetlands, including Ramsar Sites. The output will be a Ramsar Technical Report, and the cost estimate has been revised accordingly.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	1.7	I support its lower priority status as per draft work plan (i.e. not identified as higher priority)		This task, now task 1.3 in the revised work plan, has been revised and assigned higher priority status. Please see paragraphs 9-10 of SC52-10 for additional discussion.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Outputs and target audiences	1.7	Do you need both outputs? what would be included in policy brief that wouldn't be in the BN? CPs that aren't policy makers. Not sure I understand why CPs separate here.		The task, now task 1.3, has been revised and the proposed outputs now include a Briefing Note and, if Parties so desire, revised guidelines annexed to a DR or as a COP information document.

Panama	STRP NFP	Peatlands focus	1.7	Regarding the task description: why only tropical peatlands? this is something that perhaps the reader will ask. Perhaps complement with a justification on why only this ecosystem was chosen. Regarding the outputs: To provide advice is an activity. What tangible output will be delivered?		The task, now task 1.3, will cover not only guidelines for inventories of tropical peatlands, but also guidelines for designation of all peatlands as Ramsar Sites. Emphasis is placed on tropical peatlands as they are under immense pressure with regional implications for human wellbeing and biodiversity. Please see paragraphs 9-10 of SC52-10 for additional discussion.
USA	AA (NFP)	Delete task	1.7	Resolution XII.11 para 24 asks the STRP to consider doing multiple activities; however, this activity is not included in the resolution. Considering this we must insist it be deleted. Since we will only agree to a single peatland-focused task within the work plan, it should be one that was actually requested by the Parties in Resolution XII.11 para 24 since that is the clearest indication of Parties' interests.		We have amended the draft work plan so that the three proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11. (A fourth peatland-related task appears under the advisory tasks.) The STRP welcomes clarification and instruction from the Standing Committee on which peatland-related tasks should move forward.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Policy brief contents	1.8	what would be included in the policy brief? what would it address specifically.		Former task 1.8 has been placed in the advisory tasks, as the task contemplates providing advice that may not necessarily lead to a tangible STRP-authored output.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	1.8	Regarding output (1): suggest adding the following "a document about" a Peatlands Hotspot Atlas Project ...		Former task 1.8 has been placed in the advisory tasks, as the task contemplates providing advice that may not necessarily lead to a tangible STRP-authored output.
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Clarification on scope and outputs and suggestions	1.8	What kind of "atlas" will it be? Will it be one with overview maps, quite detailed maps or an atlas without maps but giving a global description on what kind of peatlands that are the hot spots in each biogeographic region or similar. It may be too difficult to make an atlas with detailed maps and information about hot spots especially in countries with a large peatland area and/or not sufficient detailed (site by site) data about peatlands and greenhouse gases. It's not totally clear what aspects the choice of hot spots are based upon. Since the presentation of the results is to take place at UNFCCC, the climate issue is certainly included, but what about other ecosystem services and conservation values? If the atlas is only covering peatlands from a climate point of view we suggest that the project is re-named "Peatland hotspots for the climate/carbon storage etc." or similar. If adding conservation values and best sites for restoration for the biodiversity the picture will be different but more in line with the purpose of the Ramsar convention. The Swedish EPA suggests a hot spot atlas with different kinds of hot spots, created by different combinations of present state (intact/virgin mire, mire with some human impact, peatlands no longer mires) and biodiversity values (existing ones and potential ones if restored including their importance in the sub-region they are situated). The Swedish EPA would also like to have this task as a higher priority, being of high importance both for climate and biodiversity.		Comment noted. Former task 1.8 has been placed in the advisory tasks, as the task contemplates providing advice that may not necessarily lead to a tangible STRP-authored output.
TWA 2						
Madagascar	STRP NFP	Ecosystem services	Overarching comment	All the tasks in the work plan are good but wonder whether additional tasks on ecosystem services can be added under this thematic work area, given that the subject is also covered in thematic work area 3		Comment noted. Tasks 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 will cover wetland ecosystem services.

USA	AA (NFP)	Tasks responsiveness to theme	Overarching comment	Most of the projects listed under this theme do not fit within this theme and appear to be listed here for convenience's sake only. The very few that are relevant are pretty much all what we would consider meeting only the "other wetlands" part of this theme. This is not acceptable. This section should be rewritten to include a proposal that is focused on Ramsar sites or at least Ramsar plus other sites. We are looking to the STRP to respond to Parties' priorities, not the other way around. This section is not acceptable.		Comment noted. Tasks have been revised to better align them with the thematic work area.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.1	Given that this task does not appear to require substantial STRP resources but would provide substantial benefit in facilitating access for site managers to directly relevant STRP outputs – I suggest this should be given higher priority		Higher priority status has been retained.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Costs clarification	2.1	Regarding costs: so no cost for STRP to produce this.		There will be no cost implications for the STRP budget for providing advice. There will be Secretariat staff time costs, and there may be translation costs (to be determined).
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	2.1	Here, a good explanation of the output is provided. This should be consistent with other outputs where the deliverable appears to be very subjective, meaning that some products could be perceived as incomplete or it is not clear what the deliverable will be.		Comment noted
Mexico	AA (NFP)	National documents; capacity building; official languages	2.1	We suggest to request CPs to share national or local documents related to good practices which can be useful to other Parties for inclusion in the portal, as well as opportunities for free (or not) capacity building which they can offer. Finally, emphasis should be given in the site to all existing site management tools in the official languages.		Comment noted
UK	STRP NFP	Peatlands focus	2.1	Why single out peatland restoration over restoration of other wetlands (mangroves, wet grasslands etc.). There is a massive amount of published literature of wetland site management (and restoration). It will be very restrictive if this resource is limited just to Ramsar-derived outputs – important to include all relevant information/guidance. The Ramsar/IUCN/WWF Field guide to site management absorbed a large amount of Ramsar type to derive just some years ago. Important that we are not re-inventing wheels here.		The language of the task has been amended to "wetland restoration".
USA	AA (NFP)	Delete task	2.1	This does not belong in this table and must be deleted. STRP information is as we understand it already being incorporated into the main Ramsar website, so the intention of this task is unclear. If for some reason these existing handbooks are not already being moved onto the website with the rest of the material the STRP should (a) highlight this oversight to the team conducting the website information transfer and/or (b) list this outside of the table of thematic areas as another type of task - in this case, one for CEPA/Communications team consideration. In such an instance we encourage the STRP Chair to work with the communications team to secure cost estimates and such so that the Parties might consider whether they thought it would be valuable. As indicated, this must be deleted out of this table.		While information is being included in the website, the purpose of the toolkit will be to compile all relevant resources on site management into one place that is easily accessible to Ramsar Site Managers. The language of the task has been revised as follows for further clarity: A web page that would contain existing STRP guidance and outputs on site management, including best practices and case studies on wetland restoration and traditional and local knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities to be compiled by the Secretariat, along with a list of international and/or regional initiatives and capacity development resources and relevant reference sources. The site would be updated and maintained on a regular basis by the Secretariat. The STRP would provide relevant technical guidance and material with annotations to be included in this toolkit. As we have received conflicting instructions, we have not deleted this task and welcome instruction from the Standing Committee.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.2	I agree with the higher priority given to these task – it is likely to deliver real value for the Oceania region Contracting Parties		This task has been deleted from thematic work area 2 and aspects of it are covered by task 3.3 - Wetland ecosystems and Disaster Risk Reduction.

Canada	AA (NFP)	Task description and PEDRR clarification	2.2	Regarding the task description: in the form of a BN or what? Regarding the expected outputs: question about what is the PEDRR network.		This task has been deleted from thematic work area 2 and aspects of it are covered by task 3.3- Wetland ecosystems and Disaster Risk Reduction. Task 3.3 proposes a Policy Brief on integrating wetlands in Disaster Risk Reduction. The Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR) is a global alliance of UN agencies, NGOs and specialist institutes.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	2.2	Regarding output (2) on "Provide advice, as needed, to the PEDRR networks": is this an activity? what would be the tangible output? A report about the work performed? Outputs should be concrete and measurable. Activities should be included in the corresponding section, as these are processes to accomplish such an output.		This task has been deleted from thematic work area 2 and aspects of it are covered by task 3.3- Wetland ecosystems and Disaster Risk Reduction. Additionally, advice to PEDRR has been listed as an STRP advisory function.
USA	AA (NFP)	Placement of task; reconfigure task	2.2	This task as currently described does not fit in this category as it is not related to this theme. In addition, there is no planning aspect. We do not know what the PEDRR network is but anticipate that the STRP can provide advisory functions outside of the tasks included in the work plan. We cannot accept this item as currently rendered. If it is reconfigured to actually fit within the scope of this thematic area we might be able to reconsider. Alternatively, we see potential synergies with task 3.1 and suggest these two tasks might be usefully blended in some respects and presented under theme three.		This task has been deleted from thematic work area 2 and aspects of it are covered by task 3.3 - Wetland ecosystems and Disaster Risk Reduction. Task 3.3 proposes a Policy Brief on integrating wetlands in Disaster Risk Reduction. Additionally, advice to PEDRR has been listed as an STRP advisory function.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.3	I agree with not identifying this as a higher priority task.		This is now task 2.2. Priority status unchanged
Madagascar	STRP NFP	Relevance of task at national level	2.3	This task is very relevant because in Madagascar they are always working with local communities		This is now task 2.2. Comment noted
Panama	STRP NFP	Task description and outputs	2.3	Regarding the task description: if this is a task, should it not be instead the determination of these implications? As contemplated, it does not define a task. Regarding the outputs: a report with at least x amount of notes? as stated, it reads subjective		Comment noted. This is now task 2.2. Language has been revised for more clarity and better alignment with the thematic work area.
Japan	STRP NFP	Mandate clarification	2.3	Is this task based on any COP resolutions or Standing Committee decisions?		The task is proposed based on the general instructions in Resolution XII.5, Annex 1, paras. 1-2.
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.3	The Swedish EPA consider this project of be of low importance since all transboundary wetland management has to be in line with the legislation and practices in the countries involved, no policy brief can solve or list all things that has to be considered. We would like it to be classified as a low priority for the STRP.		This is now task 2.2. Priority status unchanged
USA	AA (NFP)	Delete task or reconfigure	2.3	The topic of transboundary wetland management is an interesting one but this task as currently written does not talk about this topic within the scope of this thematic area - in other words it does not purport to provide best practices for developing and implementing management plans, action plans, or other tools for Ramsar or any other sites. If this is rewritten we might be willing to consider it, but otherwise as it is currently written we must insist it be deleted as it has no relevance to the theme and appears to be simply shoved in this category out of a need for a place to park it, which is not acceptable		Comment noted. This is now task 2.2. Language has been revised for more clarity and better alignment with the thematic work area.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.4	I agree with the higher priority given to this task –it is likely to deliver real value for the Oceania region Contracting Parties		The simplified Ramsar Sites management manual (previously task 2.4) has been moved to the advisory functions of the Panel, as it is a task to be largely carried out by the Secretariat in coordination with the CEPA programme, communications team and the STRP.

Madagascar	STRP NFP	R-METT	2.4	Wondered whether R-METT could be simplified because it is quite complex		Former task 2.4-Simplified Ramsar Site management manual, which included reference to the R-METT, is now listed as part of the advisory functions of the Panel, as it is a task to be largely carried out by the Secretariat in coordination with the CEPA programme, communications team and the STRP. The STRP will work with the Secretariat to ensure the bibliographic references are easily accessible to the reader and that are in line with internal publication and design guidelines.
Panama	STRP NFP	Task description	2.4	Regarding the task description: A documents is an output, so in the corresponding section there should be a task, such as the revision or updating or the document.		Comment noted.
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Delete/ assign low priority status	2.4	[We] would like to have this task deleted or as low priority, most countries have their own way to do management plans and want the management plans for the Ramsar sites to blend in with the ones for other protected areas. How many countries use the existing manual? There is also already lots of information about wetland management on the internet and several books published on the topic. Concerning the R-METT it can be discussed if this tool is an efficient one for monitoring and if a handbook with more information about that tool is needed. Many countries also have their own systems to monitor what happens in protected areas.		Comment noted. Former task 2.4-Simplified Ramsar Site management manual, which included reference to the R-METT, is now listed as part of the advisory functions of the Panel.
UK	STRP NFP	Clarify scope of task	2.4	This is exactly what the Ramsar/IUCN/WWF publication set out to achieve http://assets.panda.org/downloads/wetlands_management_guide_2008.pdf . It's unclear to me why we need further work on this topic – surely we just need to disseminate this existing product.		Comment noted. This resource will be very helpful.
USA	AA (NFP)	Delete or reconfigure task	2.4	The underlying concept - creating an even simpler management tool - is interesting. However, the description of the task as written references a manual that is to be field tested at a workshop that is already planned and it sounds like the work is already completed and not like this is a task for the STRP over the next three years. If this manual already exists this task should be deleted. If it does not, the task should be rewritten so it is clearer and the reasons for the high costs are clearer as well - if this manual is drawing from an existing manual as described it shouldn't cost as much as if the work was being done from the start. It is helpful that the prioritization is indicated on this one - we would be curious whether the NFP responses concur since this helps one region only instead of helping all.		Comment noted. Former task 2.4-Simplified Ramsar Site management manual, which included reference to the R-METT, is now listed as part of the advisory functions of the Panel.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.5	I agree with not identifying these as higher priority – 2.5 and 2.6 reflect the overemphasis on peatlands throughout the work plan.		This task has been merged with former task 1.7, moved to thematic area 1 and re-numbered as task 1.3. We have amended the draft work plan so that the three proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11.
UK	STRP NFP	Correct reference to resolution	2.5	As requested by Resolution XII.11 (not XI.11 as in draft plan). Important task		Higher priority status has been retained. Reference has been corrected.

USA	AA (NFP)	Placement of task; reconfigure task	2.5	Finally! the STRP is requested in Resolution XII.11 para 24 to consider doing multiple activities; and this is one of them. However, this activity unfortunately does not fit in this theme, which is all about planning, not about developing guidelines. Since we will only agree to a single peatland-focused task within the work plan, as previously indicated it should be one that was actually requested by the Parties in Resolution XII.11 para 24 since that is the clearest indication of Parties' interests. That said, it is not clear to us as it is currently written which thematic area this element might fit under and so this needs to be rewritten in order to be considered under this theme, or it needs to be altered to be fit under another theme - if, that is, this is the single most important peatlands task and thus is the one that is included in the work plan - we would be interested to hear if any NFPs indicated this is their top choice of the six proposals on this single topic of peatlands. This needs to be altered, potentially altered and moved to another theme, or deleted. As noted above, in altering the task elements, it might be worth considering whether aspects of task 1.8 - which is not found in Resolution XII.11 para 24 - could be included, possibly also blending with elements of task 2.6 below. Again, this resulting amended task with a new thematic home would still need to be identified by Parties as the one and only top choice.		This task has been merged with former task 1.7, moved to thematic area 1 and re-numbered as task 1.3.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	2.6	I agree with not identifying these as higher priority – 2.5 and 2.6 reflect the overemphasis on peatlands throughout the work plan.		This task has been re-numbered as task 2.3 and the language has been revised to better align the task with the thematic work area.
Panama	STRP NFP	Target audiences; outputs	2.6	Regarding the target audience: The text highlighted in green [see original comments by Panama in draft work plan] for example is a good example of a well developed task vs a product. Other outputs should be standardized and follow an adequate approach, as is established by the logical framework of approaching activities, tasks and products (deliverables, objects of verification).		Comment noted.
UK	STRP NFP	Correct reference to resolution	2.6	Cross reference is Resolution XII.11 not XI.11		Reference has been corrected.
USA	AA (NFP)	Placement; Reconfigure task or delete	2.6	Another one! the STRP is requested in Resolution XII.11 para 24 to consider doing multiple activities; and this is another one of them, which is great. However, this activity unfortunately also does not fit in this theme, which is all about planning, not about developing guidelines. Since we will only agree to a single peatland-focused task within the work plan, as previously indicated it should be one that was actually requested by the Parties in Resolution XII.11 para 24 since that is the clearest indication of Parties' interests. That said, it is not clear to us as it is currently written which thematic area this element might fit under and so this needs to be rewritten in order to be considered under this theme, or it needs to be altered to be fit under another theme - if, that is, this is the single most important peatlands task and thus is the one that is included in the work plan - we would be interested to hear if the NFPs indicated this is their top choice of the six proposals on this single topic of peatlands. This needs to be altered, potentially altered and moved to another theme, or deleted. In addition, if this were to be the single one chosen after it is amended and relocated, we question why the cost is so high for a questionnaire, this seems extremely expensive. As noted above, in altering the task elements, it might be worth considering whether aspects of task 1.8 - which is not found in Resolution XII.11 para 24 - could be included, possibly also blending it with elements of task 2.5 above. Again, this resulting amended task with a new thematic home would still need to be identified by Parties as the one and only top choice.		This task has been re-numbered as task 2.3 and the language has been revised to better align the task with the thematic work area.

New Zealand	AA (NFP) and STRP NFP	Linking IAS to more than one task	2.7	<p>Regards [2.7] and Target 1.4 of the Strategic Plan, we want to stress the need not to treat Task 2.7 as a one-off issue, but to clearly link to the need for risk assessment and prevention of invasive species in any guidance or tools for activities that are known to provide potential high-impact pathways. As a minimum, incorporation of risk assessment and invasive species prevention (cross referencing to Task 2.7) should be incorporated in:</p> <p>1) Task 4.3 (Aquaculture developments and wise use of wetlands). Due to the high risk for native biodiversity that aquaculture can create with regards to being a source of biological invasion when it uses alien species for aquaculture, it is critical to use best practice risk assessment processes (e.g. see: Hewitt, C.L., Campbell, M.L. and Gollasch, S. (2006). Alien Species in Aquaculture. Considerations for responsible use. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. viii + 32 pp. https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2006-036.pdf)</p> <p>2)Task 2.2. (Wetland Ecosystem Based Adaptation for Disaster Risk Reduction) and especially Task 5.1 (Promoting best practices in wetland restoration) – due to the potential risks created if alien species are used for wetland restoration and/or disaster recovery and disaster risk reduction, the invasives issue needs to specifically included (See e.g. the excellent publication Sudmeier-Rieux, K., H. Masundire, A. Rizvi and S. Rietbergen (eds). (2006). Ecosystems, Livelihoods and Disasters: An integrated approach to disaster risk management. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. x + 58 pp https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/CEM-004.pdf and in particular one of the case studies therein – an example from Sri Lanka post 2004 tsunami (page 32)) .</p> <p>We recommend that the Work Plan explicitly includes the relevant cross-linking links to Task 2.7 and Target 1.4 for Tasks 4.3 and 2.2 and others as relevant. It also may be useful to mention the importance of involving IUCN Programmes and Commissions, including the new IUCN Invasive Species officer (starting early 2016), and the SSC’s Invasive Species Specialist Group.</p>		Task has been re-numbered as 2.4 and the language has been revised. Comments noted. We appreciate the references and look forward to collaborating with IUCN on this task should the Standing Committee approve this task moving forward.
UK	STRP NFP	Possible collaboration	2.7	Potentially joint with AEWA as noted elsewhere.		Task has been re-numbered as 2.4. Language has been revised to include collaboration with AEWA.
USA	AA (NFP)	Reconfigure or delete task	2.7	To our great frustration yet again this appears to be something that is just shoved into this theme as a matter of convenience instead of appropriateness. IAS are important, but this does not fit with the theme. Moreover, we question the usefulness of a guide to guidance - the guidance should be able to stand alone and not need further explanation. In addition, simply because this is a task that the STRP was working on previously does not obligate the parties - who have clearly articulated their priorities - to pay to continue the work in the current triennium. If this were formulated as best practices for developing and implementing action plans to manage IAS in Ramsar sites and other wetlands this could be far more valuable to parties than the task that is currently described here. If this is not completely revised so it is not just a continuation of old work this must be deleted. In addition, the resolution text referenced here is not a decision, it is just including invasives in a list of priority areas of focus over the next nine years. Reformulate or delete.		Task has been re-numbered as 2.4 and the language has been revised for better alignment with the thematic work area.
TWA 3						
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	3.1	I support the higher priority given to task 3.1.		The high priority status has been retained
Canada	AA (NFP)	Outputs	3.1	Regarding the expected outputs: should this not be a policy brief if destined for policy makers.		Output has been adjusted to note that Policy Brief is for policy makers, while the annexed protocol is directed toward practitioners.

USA	AA (NFP)	Costs clarification	3.1	This looks like an excellent proposal. One question we have is that the cost listed is about half of what was estimated generally for briefing notes and there is no indication of how costs will be saved here, e.g., in kind costs of some sort being provided, which would be useful to know. Otherwise the figure needs to be corrected.		The costs have been clarified. The estimate is now CHF 25,300 [9,000 for layout, design, review, translation and publication costs; 6,300 for consultant; and 10,000 for a six-person writing workshop].
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	3.2	I support the higher priority given to task 3.2.		The high priority status has been retained
Panama	STRP NFP	Task description	3.2	I am not sure whether this is a task. Would it not be better to say that it is the revision of a document to accomplish its adaptation?		Task has been reformulated to be a part of 3.1
USA	AA (NFP)	Combine or delete	3.2	As written we can see no difference between 3.1 and 3.2 and we thus anticipate they might usefully be combined. We do not understand the cost requirement here for IPBES members' participation, especially considering one of the STRP members listed for this theme is on IPBES so this seems unnecessary. We are not clear what a stepwise protocol is meant to mean, and how this would be different from the briefing note described in 3.1. We would not support having two identical tasks here. Moreover, any work involving information from the IPBES process should clearly indicate the IPBES timeline for such information to be available. This description says the information is already available in 2015; however the call for comments only took place in September 2015, so we see some disconnects and confusion here. Regardless, we do not support inclusion of this item as a standalone item since 3.1 seems to be a better project which already incorporates any added IPBES dimension or could easily have ILC aspects incorporated as appropriate.		Tasks 3.1 and 3.2 have been combined.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	3.3	The Oceania region includes a number of small island state Contracting Parties which may find the availability of valuation information of great benefit in balancing economic development with wetland conservation. Given the resource constraints of such CPs, this benefit would be most effectively realised by the availability of a toolkit to support direct application of valuation protocols. I therefore consider that the task 3.3 should likewise be identified as a higher priority.		Given the utility expressed for SIDS, we may work on a document to specifically cater to this request as part of STRP's ad hoc advisory responsibilities, should the task be approved to move forward.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Clarification needed	3.3	Regarding the task description: clarification requested regarding what is TWA No.2.		Text revised.
Panama	STRP NFP	Output	3.3	What is the deliverable? A report with the toolkit?		The deliverable will be a report with a toolkit.
USA	AA (NFP)	Delete	3.3	We do not agree with the inclusion of the toolkit referenced, which we have already indicated in our response to task 2.1 is not acceptable in this work plan. As a result, this must be deleted. Moreover, this duplicates work being proposed in 3.1, just putting it into a different format. In addition, as we understand this description it would be using IPBES information which does not appear to even be available.		task 3.3 (now 3.2) does not duplicate task 3.1, but instead provides wetland practitioners with a method to derive multiple values of wetlands and use the same for integrated management. It is a logical flow from task 3.1 which responds to the needs of policy makers.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	3.4	The small island state Contracting Parties of Oceania may find case studies a valuable support for direct application of valuation approaches. I support allocation of higher priority for this task.		Comment noted, but in light of current resources available, the task has not been proposed as higher priority. The STRP welcomes instruction from the Standing Committee in this regard.
Panama	STRP NFP	Task description; outputs	3.4	Regarding the task description: "made available" does not seem like a task. The process to make something available is a verb, like for example: "to distribute, facilitate" or something along those lines. Regarding expected outputs add: "a document" with case studies...		Edits incorporated.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Synergies and harmonization with other MEAs	3.4	We suggest a strong linkage and harmonization with the methodologies promoted by other environmental conventions (CBD, etc. ...).		Edits incorporated.

USA	AA (NFP)	Combine or delete	3.4	Yet again we see work here that could potentially be incorporated into the task proposed in 3.1. This does not need to be a standalone task as it is written here, and does not seem to us to be a top priority at any rate. We would be open to combining it with something in thematic area 2 as it indicates there is believed to be a linkage but we cannot tell from this as written which task that would be. Regardless, we would not accept this as a standalone task, though we do agree that if it remains in some capacity combined with another element that collaboration with CEPA would be critical.		We propose to deliver this task within the suite of case studies being developed to support integrated wetland management under Thematic Work Area 2.
TWA 4						
Australia	AA (NFP)	links with Handbook 10	4.1	I note the strong links between this task and the existing Handbook 10 (identified in the literature review). I encourage the STRP to build on Handbook 10 and avoid duplication of existing work.		Comment noted.
Panama	STRP NFP	Target audiences	4.1	It is interesting to see that some sections are well formulated, while others are not. There is a need to standardize the document taking into account what has been done in the well structured sections.		Comment noted.
USA	AA (NFP)	Costs clarification; reconfigure or delete	4.1	The fundamental subject matter is potentially interesting, however, we have some major concerns here. First, the cost is astonishingly higher than that listed for a technical report (33,500CHF). Second, the focus is on the SDGs, not on the Ramsar Convention, which is not acceptable. Third, it is not clear to us why we would pay funds to augment what appears to be a project already planned/underway by one of our IOPs? Fourth, there are way too many elements, and b-d would need to be streamlined considerably if this were reformulated and resubmitted. We cannot accept this project as written - this indicates it will help the practitioners and such at national and subnational levels, but these people are NOT involved with the SDGs; they are however involved with Ramsar. If this project cannot be reworked it needs to be deleted from this list - clearly it would still continue within WWF anyway - as it is not serving our constituency. This unfortunately appears to be yet another example of STRP participants taking something they already know they want to work on and forcing it to fit into the thematic areas when it clearly does not, and we reject such an approach.		There will be no cost implications for the STRP budget as WWF has offered to provide CHF 100,00. The costs have been revised and the proposed CHF 20,000 figure has been deleted, as the WWF funds will suffice to deliver this task. The technical report will be drafted jointly with the STRP and will target Ramsar audiences. The policy brief will be a Ramsar-led output. The language of the task has been revised for more clarity and alignment with the thematic work area.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Support for task	4.2	It is important that RAMs deliver the role required by Contracting Parties and I support this task as a mechanism to consider how best RAMs can achieve this		Comment noted. This task is being proposed as a higher priority task.
Mexico	AA (NFP)	Suggest evaluation of MR as complement to Res XII.6	4.2	Feedback from National Focal Points seems to be fundamental to us. We suggest to include here, as a complement to Draft Resolution XII.6, Rev.2, an evaluation of the use and utility of the Montreux Record to improve management, threats, monitoring mechanisms and support to the sites listed in the Record.		The task contemplates feedback from STRP National Focal Points. A separate task on the Montreux Record has been added as task 2.6.
Panama	STRP NFP	Outputs	4.2	Regarding output 1: is there something set out as an activity? what is the concrete output? the publication in the web? Regarding output 2: it is put forward like a process and I think it should be reformulated to a tangible product Regarding output 4: it is presented in a very subjective manner. If the STRP is unsure whether these activities will be carried out, it is better not to mention them. But if they are going to be undertaken, it is better to propose something tangible. For example, it could be at least x number of seminars.		The outputs include a comprehensive review and analysis in the form of a report, a Policy Brief and a Briefing Note. We also plan to conduct webinars.
UK	STRP NFP	Prioritization and clarification request	4.2	Analysis of Regional Advisory Missions. Really important. What happened also to the retrospective analysis of the case studies in the Ramsar Wise Use Handbook? Could that would be included as a further "what happened next..." sort of way?		Comment noted.

USA	AA NFP	Delete task	4.2	This very expensive proposal yet again appears to us to be shoved into a category into which it does not fit. While some RAMs may be related to challenges with balancing development, as this proposal is written it seems to us that it would be an interesting academic exercise but would not have any chance of producing something that could actually be used by policymakers and practitioners. We appreciate what appears to be an effort to generate support for and interest in RAMs - which we note provides more work for the STRP - but do not consider this proposed task to be appropriate and we request it be deleted.		The language of the task has been revised for better alignment with the thematic work area.
Argentina	AA (NFP)	Proposed text; consider negative impacts of aquaculture	4.3	<p>The task of "linking the main types of aquaculture production systems in the world to the Ramsar wetland classification system" is not clear. The fact of establishing a linkage between the Convention's classification system and the different types of aquaculture production does not seem to be appropriate to the purposes of the classification.</p> <p>The theme of the potential of aquaculture to contribute to food security, while can be taken into account, it is not a central point for analysis under the framework of the Ramsar Convention.</p> <p>It is considered that the work of the STRP should focus on the relationship between aquaculture activities and wetlands taking into account both the negative impacts of this activity on wetlands as well as proposals of good practices for its development within the wise use framework.</p> <p>It is also suggested to take into account article 8 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly subsections g) and h) to consider explicitly the issue of the deliberate or accidental release of organisms used in aquaculture activities be it modified or exotic native species.</p>	<p>Task description: An analysis of the relationship between aquaculture activities and wetlands, including a description of the main types of aquaculture production systems, the environmental impact of this activity on wetlands and recommendations on good practices for the sustainable development of this activity taking into account, among other things, article 8 of the Convention on Biological Diversity.</p> <p>Expected outputs: Policy Brief on aquaculture developments and wise use of wetlands.</p> <p>Target audience(s): policy makers in both conservation and aquaculture communities.</p>	Comments noted. The Policy brief will address the risks of aquaculture generally. Given the variety of wetland types and systems that aquaculture covers we are not sure that the environmental impacts of the different types of aquaculture systems can be covered in a Policy Brief. Rather it is recommended to make decision makers aware of the main issues and point them to sources of information that are relevant for their particular wetland or aquaculture types. This could be accomplished within task 2.4, but note that the output there is targeted to practitioners.
Argentina	STRP NFP	Proposed text; consider negative impacts of aquaculture	4.3	<p>After analysing the tasks proposed for the five thematic areas of the work plan, it became necessary to make a comment to Point 4.3 "Aquaculture development and wise use of wetlands". In this regard, we agree in considering that it is not clear the task of " linking the main types of aquaculture production systems in the world to the Ramsar wetland classification system in the context of the interactive governance framework ". The fact of establishing a correspondence between the classification system of the convention and the various types of aquaculture production does not seem appropriate for the purposes of the wetland classification. Another question that arose is the "potential of aquaculture to contribute to food security". Although we believe that this could be considered, it is not a central point to be analysed in the framework of the Convention.</p> <p>Furthermore, it was discussed what should be the focus of the STRP's work. In that regard, it was agreed that it should focus on the relationship between aquaculture activities and wetlands, considering both the potential negative impacts of this activity on wetlands and potential good practices that could be taken to its development in the framework of the wise use of wetlands.</p> <p>Finally, it was considered important to take into account the Article 8 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (in particular paragraphs g and h), which explicitly consider the problem of deliberate or accidental release of organisms used in aquaculture ventures, both modified native species or exotic ones.</p>	<p>Analysing the relationship between aquaculture activities and wetlands, including a description of the main types of aquaculture production systems, the environmental impact of this activity on wetlands and recommendations on good practices for the sustainable development of this activity taking into account, among other things, article 8 of the Convention on Biological Diversity.</p>	Comments noted. The Policy brief will address the risks of aquaculture generally. Given the variety of wetland types and systems that aquaculture covers we are not sure that the environmental impacts of the different types of aquaculture systems can be covered in a Policy Brief. Rather it is recommended to make decision makers aware of the main issues and point them to sources of information that are relevant for their particular wetland or aquaculture types. This could be accomplished within task 2.4, but note that the output there is targeted to practitioners.
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	4.3	I suggest higher priority for this task. This work may make an important contribution to support balanced consideration of aquaculture developments in the Oceania region, particularly the smaller scale, operations of the smaller islands states with limited resources to efficiently consider associated negative environmental and biodiversity impacts.		Comment noted, but in light of current resources available, the task has not been proposed as higher priority. The STRP welcomes instruction from the Standing Committee in this regard.

USA	AA (NFP)	Reconfigure or delete task	4.3	This proposed project has some potential to be interesting to Parties; however, it would need to be refocused so that the policy brief developed is appropriate for a different audience than the ones listed - i.e. wetland policymakers. That said, we also question whether aquaculture is the most useful theme for such an effort. Time and time again Parties have cited concerns with industrial applications as their top concerns - aquaculture impacts countries in certain parts of the world far more than others, while extractive industries and infrastructure, to name just two, impact far more Ramsar Parties. We think this proposal would be strengthened by adjusting the focus for the theme and the audience, in which case we could consider a revised version of this proposal	Comments noted.
TWA 5					
Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	5.1	I suggest this be given low priority – there are overlaps with other tasks, for example 2.1, and should not be a priority at this stage as a standalone task.	Higher priority status retained.
Japan	STRP NFP	Prioritization	5.1	Was this task added to the set of priority tasks recommended by the STRP at SC 51? Are they still on the table? Because it does not have "higher" priority status in the version of the draft work plan that was circulated for consultation.	The task was recommended by the STRP Chair for higher priority at SC52 during his oral report, after having consulted with the Secretariat. It is listed as higher priority in the amended draft work plan.
UK	STRP NFP	Linkages to other tasks missing	5.1	Important that this is joined up with other restoration activity potentially undertaken under other tasks (see comments above).	Comment noted
USA	AA (NFP)	Reconfigure task	5.1	We see some aspects of this project as very promising, but others need considerable revisions before they would be acceptable to us. Under expected outputs, we cannot understand why briefing note 6 (urban, peri-urban, wise use) is the starting point for this topic - the description is not well explained and it does not make sense to us as currently written. We believe that outputs two and three could usefully be combined to make some helpful materials. However, we strongly caution the STRP about getting into policy matters, e.g., the reference to helping explain why resources should be invested in these efforts should be deleted. While this could be implicit in the materials it should not be explicit - this is not a scientific call, it is a policy call and scientists should not purport to provide policy guidance in this way. Moreover, output three must be deleted - identifying sources of funding for practitioners is clearly well beyond the scientific scope of the STRP and is not acceptable. This is surely not the best use of scientists' time or Parties resources to pay this group to perform that function.	The reference to briefing note 6 was a typo. It has been corrected to refer to briefing note 5. The third output has been deleted. The remaining outputs will be policy relevant, but not policy prescriptive.
Australia	AA (NFP)		5.2	I note that the UNFCCC is the appropriate avenue for REDD+ negotiations, although it is unlikely that this kind of detailed work on the implications for wetlands has been done as part of negotiations (previously or in future).	Comment noted.
Canada	AA (NFP)	Clarification on outputs requested; suggest to revise outputs	5.2	Regarding the expected outputs: why does this one just have BN and destined for both practitioners and policymakers- this makes sense actually. Is there a way only one be output could produced in some tasks above for both target audiences to use like in this one. This could reduce workload.	Output has been modified to a Policy Brief for policy makers.
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	5.2	REDD-plus will affect many and a large total area of wetlands. We would like this issue to have the priority "Higher".	Given conflicting instructions by other CPs, the lower priority status has been retained.
USA	AA (NFP)	Reconfigure or delete task	5.2	We do not see how this relates to the theme at hand - which uses the parameters of wetland restoration as a framework. We do not read REDD+ as focusing on restoration and we do not see a need to complete work from a previous triennium. This yet again appears to be a product of STRP members struggling to adapt to a new paradigm of work, and we cannot accept inclusion of this proposed task as written. Wanting to complete previously initiated work is not enough of a reason to include work since the approach of the STRP is now different.	Given conflicting instructions by other CPs, the task has been retained for consideration during SC52.

Australia	AA (NFP)	Prioritization	5.3	I agree with the lower priority given to this task and note that again it reflects the overemphasis on peatlands throughout the work plan.		Lower priority status has been retained. We have amended the draft work plan so that the three remaining proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11. (A fourth peatland-related task appears under the advisory tasks.) For additional information, see para 9 of SC52-10. The STRP welcomes clarification and instruction from the Standing Committee on which peatland-related tasks should move forward.
Panama	STRP NFP	Task description	5.3	A technical report is an output and not a task. In any case, it would be the drafting of the report what should be proposed in this section.		Comment noted
Sweden	AA (NFP)	Possible contribution of examples	5.3	Sweden has some examples on restoration from the Life-project "Life to ad(d)mire" that might be part of the Technical Report.		Comment noted and examples would be welcomed
USA	AA (NFP)	Reconfigure or delete task	5.3	This is the sixth proposed project on peatlands, and we have previously indicated this many proposals is completely unacceptable to us. If this were to be chosen by the STRP as the most important peatland project and the sole project under thematic area five it would need to have a climate change aspect added into it in order for it to be acceptable to us. Resolution XII/11para 24d does not have a climate change aspect explicitly elaborated, though it could be both; however, for this project to be acceptable to us under this thematic area it would need to be re-written to have a climate change aspect to it so that it corresponds with the thematic area in which it is found. Otherwise it must be deleted.		Task description and outputs have been adjusted to include a climate change dimension. We have amended the draft work plan so that the three remaining proposed peatland tasks in the thematic work areas align more closely with the COP's requests in Resolution XII.11. (A fourth peatland-related task appears under the advisory tasks.) For additional information, see para 9. of SC52-10. The STRP welcomes clarification and instruction from the Standing Committee on which peatland-related tasks should move forward.