



MedWet Strategic Planning Workshop 2-3 November 2017, Hotel City, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Analysis of the questionnaire

MedWet Questionnaire 2017 rapid analysis to discover trends

“MedWet - Wetlands for a Sustainable Mediterranean Region”

Extent of responses

The eleven questions below were sent to all MedWet members (i.e. 28 country members plus 15 non-country members) in early August and again in early September with the request to respond by mid-September. Until mid-October, we got responses by 30% of the members (13 out of 43):

9 MedWet member countries responded: Algeria, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Spain, Turkey.

4 MedWet non-country members responded: EKBY Greek Biotope Wetland Centre, IUCN-Med, Thymio Papayannis, Tour du Valat (incl. Med. Wetlands Observatory).

19 MedWet member countries did not reply: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Syria, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia.

11 MedWet non-country members did not reply: ARPAT Italy, Berne Convention, European Commission, ICNB Portugal, CEHUM Spain, IWMI, WWF, Barcelona Convention (incl. MAP), BirdLife International, Wetlands International, UNDP.

“Why focusing on Mediterranean wetlands?”

I. The three most important reasons why wetlands are important in my country or for my organisation (list the most relevant ecosystem services, etc.):

- wetlands are important for **biodiversity (10x)**, recreation (2x), tourism (3x) and research
- wetlands provide important **hydrological services and water resources (8x)**
- wetlands provide economic returns on **products (5x)**: fisheries, agriculture, salt, rural development
- wetlands are important habitats for **migratory birds (4x)**
- wetlands are assets when fighting desertification (3x)
- wetlands provide cultural heritage and educational opportunities (3x)
- wetlands help mitigate flood and climate impacts (2x)
- wetlands are threatened and disappearing (with them their values and services) (2x)
- wetlands store carbon



2. The analyses and reports produced by the Mediterranean Wetland Observatory (MWO) that were most useful for my country or my organisation:

- “Mediterranean Wetland Outlook” synthesis (5x)**
- publications on **land uses and biodiversity (4x)**
- awareness documents (3x)**
- wetland **inventory, management, monitoring and assessment tools (3x)**
- EO and GIS cartography tools, spatial dynamics analysis **(2x)**
- training tools
- science-based documentation to increase knowledge
- documents on cultural heritage
- earlier series of booklets produced by Tour du Valat
- need to include the Ramsar NFP in the preparation of reports

3. What analyses and work should the Mediterranean Wetland Observatory (MWO) undertake in order to provide my country or my organisation with most useful information?:

- wetland **surveys, status and assessments, including valuation (6x)**
- on **indicators** and the development of **data bases (4x)**
- on **ecosystem services (3x)**
- capacity building** training **(2x)**
- sharing of **best practices (2x)**
- integration of wetlands conservation into different sectors, including water basin planning
- on wetland dynamics
- more communication among members
- development of national monitoring and observatory mechanisms
- focus on mountain wetlands
- wetland management, restoration and conservation
- strategic communication for policy makers
- improve information for administration and public
- land use pressures on Mediterranean wetlands
- focus on concrete results and tangible products for MedWet members

4. On what subjects should the experts of the Scientific and Technical Network (STN) focus in the short term? What kind of product would you find most useful (reports, leaflets, trainings, workshops, assessments...?) (NB: The 5 working groups of the STN are focussing on Biodiversity, Inventories, Climate change, Water, Ecosystem services):

- regional syntheses on biodiversity, inventory, ecosystem services (10x)**
- climate change (9x)**
- water resources (6x)**
- provide specific **training (4x)**
- wetland **restoration** and rehabilitation and its techniques **(2x)**
- ecotourism facilities and opportunities **(2x)**
- policy briefs based on scientific findings for decision makers
- brief reports and leaflets
- workshops and videos
- support the Mediterranean Wetlands Observatory
- cooperation with local communities and decision makers



5. The key added value that MedWet brings (or should bring) to my country or my organisation/community:

- _ **exchange** of know-how on communication, education, cooperation, indicators **(6x)**
- _ development of **joint projects for solutions** and twinnings **(6x)**
- _ **dissemination** of information and tools **(5x)**
- _ information and comparisons **for decision and policy makers (4x)**
- _ providing a comparison of the **national situation vs. the regional level (3x)**
- _ regional network development (2x)
- _ rising effectiveness of conservation programmes (2x)
- _ capacity building for staff (2x)
- _ dialogue platform between governments and civil society actors
- _ valorisation of ecosystem services for adaptive responses to global changes
- _ enhancing eco-tourism

“Which is the most efficient structure for MedWet?”

6. The functions of the professional MedWet Coordinator and his/her Secretariat. Are both needed? What would be the most efficient composition of staff? Make a concrete proposal for the functions and the positions needed:

- _ **active coordinator responsible (10x)** for the implementation of the action plan adopted by MedWet/Com
- _ besides the coordinator a **communication officer (7x)** and a **project officer (6x)**
- _ additional staff on a temporary basis depending on additional income (3x)
- _ besides above officers administrative staff (2x), a natural resources economist and a wetland conservation specialist
- _ additional staff based on coordinator's needs/decision
- _ the secretariat should move to a less expensive country
- _ a radical proposal to have no coordinator, the MedWet chair coordinating, supported by a secretariat (head, communications, scientific officers) attach the secretariat to a wetland centre/NGO and a bureau

7. Does MedWet need a Steering Group and how should it be composed? Would a smaller Bureau be more efficient? How should the Bureau be composed? Make a concrete proposal:

- _ **steering group is needed (8x)** to support the small secretariat, but it should be composed of **persons able and willing (3x)** to engage in its work, representing geographical and gender diversity (2x)
- _ **small bureau (5x)**, such as the current FoC, seems effective it should be composed of persons able and willing to engage in its work, representing geographical and gender diversity
- _ with a good coordinator: no steering group is needed, possibly only task forces for specific themes
- _ a bureau replacing the steering group: MedWet chair, 3 regional country members (?), 1 wetland centre/scientific institution, 1 NGO/civil society, 1 Ramsar Secretariat

“How to support MedWet and its work?”

8. How can my country (or my organisation – responses at the bottom) support MedWet and its structures (MWO, STN, Secretariat) in cash and in kind:

- _ providing infrastructure for **meetings** or seminars, **in kind support (8x)**



- _ **paying annual contributions in time (7x)**
- _ creating **synergies** among different partners and **capacities at national level (2x)**
- _ preparation of educational materials (2x)
- _ support the submission of project proposals, also to development cooperation agencies
- _ my country needs a Ramsar COP Resolution to pay annual dues (Turkey)
- _ Tour du Valat is willing to continue its current support at different levels
- _ EKBY is willing to contribute and participate in STN
- _ IUCN is willing to support project development, organising seminars, and political lobbying
- _ Thymio Papayannis/Med-INA is willing to provide voluntary secondments and financial support

9. Where should additional financial support for MedWet activities come from? Make concrete proposals:

- _ **projects submitted to donors (7x)**, allowing different countries to work together, and the secretariat to obtain overheads to cover its costs
- _ the secretariat to raise specific funds for its own functions of networking and communication/outreach, capacity building and policy development **(3x)**
- _ **EU (5x), GEF (3x)**, FFEM, GCF, IKI
- _ work with other organisations that implement environmental or wetland projects (2x)
- _ private business partners (2x)
- _ ask non-governmental MedWet members to pay modest annual contributions (2x)
- _ Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- _ innovative funding such as BioFin

10. Which are the partners that MedWet should cooperate with as a priority? List organisations and countries:

- _ secretariat of **CBD (4x), UNEP-MAP (5x), EU (6x), AEWA (2x)**, Mediterranean Union (3x), MedPAN, IPBES, CITES, CMS, UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNDP, GEF, League of Arab States, EEA, Medwaterbirds, focused on **tangible outcomes (2x)**
- _ **IOPs (2x)** of Ramsar, out of which **IUCN (4x)**
- _ **Ramsar Site managers (2x)**
- _ countries: France (2x), Italy (2x), Morocco, Portugal, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Egypt
- _ wetland-related research centres and universities
- _ other Ministries and administrations
- _ stakeholder groups (fishermen, farmers, tourist sector)

“Any additional views/suggestions that you consider to be useful?”

- _ MedWet should limit its focus on operational activities showing added value
- _ support strategies and policies of its members (notably countries) based on the evidence-based work of MWO and STRN
- _ develop a good representation of and coordination between the national focal points
- _ have a good representation of MedWet in Ramsar meetings
- _ develop a RS managers network, support it technically and facilitate know-how transfer among them
- _ focus on cooperative projects and actions among different MedWet members
- _ being adaptive and flexible, avoiding heavy formalisms and administrative structures
- _ strengthen the MedWet Committee as MedWet’s core body, through an appropriate role of its state members (funders)
- _ simplifying MedWet structures, avoiding duplication and bureaucracy



- _ effective and professional secretariat operation
- _ MedWet and Ramsar National Focal Points need to be identical (as long as MedWet is a Ramsar Regional Initiative)
- _ a priority for MedWet is to reinforce its relations with the administrative authorities in the member countries to undertake joint activities at regional level