

**Ramsar Information Sheet** 

Published on 24 March 2016

# **Belarus Iput River Floodplain**



Designation date Site number

30 March 2015 2262 Coordinates 52°30'49"N 31°28'42"E Area 3 501,80 ha

https://rsis.ramsar.org/ris/2262 Created by RSIS V.1.6 on - 5 October 2016

## Color codes

Fields back-shaded in light blue relate to data and information required only for RIS updates.

Note that some fields concerning aspects of Part 3, the Ecological Character Description of the RIS (tinted in purple), are not expected to be completed as part of a standard RIS, but are included for completeness so as to provide the requested consistency between the RIS and the format of a 'full' Ecological Character Description, as adopted in Resolution X.15 (2008). If a Contracting Party does have information available that is relevant to these fields (for example from a national format Ecological Character Description) it may, if it wishes to, include information in these additional fields.

### 1 - Summary

#### Summary

The territory represents the highly waterlogged floodplain of the lput river - the left tributary of the Sozh river. This natural complex is a transboundary wetland and extends beyond the Belarus to a territory of Briansk region of Russia. The site is a part of the resettlement and exclusion zone of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. Almost all economic activities are prohibited here.

The floodplain of the lput River remains in a natural state and is a representative example of middle rivers' floodplains which in the past were widespread in the Eastern Polesie. Broad-leaf and black alder forests waterlogged during most of the year, floodplain sparce oak woods, floodplain meadows and fen mires are represented here. Due to difficult access to this territory, natural floodplain communities and indigenous old forests with complex of typical species are still present here. There are 9 rare and endangered plant species and 11 animal species from the Red Data Book of Belarus on this territory.

## 2 - Data & location

- 2.1 Formal data
- 2.1.1 Name and address of the compiler of this RIS

#### Compiler 1

Name	Maximenkov Michail Viktorovich, Jurgenson Natalia Ateevna, Kozulin Alexander Vasilievich, Beliatskaya Olga Sergeevna
Institution/agency	The State Research and Production Association
Postal address	Akademicheskaya Str. 27 220072 Minsk Belarus
E-mail	maksimenkovm@gmail.com
Phone	+375 172 949069
Fax	+375 172 949069

#### 2.1.2 - Period of collection of data and information used to compile the RIS

From year	2013
To year	2014

#### 2.1.3 - Name of the Ramsar Site

Official name (in English, French or Spanish) Iput River Floodplain

Unofficial name (optional) Пойма реки Ипуть

#### 2.2 - Site location

#### 2.2.1 - Defining the Site boundaries

b) Digital map/image

<1 file(s) uploaded>

#### Boundaries description (optional)

Borders of the Ramsar site "lput River Floodplain" coincide with the borders of the Wetland Reserve of Local Importance "lput". Boundaries of the lput River Floodplain site go along edges of forest planning quarters and along the State border of Belarus and Russia.

#### 2.2.2 - General location

a) In which large administrative region does the site lie?	Dobrush district/Gomel region
b) What is the nearest town or population	Dahmah taura

centre? Dobrush town

#### 2.2.3 - For wetlands on national boundaries only

a) Does the wetland extend onto the territory of one or more other countries?
b) Is the site adjacent to another designated Ramsar Site on the Yes O No O

territory of another Contracting Party?

#### 2.2.4 - Area of the Site

Official area, in hectares (ha): 3501.8

Area, in hectares (ha) as calculated from 3503.29

#### 2.2.5 - Biogeography

Biogeographic regions							
Regionalisation scheme(s)	Biogeographic region						
EU biogeographic regionalization	Continental						

Other biogeographic regionalisation scheme

National: Eastern Polesie (Dementiev V.A., 1959. System of physiographic regions of Belarus/«Physical and economic geography of Byelorussia» Minsk, 150 p. (In Russian)).

## 3 - Why is the Site important?

#### 3.1 - Ramsar Criteria and their justification

#### Criterion 1: Representative, rare or unique natural or near-natural wetland types

Hydrological services provided	The lput River is longest and most affluent tributary of the Sozh River. The hydrology of the Sozh River (the tributary of the Dnieper River) is strongly defined by the state of the lput River's floodplain.
Other ecosystem services provided	The lput River Floodplain has a great importance for local people as a place of traditional amateur fishing. The site is situated in the Polesie region and together with already existing here Ramsar sites (Zvanets, Sporovskiy, Olmany mires, Middle Pripyat, Staryi Zhaden, National Park Pripyatskiy) contains rare biotopes (floodplain meadows, fen mires, deciduous waterlogged forests) which potentially could be inhabited by globally threatened bird species of wetlands.
Other reasons	The floodplain of the lput River remains in a natural state and is a representative example of middle river's floodplains which in the past were widespread in the Continental region, and in particular in the Eastern Polesie. Today, the most middle rivers' floodplains are drained and used for agriculture. Due to difficult access to this territory, natural floodplain communities and indigenous old forests with complex of typical species still present here. Thus, the site is one of the largest floodplain ecosystems in the Eastern Polesie, preserved in close to natural state.

#### ☑ Criterion 2 : Rare species and threatened ecological communities

#### Criterion 3 : Biological diversity

	The wetland supports populations of plant and animal species important for maintaining the biological diversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie - the region of the continental zone of Europe, which has a large proportion of well-preserved natural wetland ecosystems.
	The flora of the site is quite representative, rich and diverse due to variety of ecotopes on this territory.
	There are 611 species of higher vascular plants (85 families, 6 classes, 5 divisions) in the flora
Justilication	composition of this site.
	14 species of Ground beetles were found during investigations of the territory. There are 6 amphibia
	species, 5 reptile species and 108 bird species.
	9 plant species and 11 animal species (3 insect species, 8 bird species) from the Red Data Book of
	Belarus are registered on the territory of the site.

Criterion 4 : Support during critical life cycle stage or in adverse conditions

3.2 - Plant species whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

Scientific name	Common name	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	Other status	Justification
Festuca altissima			V				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Genista germanica			V				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Iris sibirica			Ø				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Lilium martagon			×				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Platanthera chlorantha		Ø	×				National Red List - VU	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Pyrethrum corymbosum		V	Ø				National Red List - CR	The species is rare element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Salvinia natans			Ø				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Urtica kioviensis		Ø	Ø				National Red List - EN	The species is rare element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region
Viola uliginosa			V				National Red List - NT	The species is important element of the biodiversity of floodplain ecosystems of Polesie Region

## 3.3 - Animal species whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

Phylum	Scientific name	Common name	Species qualifies under criterion2469	Species contributes under criterion 3 5 7 8	p. e Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Agabus clypealis		Øooo				EN Star				
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Anergates atratulus		ØOOO				VU Strainer Strainer				
CHORDATA/ AVES	Aquila pomarina	Lesser Spotted Eagle	ØDDD6	2						National Red List - VU	breeding pairs. The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
CHORDATA/ AVES	Ardea alba	Great Egret	Ø0006	2000						National Red List - VU	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
CHORDATA/ AVES	Aythya ferina 📲 🖳 💫	Common Pochard	Vooo								

Phylum	Scientific name	Common name	Species qualifies under criterion	Spe contr un crite 3 5	ecies ributes ider erion 7 8	Pop. Size I	Period of pop. Est.	% occurrence	IUCN Red List	CITES Appendix I	CMS Appendix I	Other Status	Justification
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Carabus cancellatus											National Red List - NT	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Carabus clatratus clatratus											National Red List - VU	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Carabus violaceus											National Red List - NT	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
CHORDATA/ AVES	Ciconia nigra	Black Stork	ØØOC			2			LC			National Red List - VU	breeding pairs
CHORDATA/ AVES	Circaetus gallicus	Short-toed Snake Eagle	ØOOC			1			LC			National Red List - EN	breeding pairs. The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
CHORDATA/ AVES	Crex crex	Corn Crake	ØOOC			50						National Red List - VU	males. The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
CHORDATA/ AVES	Dendrocopos leucotos	White-backed Woodpecker										National Red List - NT	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
ARTHROPODA / ARACHNIDA	Dolomedes plantarius		ØOOC									National Red List - VU	
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Dytiscus Iatissimus		ØOOC									National Red List - VU	
CHORDATA/ AVES	Falco subbuteo	Eurasian Hobby;Northern Hobby				2						National Red List - NT	breeding pairs. The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Formicoxenus nitidulus		ØOOC						VU Sigest				
CHORDATA/ AVES	Grus grus 🛃 🛀 🄌	Common Crane	ØOOC									National Red List - VU	The species contributes to the high biodiversity value of the wetland
ARTHROPODA / INSECTA	Harpagoxenus sublaevis		ØOOC										
CHORDATA/ AVES	Streptopelia turtur	European Turtle Dove;European Turtle-Dove	ØOOC										

3.4 - Ecological communities whose presence relates to the international importance of the site

Name of ecological community	Community qualifies under Criterion 2?	Description	Justification
9080 Fennoscandian deciduous swamp woods	V		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
Old pine forests on mineral soils			
Forests dominated by ashes		This type of forest is rare for the region and for the whole Belarus	
Rare broad-leaf tree species communities		Communities with a share or domination of rare broad-leaf species in tree stands composition: ash, wych elm and European white elm, linden	
Old silver birch forests with Betula complex of plants			
Old aspen forests			
Indigenous black alder forests on fen mires		These are unique because of their well- preserved condition and age composition	
Old upland and floodplain oak woods		These are unique because of their well- preserved condition and age composition	
9170 Galio-Carpinetum oak-hornbeam forests	V		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
3150 Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition – type vegetation	Ø		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
3270 Rivers with muddy banks with Chenopodion rubri p.p. and Bidention p.p. vegetation	Ø		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia)	Ø		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
6440 Alluvial meadows of river valleys of the Cnidion dubii	V		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
6450 Northern boreal alluvial meadows	×		Annex I of the Habitat Directive
91E0 Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnenion incanae, Salicion albae)	Ø		priority habitat, Annex I of the Habitat Directive
91F0 Riparian mixed forests of Quercus robur, Ulmus laevis and Ulmus minor, Fraxinus excelsior or Fraxinus angustifolia,	Ø		Annex I of the Habitat Directive

## 4 - What is the Site like? (Ecological character description)

#### 4.1 - Ecological character

The potential Ramsar site "lput River Floodplain" is a transboundary site situated on the border of two countries - Belarus and Russia. The floodplain of the lput River remains in a natural state and is a representative example of middle rivers' floodplains which in the past were widespread in the Eastern Polesie. Broad-leaf and black alder forests waterlogged during most of the year, floodplain sparce oak woods, floodplain meadows and fen mires are represented here. Due to difficult access to this territory, natural floodplain communities and indigenous old forests with complex of typical species are still present here.

Vegetation of the potential Ramsar site "lput River Floodplain" is mainly forest. The following forest types dominate here: rich in flora pine -Pteridium and pine - Oxalis forests, upland and floodplain oak woods, indigenous mire phytocenoses with prevailing of Black alder. As a result, a motley mosaic of communities is formed which creates a favourable conditions for a big number of protected flora and fauna species.

Despite the intensive forestry activities in the region, the high share of indigenous broad-leaf forests are preserved within the potential Ramsar site. Weakly disturbed by economic activities indigenous black alder communities and floodplain oak woods, unique because of their well-preserved condition and age composition are concentrated in the lput River's valley and floodplain. Old-growth stands have a significant share in the age structure of the site's forests. There are individual trees more than 120 years old among the old pine forests. More than 140 years old stands are found among oak wood and ash stands, and the age of separate trees amounts to 200 years. Small parts of the floodplain are occupied by ash dominated communities. Hard-to-reach parts of the floodplain are dominated by indigenous black alder communities with age of tree stands more than 80 years.

The potential Ramsar site "lput River Floodplain" has high importance for maintaning the biological diversity in the region. The site is situated in the Polesie region and together with already existing here Ramsar sites (Zvanets, Sporovskiy, Olmany mires, Middle Pripyat, Staryi Zhaden, National Park Pripyatskiy) contains rare biotopes (floodplain meadows, fen mires, deciduous waterlogged forests) which potentially could be inhabited by globally threatened bird species of wetlands.

### 4.2 - What wetland type(s) are in the site?

Inland wetlands

Wetland types (code and name)	Local name	Ranking of extent (1: greatest - 4: least)	Area (ha) of wetland type	Justification of Criterion 1
Fresh water > Flowing water >> M Permanent rivers/ streams/ creeks		0		
Fresh water > Lakes and pools >> Tp: Permanent freshwater marshes/ pools		4	168.09	
Fresh water > Lakes and pools >> Ts: Seasonal/ intermittent freshwater marshes/ pools on inorganic soils		3	584.8	
Fresh water > Marshes on inorganic soils >> W: Shrub- dominated wetlands		1	1593.3	Representative
Fresh water > Marshes on inorganic soils >> Xf: Freshwater, tree-dominated wetlands		2	1148.6	Representative
Fresh water > Marshes on peat soils >> Xp: Permanent Forested peatlands		0		

Human-made wetlands										
Wetland types (code and name)	Local name	Ranking of extent (1: greatest - 4: least)	Area (ha) of wetland type	Justification of Criterion 1						
9: Canals and drainage channels or ditches		0								

(ECD) Habitat connectivity

The site together with other Polesie's Ramsar sites considerably increases the resilience of populations of wetland bird species through the expansion of protected habitats' area - floodplain meadows, fen mires, deciduous waterlogged forests.

#### 4.3 - Biological components

#### 4.3.1 - Plant species

<no data available>

#### 4.3.2 - Animal species

Other noteworthy animal species

RIS for Site no. 2262, Iput River Floodplain, Belarus

Phylum	Scientific name	Common name	Pop. size	Period of pop. est.	%occurrence	Position in range /endemism/other
CHORDATA/AVES	Ciconia ciconia	White Stork				
CHORDATA/AVES	Lullula arborea	Woodlark				
CHORDATA/AVES	Phoenicurus phoenicurus	Common Redstart				
CHORDATAAVES	Phylloscopus sibillatrix					
CHORDATAAVES	Tringa totanus	Common Redshank				
CHORDATA/AVES	Vanellus vanellus	Northern Lapwing				

#### 4.4 - Physical components

#### 4.4.1 - Climate

Climatic region	Subregion
D: Moist Mid-Latitude climate with cold winters	Dfb: Humid continental (Humid with severe winter, no dry season, warm summer)

#### 4.4.2 - Geomorphic setting

a) Minimum elevation above sea level (in metres)	123
a) Maximum elevation above sea level (in metres)	135

Middle part of river basin 🗹

Please name the river basin or basins. If the site lies in a sub-basin, please also name the larger river basin. For a coastal/marine site, please name the sea or ocean.

lput River - the left tributary of the Sozh River

4.4.3 - Soil

Mineral 🗹

Organic 🗹

Are soil types subject to change as a result of changing hydrological conditions (e.g., increased salinity or acidification)?

Please provide further information on the soil (optional)

Soil cover is quite diverse. Insignificant slope of the surface and low degree of this territory's drainage led to a wide distribution of swampy soils. Sod-podzolic soils are common on floodplain terraces, these are changed by swampy and peat-mire soils in depressions.

#### 4.4.4 - Water regime

Water permanence
Presence?
Usually permanent water present
Usually seasonal, ephemeral or intermittent water present

#### Source of water that maintains character of the site

Presence?	Predominant water source
Water inputs from rainfall	
Water inputs from surface water	V

Water destination
Presence?
To downstream catchment

## Stability of water regime Presence?

Water levels fluctuating (including tidal)

Please add any comments on the water regime and its determinants (if relevant). Use this box to explain sites with complex hydrology.

Floods occur in April, the highest excess above the lowest level during the flood is 3-4 meters.

#### 4.4.5 - Sediment regime

<no data available>

#### 4.4.6 - Water pH

Akaline (pH>7.4) 🗹

4.4.7 - Water salinity

Fresh (<0.5 g/l) 🗹

#### 4.4.8 - Dissolved or suspended nutrients in water

Eutrophic 🗹

#### 4.4.9 - Features of the surrounding area which may affect the Site

Please describe whether, and if so how, the landscape and ecological characteristics in the area surrounding the Ramsar Site differ from the i) broadly similar O ii) significantly different I

site itself:

Surrounding area has greater urbanisation or development  $\ensuremath{\overline{\!\!\mathcal M}}$ 

Surrounding area has higher human population density

Surrounding area has more intensive agricultural use 🗹

Surrounding area has significantly different land cover or habitat types  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Z}}$ 

#### 4.5 - Ecosystem services

#### 4.5.1 - Ecosystem services/benefits

Provisioning Services						
Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance				
Food for humans	Sustenance for humans (e.g., fish, molluscs, grains)	Medium				

#### Regulating Services

togataling bol hood					
Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance			
Maintenance of hydrological regimes	Groundwater recharge and discharge	High			

#### Supporting Services

Ecosystem service	Examples	Importance/Extent/Significance
Biodiversity	Supports a variety of all life forms including plants, animals and microorganizms, the genes they contain, and the ecosystems of which they form a part	High

#### Within the site: 1000

Have studies or assessments been made of the economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by this Ramsar Site? Yes O No O Unknown I and the statement of the statement of the second statement of the statement of the second statement of the se

#### 4.5.2 - Social and cultural values

<no data available>

#### 4.6 - Ecological processes

(ECD) Vegetational productivity, pollination, regeneration processes, succession, role of fire, etc.	As a result of cessation of mowing and grazing the open floodplain meadows are overgrowing with shrubs
(ECD) Notable aspects concerning migration	The site is one of the most important in the South-Eastern Belarus stopovers of waterfowl during spring and autumn migrations.

## 5 - How is the Site managed? (Conservation and management)

## 5.1 - Land tenure and responsibilities (Managers)

#### 5.1.1 - Land tenure/ownership

Public ownership					
Category	Within the Ramsar Site	In the surrounding area			
National/Federal	1	1			
aovernment					

Provide further information on the land tenure / ownership regime (optional):

The territory is in State's ownership and lands are in a long-term use of the Gomel Forestry. Besides, the Russian enclave and military unit for the destruction of ammunition are situated here.

#### 5.1.2 - Management authority

Please list the local office / offices of any agency or organization responsible for managing the site:	Dobrush Regional Executive Committee Dobrush Regional Inspection on Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Gomel Forestry
Provide the name and title of the person or people with responsibility for the wetland:	Mohoreva Olga Fiodorovna, the head of the Dobrush Regional Executive Committee
Postal address:	246021, Belarus, Gomel town, Leningradskaya str. 42
E-mail address:	isp@dobrush.gov.by

#### 5.2 - Ecological character threats and responses (Management)

#### 5.2.1 - Factors (actual or likely) adversely affecting the Site's ecological character

Energy production and mining							
Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	In the surrounding area			
Mining and quarrying	Low impact	Medium impact	s and a second s				

Biological resource use				
Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	In the surrounding area
Logging and wood harvesting	Low impact	High impact	×	

Human intrusions and disturbance					
Factors adversely affecting site	Actual threat	Potential threat	Within the site	In the surrounding area	
(Para)military activities	Medium impact	Medium impact	s.		

#### Please describe any other threats (optional):

The territory of the site is a part of the resettlement and exclusion zone of Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. The level of radioactive contamination is 15-40 Curie/km2. Almost all economic activities are prohibited here, except for fire protection activities, forest's firebreaks care and road service. Radioactive contamination of the area led to saturation of ground litter and upper soil layers with products of radioactive decay. Nevertheless, no critically negative effects of this influence on the ecosystems have been identified. Besides, the Russian enclave and military unit for the destruction of ammunition are situated here.

#### 5.2.2 - Legal conservation status

## National legal designations Online information url Overlap with Ramsar Site Wetland Reserve of Local Importance Iput http://www.levonevski.net/pravo/ normreg2013/num02/d02291.html whole

#### 5.2.3 - IUCN protected areas categories (2008)

IV Habitat/Species Management Area: protected area managed mainly for conservation through management intervention

#### 5.2.4 - Key conservation measures

RIS for Site no. 2262, Iput River Floodplain, Belarus

## Measures Status Legal protection Implemented

#### Human Activities

Measures	Status		
Research	Proposed		

#### Other:

The wetland is situated in the resettlement and exclusion zone of Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant and almost all economic activities are prohibited here.

#### 5.2.5 - Management planning

Is there a site-specific management plan for the site? No

Has a management effectiveness assessment been undertaken for the site? Yes O No O

If the site is a formal transboundary site as indicated in section Data and location > Site location, are there shared management planning Yes O No processes with another Contracting Party?

#### 5.2.6 - Planning for restoration

Is there a site-specific restoration plan? Please select a value

#### 5.2.7 - Monitoring implemented or proposed

<no data available>

## 6 - Additional material

#### 6.1 - Additional reports and documents

#### 6.1.1 - Bibliographical references

1. The Red Data Book of the Republic of Belarus: rare and threatened plant species / L.I. Choruzik, L.M. Suschena, V.I. Parfenov and others. – 2nd edition – Minsk: BelEn, 2006. – 456 p. (In Russian).

2. Committee on land resources, geodesy and cartography at the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus. National Atlas of Belarus. Minsk: RUP "Belkartographia", 2002. – 292 p. (In Belarussian).

3. National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus. Statistical bulletin "Population numbers on 1 January 2013 and average annual population number for 2012 in the Republic of Belarus by regions, districts, towns, settlements of town type". Minsk, 2013. 17 p. http://belstat.gov.by/homep/ru/publications/population/2013/bulletin2013.php

4. Jurgenson, N., Shushkova, E., Shliahtich, E., Ustin, V. Protected Areas. Handbook. – Minsk: State Research and Production Association "Bioresources Research Center of the Belarusian National Academy of Sciences", 2012. – 204 p. (in Russian).

5. Yakushko, O., Marjina, L., Emelianov, Ju. Geo-morphology of Belarus: tutorial for students of geographical and geological departments. – Mn.: BSU, 1999. – 173 p. elib.bsu.by/bitstream/123456789/.../4/Геоморфология%20Беларуси.DOC

6. Dementiev V.A., 1959. System of physiographic regions of Belarus/«Physical and economic geography of Byelorussia» Minsk, 150 p. (In Russian)

7. EUROPEAN TOPIC CENTRE ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY Under contract with the European Environment Agency. The indicative Map of European Biogeographical Regions: Methodology and development. ETC/BD, Paris, February 2006.

www.eea.europa.eu/...maps/.../biogeographical-..

8. Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands 4th edition, 2010, Handbook 1. Wise use of wetlands.

#### 6.1.2 - Additional reports and documents

i. taxonomic lists of plant and animal species occurring in the site (see section 4.3) <no file available>

ii. a detailed Ecological Character Description (ECD) (in a national format)

<no file available>

iii. a description of the site in a national or regional wetland inventory

iv. relevant Article 3.2 reports

v. site management plan

vi. other published literature

<no data available>

#### 6.1.3 - Photograph(s) of the Site

#### Please provide at least one photograph of the site:



Forest in the floodplain of the lput River (*Maximenkov M.V.*, 2007)



The floodplain of the lput River (*Maximenkov M.V.,* 2007)



Fen mires overgown with shrubs and combined with oxbow lakes in the floodplain of the Iput River ( Maximenkov M.V., 2007)

#### 6.1.4 - Designation letter and related data

Designation letter <1 file(s) uploaded>

Date of Designation 2015-03-30