

AIDE-MEMOIRE

13th Montréal Process Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting

Moscow and Suzdal, Russian Federation

2nd – 6th July 2012

Summary

At the 22nd meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group held in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada the Montréal Process Technical Advisory Committee was tasked to *'identify appropriate indicators and mechanisms that provide a stronger foundation for describing how sustainably managed forests conserve soil and water resources and related services and functions'* (section 10: http://www.rinya.maff.go.jp/mpci/meetings/22_e.html). This meeting was held to initiate this work. The meeting also provided an opportunity to provide technical input to further progress activity underway in the Working Group related to mechanisms for communicating Sustainable Forest Management.

Moscow

Information sharing day

The meeting was opened by Mr Alexander Gorelik Director of the UN House and Mr Alexander Paniflov, Stats-Secretary – Deputy Head of the Russian Federal Forestry Agency (RFFA) who welcomed all participants (Annex 1). The day's programme (Annex 2) focussed on a range of presentations made and discussed by Montréal Process countries (Australia, China, Korea and New Zealand), the Russian Federal Forestry Agency, World Bank, UNECE/FAO, and WWF meeting participants on the topic of advances in Sustainable Forest Management. The Montréal Process TAC Convenor and Liaison Office also provided updates on recent activities (Annex 3).

Vladimir Region

Field Tour

The participants of the meeting were hosted by the Forestry Department of the Vladimir Oblast (region) for a field tour of the Vladimir base of aviation forest protection, the Murmetsevo Forest Engineering Technical School, and mixed species plantings carried out by K.F Tuermer between 1893 and 1899. The visit generated significant local interest and a number of delegates were interviewed for Russia's channel 2 news programme with an item subsequently broadcast on the meeting and visit.

Suzdal meeting

Soil and Water

- The agenda was discussed and agreed (Annex 4)
- Countries and other participants (UNECE/FAO, WWF, Silver Taiga Foundation) presented and discussed their perspectives on soil and water (Annex 5).
- Key Issues related to soil and water were identified by the group
- The indicator set was interrogated for its ability to provide information to support the Key Issues and gaps identified
- Mechanisms to further develop a response to the Key Issues were outlined for post TAC 13 meeting work

Key conclusions

- Soil and Water related issues identified included
 - Recognition that water is a boundary crossing issue
 - Multiple agencies are involved with soil and water and
 - Forests operate within a wider landscape and mix of land uses

- Increasing natural and human related pressures are affecting forests
- Soil erosion, its impacts and mitigation are a very high priority topic in MP countries with steepland forests
- Public awareness of forests and their role in soil and water
- Interdependencies of issues are very important
- Forests as a supplier of ecosystem services
- The MP C&I framework is a very good foundation for addressing soil and water issues, but some gaps were identified
- Series of actions identified (Annex 6)
 - Develop a discussion paper on cross sectoral linkages
 - Wider testing of Japanese erosion methodologies by member countries
 - Australia to propose a supplementary statement in the technical notes with a provision to account for change in 'landuse' if forest cover has been removed
 - Small scoping group to develop indicators that reflect supply of ecosystem services to 'neighbours' and wider society
 - Review how forests are incorporated in national water agency monitoring and reporting frameworks
 - Reflect on/revisit indicators 4.2.a, 4.3.a after next reporting round.
 - Undertake country case studies on pressures (as reflected by increasing regulation) and ability to report on impacts on forests water supply and soil (NZ lead)
 - Continue to share advances in methodologies related to S&W across countries – possibly a Montréal Process web site area for sharing method developments.
 - Proposed international workshop on harvesting damage, mitigation, best management practises and training needs.
 - Review paper on impacts of planted forests on water
 - Create a portal on the MPWG website, which will include links to Methodology (see issue above)
 - Develop paper including graphic showing how indicators interact and can be used to evaluate effects of impacts, policy changes etc – application of pressure:state:response to soil and water indicators
 - Consider how to incorporate spatial component into existing (*soil and water*) indicators

Next steps

- Flesh out context statements associated with each Key Issue
 - Note the few 'orphans'
- Work on agreed actions – deadline end 2012

Communications

- Due to a storm on the East Coast Peter Gaulke (TAC member USA) was unable to attend the meeting and lead the discussion on this topic, Using material provided by him to guide discussion (Annex 7) the TAC discussed the draft communications plan (Annex 8).
- Key conclusions are summarised in Annex 9, the three main points were:
 - Advancing the website -The website could be enhanced by addition of areas devoted to:
 - advances in methodologies
 - information resources and links related to forests, soils and water
 - a news and articles section updated with one item per country per quarter
 - Advancing the communications plan – stories to be communicated should firstly be topical.

- Advance work from joint meeting - electronic communications between members and the suggestion of a member country intranet was suggested.

C&I and Governance

Observers from the World Bank presented the PROFOR/Bank's approach to developing a Governance diagnostics tool (www.profor.info/profor/knowledge/defining-forest-governance-indicators) and indicators measuring governance in the broad sense. They shared the results of field implementation in Russia, its high relevance to the efforts of the Montréal process ongoing work on developing criteria and indicators for SFM, in particular criterion 7 Annex 10). Further collaboration was proposed, having in view that the Bank is planning to continue the work on diagnostics and indicators for forest governance in ENPI-FLEG-2 countries (Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Russia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan) the results and experience are of high relevance to the Montréal Process.

Other outcomes

- UNECE/FAO are keen to work together with MP and Forest Europe on technical and scientific issues related to C&I reporting.
- Establish contact between Wairiki Institute of Technology School of Forestry and Muromtsevsky Forestry College.

Next steps:

- Report back to Montréal Process Working Group phone meeting 18th July 2012.
- Communicate findings to TAC members of countries unable to attend and seek input
- Establish regular Skype/phone/email contact schedule with TAC for follow up actions
- Undertake agreed actions
- Prepare final report and recommendations to MPWG by May 31st 2013

Acknowledgements:

The TAC acknowledges the support of the Russian Federal Forestry Agency, the Vladimir Forestry Department, the involvement and significant input of UNECE, World Bank Russia, WWF Russia, the Vladimir base aviation protection of forests and Muromtsevsky Forestry College, and the Director of the UN Building in Moscow Mr. Alexander Gorelik for hosting the information sharing day. It extends especial appreciation to Deputy Head of the Forestry Department of the Vladimir Region, Mr. Constantin Alekseev, Head of GBU VO "Vladimir base aviation protection of forests", Mr. Timofei Bakurov, Head of Regional control office management Ms. Elena Pylenok, Director of Muromtsevsky Forestry College, Mr. Alexander Kuklev, Head of Administration Sudogodskii district, Mr. Alexander Starodubtsev, Director Andreevsky forestry, Mr. Eugene Malyshev and Dr. Maria Palenova (Russian MP WG member), Igor Volkov, Marina Linicheva for their contributions to the very successful outcomes of the meeting.

Annexes:

1. List of participants
2. Moscow Agenda
3. Information day presentations
4. Suzdal Agenda and TAC Convenor background
5. Soil and Water presentations
6. Soil and Water Issues, Gaps, and Actions
7. Communications item discussion guidance
8. Draft Joint Communications plan
9. TAC conclusions on the communications item
10. C&I and Governance presentations

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

13th Montréal Process Technical Advisory Committee
‘Soil and Water – telling the story for forests’
2nd – 6th July 2012
Moscow and Suzdal, Russia
List of participants

1	Timothy	Payn	Scion Department: Forest Environment and Economics, New Zealand	Principal Scientist
2	Ichiro	Nagame	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Forestry Agency, Japan	Senior Policy Analyst for International Affairs
3	Claire	Howell	Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, National Forest Inventory Department, Australia	Senior Scientist, Manager
4	Maria Veronica	Oyarzun	National Forest Service Department: Native Forest, Chile	Forestry Engineer
5	Jingpin	Lei	Chinese Academy of Forestry: Research Institute of forestry, China	Associate Professor
6	Wenfa	Xiao	Chinese Academy of Forestry, Research Institute of forest ecology and environment protection, China	Professor, General Director
7	Chaozong	Xia	Academy of Forest Inventory and Planning, State Forestry Administration Division of Forest Resources Monitoring, China	Senior Engineer
8	Shouxin	Xie	State Forestry, Department of Forest Resources Management, Division of Forest Resources Utilization, China	Chief Division
9	Toshihiro	Shima	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Forestry Agency, Japan	Policy Coordinator
10	Timothy David	Barnard	Scion Forest Environment and Economics, New Zealand	Team Manager
11	Peter	Gaulke	USDA Forest Service, National Forest System - Ecosystem Management Planning, USA	NEPA, Strategic Planning & Sustainability Specialist
12	Pablo Luis	Peri	INTA, Department Forestry, Argentina	Forestry engineer
13	Roman	Michalak	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe	Forestry Officer

			Department: Sustainable Land Management Division	
14	Se Kyung	Chong	Korea Forest Research , Forest Policy Department, South Korea	Researcher
15	Przemyslaw	Majewski	Silver Taiga Foundation, Russia	Director of the Silver Taiga Foundation and Project Leader of the Komi Model Forest
16	Alexander	Panfilov	Federal Forestry Agency of RF	Deputy Head
17	Maria	Palenova	Russian Research Institute for Silviculture and Mechanization of Forestry (VNIILM) , Russia	Head of the International support sector
18	Andrey	Filipchuk	Russian Research Institute for Silviculture and Mechanization of Forestry (VNIILM) , Russia	Deputy director
19	Marina	Nezhlukto	Russian Research Institute for Silviculture and Mechanization of Forestry (VNIILM) , Russia	Head of Information Management Sector
20	Andrey	Yugov	Russian Research Institute for Silviculture and Mechanization of Forestry (VNIILM) , Russia	Researcher
21	Igor V.	Volkov	FGUP "Roslesinforg", Russia	
22	Marina	Smetanina	World Bank , Russia	Coordinator for ENPI FLEG Regional Program in Russia,
23	Evgeny	Kuzmichev	World Bank , Russia	Senior Consultant for for ENPI FLEG Regional Program in Russia
24	Vladislava	Nemova	World Bank, Russia	ENPI FLEG Regional Program Secretariat,
25	Nikolay	Shmatkov	WWF Russia, Russia	Forest Policy Coordinator, the chief editor of magazine "Sustainable forest management"
26	Maxim	Bobrovsky	Institute of Physicochemical and Biological Problems in Soil of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia	Senior Researcher
27	Alexander	Gorelik	UN Office in Moscow, Russia	Director
28	Elena	Armand	UNDP, Russia	
29	Marina	Linicheva	Federal Forestry Agency, Russia	Consultant

13-ое заседание Технического Консультативного Комитета Монреальского процесса
13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
 2-е июля 2012 г., Дом ООН, г. Москва
2nd July 2012, UN House, Moscow
Provisional Chairman Agenda

ANNEX2: MOSCOW AGENDA

Время /Time	Деятельность/повестка дня Activity/Agenda item	Модератор/выступающий Chairman/ Speaker
02-07-2012 понедельник Monday		Председатель Филипчук Андрей Николаевич, председатель Европейской лесной комиссии ФАО Chairman Mr. Andrey Filipchuk Chair of the FAO European Forestry Commission
	Пункт 1. Открытие и приветствия. Утверждение повестки дня Item 1. Opening and welcome. Adoption of the agenda	
9:00 – 9:10	Представитель Дома ООН Welcome from Director of the UN House in Moscow	Горелик Александр Семенович Alexander Gorelik
9:10 – 9:20	представитель Рослесхоза Welcome from Deputy Head of Federal Forestry Agency of the Federal Forestry Agency	Панфилов Александр Викторович Aleksander Panfilov
9:20 – 9:30	Представитель Секретариата Монреальского процесса Montréal Process Liaison Office	Шима Тошихиро (Япония) Toshihiro Shima (Japan)
	Пункт 2. Обмен информацией в области устойчивого управления лесами Item 2. Information Sharing in Sustainable Forest Management	
9:30 – 9:50	Обзор развития системы индикаторов МП Recent Montreal Process technical developments - indicators review	Т.Пайн (НЗ) Tim Payn
10:10 – 10:30	Использование критериев и индикаторов МП для планирования в лесном хозяйстве Using C&I for planning	Т.Барнард (НЗ) Tim Barnard (NZ)
10:30 – 10:50	Последние усовершенствования процесса отчетности, представления данных и коммуникации по критериям и индикаторам МП Communications/website	П.Гауке (США) Peter Gaulke (USA)
10:50 – 11:30	Обмен опытом применения критериев и индикаторов МП на региональном и национальном уровнях стран-членов Монреальского процесса	Ховелл Клэр (Австралия), Чонг Се Кунг (Ю.Корея), Хайо Венфа (Китай) Claire Howell (Australia). Se Kyung Chong

10:50 – 11:30	Обмен опытом применения критериев и индикаторов МП на региональном и национальном уровнях стран-членов Монреальского процесса Presentations by TAC members on recent technical developments, country highlights	Ховелл Клэр (Австралия), Чонг Се Кунг (Ю.Корея), Хайо Венфа (Китай) Claire Howell (Australia) . Se Kyung Chong (Korea) , Xiao Wenfa (China)
11:30-12:00	Кофе-брейк Coffee/tea	
12:00 – 12:20	Использование российских индикаторов для оценки эффективного управления лесами The use of criteria and indicators for evaluating good governance of forests	Андрей .Филипчук (ВНИИЛМ) Andrey Flipchuk (VNIILM)
12:20 – 12:50	Критерии устойчивого управления лесами в рейтинге Всемирного фонда дикой природы России: уроки и перспективы The criteria for sustainable forest management in the ranking of WWF-Russia: lessons and perspectives.	Николай Шматков (WWF России) Nikolay Shmatkov (WWF Russia)
12:50 – 13:20	Результаты осуществления проекта Всемирного банка «Диагностика качества управления в лесном секторе России» The results of the World Bank project "Diagnostic quality of governance in the forestry sector in Russia"	Марина Сметанина, Евгений Кузьмичев (Всемирный банк) Marina Smetanina, Evgenii Kuzmichev (World Bank)
13:20 – 13:50	Устойчивое управление лесами: европейские перспективы Sustainable forest management: a European perspective	Р.Михалак (ЕЖКООН) Roman.Michalak (UNECE)
13:50 – 14:00	Техническая информация по проведению заседания 2-6 июля Technical information from the local organizers of the meeting	Мария Паленова Maria Palenova
14:00-15:00	Обед Lunch	
	Пункт 3. Почва и вода – история для лесов Item 3. Soil and Water – telling the story for forests	Модератор Тим Пайн Moderator Tim Payn
15:00-15:20	Лесные почвы Европейской России: биотические и антропогенные факторы формирования Forest soil in European Russia: biotic and anthropogenic factors in pedogenesis	Максим Бобровский (ИФХиБПП РАН) Maxim Bobrovsky (RAS of RF)

15.20 – 16.00	Подготовка технических сессий 13-го заседания ТКК МП: цели и задачи заседания Preparation for Suzdal technical sessions: Outline of goals and objectives of technical session	
16.00 – 17.00	Обсуждение и утверждение повестки дня 13-го заседания ТКК МП Discuss and Finalise Agenda	

ANNEX 3: MOSCOW INFORMATION DAY PRESENTATIONS (all presentations can be found on Montréal Process website)



www.mpci.org



Montreal Process Developments, Achievements, and Future Directions

Dr Tim Payn

Convenor, Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee



Framing Futures using C&I

Tim Barnard, Loretta Garrett and Tim Payn



Использование российских индикаторов для оценки эффективного управления лесами

The use of criteria and indicators for evaluating good governance of forests



13-ое заседание Технического
Консультативного Комитета Монреальского
процесса

13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory
Committee Meeting 2nd July 2012, Moscow



Рейтинг уровня
государственного управления
лесами в субъектах РФ по
методике WWF России

Николай Шматов
Координатор проектов по лесной
политике WWF России
2/07/2012



ДИАГНОСТИКА КАЧЕСТВА УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В ЛЕСНОМ СЕКТОРЕ РОССИИ

*Евгений Павлович Кузьмичев,
Марина Игоревна Сметанина,
Немова Владислава Игоревна*



Sustainable forest management: European perspective

Roman Michalak
UNECE-FAO Forestry and Timber Section

13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
'Soil and Water – telling the story for forests'
2 July 2012



Forest soil in European Russia: biotic and anthropogenic factors in pedogenesis

Maxim Bobrovsky



Institute of Physicochemical and Biological Problems of
Soil Sciences of Russian Academy of Science
Pushchino (Russia)

ANNEX 4: SUZDAL AGENDA AND BACKGROUND TO WORK PROGRAMME

(presentation can be found on Montréal Process website)

<p>Wednesday 4th, Hotel Pushkarskaya Sloboda, Suzdal</p>	<p>9:00 – 11:30 11:30 – 12:00 12:00 – 14:00 14:00 – 15:00 15:00-17:00 18:00-20:00</p>	<p>Montréal Process Country experiences with soil and water reporting (chair T. Payn) Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Coffee/tea Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Russia, USA Lunch Other Process experiences with soil and water reporting R.Michalak (UNECE) Experience of European countries reporting on forest soil, forest, water P.Majevsky (Silver Taiga) Issues of sustainable management of river systems of northern forests - experience on the river Mezen Tour of Suzdal</p>
<p>Thursday 5th, Hotel Pushkarskaya Sloboda, Suzdal</p>	<p>9:00 - 17:00 19:00</p>	<p>Discussion of key soil and water issues and development of technical paper outline (chair T. Payn) Workshop Dinner</p>
<p>Friday 6th, Hotel Pushkarskaya Sloboda, Suzdal</p>	<p>9:00 – 13:00 13:00 – 15:00 15:00 – 17:00 17:30 – 19:00</p>	<p>Communicating Sustainable Forest Management (chair P Gaulke) Criteria and Indicators for Governance (chair T. Payn) Workshop summary and wrap up, next actions (chair T. Payn) Cultural program</p>
<p>Saturday 7th Suzdal-Moscow</p>	<p>7:00 8:00-11:00</p>	<p>check-out Travel Suzdal - Moscow</p>



www.scion.co.nz

Montreal Process 13th TAC meeting work programme

Dr Tim Payne
Convenor, Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee



SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Topics

- Soil and Water
- Communications
- Sharing progress and new ideas
 - Links of C&I to forest legality, governance

SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Outcomes by the end of the week

- To have advice for the Working Group on enhancements related to telling the soil and water story and a plan for getting there
- To have comments and suggestions for the communications sub-committee on the communications plan and the way forward and to have identified a list of good edgy stories to tell about SFM
- To have collectively learnt more

SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Agenda

- Wednesday
 - Soil and water
- Thursday
 - Communications
 - Joint activities, governance
- Friday
 - Conclude soil and water
 - Conclude communications
 - Develop next steps/actions/technical paper outline

SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Soil and Water

- To have advice for the Working Group on enhancements related to telling the soil and water story and a plan for getting there

SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Background papers

- Working Group water paper
- Criterion 4 Indicators
- Indicator list

SCION
New Zealand's Forestry Research Institute

Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators (third edition - 2009)

Table 1.1. The Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators

<p>1.0 Purpose</p> <p>1.1 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.2 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.3 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.4 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.5 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.6 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.7 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.8 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.9 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p> <p>1.10 To provide a common framework for assessing the state of forest health and vitality in the context of the Montreal Process.</p>	<p>2.0 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.1 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.2 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.3 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.4 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.5 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.6 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.7 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.8 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.9 Assessment Framework</p> <p>2.10 Assessment Framework</p>	<p>3.0 Indicators</p> <p>3.1 Indicators</p> <p>3.2 Indicators</p> <p>3.3 Indicators</p> <p>3.4 Indicators</p> <p>3.5 Indicators</p> <p>3.6 Indicators</p> <p>3.7 Indicators</p> <p>3.8 Indicators</p> <p>3.9 Indicators</p> <p>3.10 Indicators</p>	<p>4.0 Indicators</p> <p>4.1 Indicators</p> <p>4.2 Indicators</p> <p>4.3 Indicators</p> <p>4.4 Indicators</p> <p>4.5 Indicators</p> <p>4.6 Indicators</p> <p>4.7 Indicators</p> <p>4.8 Indicators</p> <p>4.9 Indicators</p> <p>4.10 Indicators</p>
--	---	---	---



Soil and Water Indicators – 1995 and 2009


<p>1995</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.0 Area and percent of forest land with significant soil erosion 4.1 Area and percent of forest land managed primarily for production functions (e.g. agriculture, forest production, water production, timber, etc.) 4.2 Proportion of stream kilometers in forested catchments in which stream flow and stream bed significantly deviated from the historic range of variability 4.3 Area and percent of forest land with significant climatic and/or hydrological changes in stream catchment properties 4.4 Area and percent of forest land with significant climatic or changes in soil physical properties (including forest soil water) in forested catchments 4.5 Proportion of water bodies in forest areas (e.g. stream kilometers, other features) in which stream flow and stream bed significantly deviated from the historic range of variability 4.6 Proportion of water bodies in forest areas (e.g. stream kilometers, other features) in which stream flow and stream bed significantly deviated from the historic range of variability 4.7 Area and percent of forest land experiencing an accumulation of pesticide residues 	<p>2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Proportion of forest land managed primarily for production functions (e.g. agriculture, forest production, water production, timber, etc.) 4.2a Proportion of forest management activities that result in protection measures 4.2b Area and percent of forest land with significant soil erosion 4.3 Water 4.3a Proportion of forest management activities that result in protection measures, or other measures, in stream kilometers 4.3b Area and percent of water bodies or stream kilometers in forest areas with significant change in stream flow and stream bed from historic conditions
---	--



TAC task – soil and water


10. Water in Relation to the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators.

- The Working Group welcomed contributions from Australia and Argentina on issues associated with water management and forestry within their countries, such as extreme drought, restrictions and new policies. There was considerable discussion on the relevance of the current set of indicators for addressing the issues associated with water and forests for both the Montreal Process as well as other international processes.
- The Working Group asked the Technical Advisory Committee to identify appropriate indicators and mechanisms that provide a stronger foundation for describing how sustainably managed forests conserve soil and water resources and related services and functions. The MPWG asked the TAC to present a report 90 days before the 23rd MPWG meeting.




Approach

- Identify issues countries face regarding soil and water
- Outline common issues and evaluate against indicator set
 - Does the indicator set give us enough to tell the story
 - Matrix of issues * relevant indicators
- Identify gaps where enhancements will add value
- Develop a technical report outline for WG



To do this week!

- Country Presentations
 - Listen
 - Record big issues as you hear them (on stickies)
 - Discuss/Comment
- Small groups
 - Identify common issues
- Plenary
 - Compile list of common issues
- Small groups
 - Map issues to indicators
 - E.g. soil erosion > 4.1.2a, 4.2b, 4.3b
 - Identify gaps
- Develop outline for technical report




Communications

Review of the Communications Plan

- The plan is being finalised by the communications sub-committee and is focused on short-term objectives (as per the above action plan). The final draft of the plan is attached as Annex one.
- It is requested that the TAC consider and make recommendations on:
 - Development of the template advisory elements of the communications plan especially on a process to enhance and refine the CSM and SPW story and keep it relevant with current needs; and
 - Technical enhancements that will enable members to be published

Technical and theme coverage

- It is requested that the TAC:
 - discuss and recommend 'hot topics' that are challenging and 'red' stone issues
 - develop a list of SPW where CSM can offer resources and which have specific relevance for a range of our member countries
 - prepare recommendations on a process to ensure the scientific and technical usefulness of the messages, including an editing process



ANNEX 5: SOIL AND WATER PRESENTATIONS (all presentations can be found on Montréal Process website)



Japan Forest Technology Association

Suzdal- Russia, 2-6th July, 2012



A proposal for indicators to detect signs of soil erosion

Satoru Miura, Forestry & Forest Products Research Institute
Masahiko Kanamori, Japan Forest Technology Association
Naaka Ogaya, Japan Forest Technology Association
Ichiro Nagame, Forestry Agency, Min. of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
JAPAN

1



Montreal Process Country experiences with soil and water reporting from China

13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory
Committee Meeting
2-6 July 2012



ARGENTINA EXPERIENCE



13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
2nd– 6th July 2012
Moscow and Suzdal, Russia



Issues of sustainable management of river systems of northern forests - experience on the river Mezen, Republic of Komi, Russia.

Przemyslaw Majewski
Silver Taiga Foundation
Komi Model Forest
Syktyvkar, Republic of Komi,
www.silvertaiga.ru

Issues of sustainable management of river systems of northern forests - experience on the river Mezen, Republic of Komi, Russia.

Przemyslaw Majewski
Silver Taiga Foundation
Komi Model Forest
Syktyvkar, Republic of Komi,
www.silvertaiga.ru

18.09.2012

Silver Taiga Foundation

1





UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION
FOR EUROPE



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS



Experience of European countries in reporting on forest soil, forest, water

Roman Michalak

UNECE-FAO Forestry and Timber Section

13th Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

'Soil and Water – telling the story for forests'

4 July 2012



SCION 
forests products innovation

Soil and Water in New Zealand

Tim Barnard, Tim Payn, Loretta Garrett and Peter Clinton



ANNEX 6: SOIL AND WATER ISSUES IDENTIFIED, INDICATOR GAPS AND ACTIONS

TAC principle: try to work within the current framework and not create additional complexity but still maintain sufficient flexibility for countries to report on their issues within the framework.

Issue Identified by TAC	Context	Relevant Indicators	Indicator framework appropriate? Gaps?	Action/ Mechanism (priority topic = X)
1.Cross Sectoral Cooperation Dialogue processes and training	<p>Soil and water is a cross sectoral issue. Water and soil issues extend beyond forests. Multi-agency involvement, different aims and mandates. Users and owners have different needs and priorities.</p> <p>Transfer of benefits – free goods, market based or in legal policy framework.</p> <p>Lack of clear understanding amongst policy professionals of the complexity of the interrelationships between soil, water and forests.</p> <p>Dialogue between parties can be at best ad hoc, and engagement depends on interests of stakeholders, their mandate and resource limitations.</p> <p>Public awareness</p>	7.1b 7.2a 7.5a 7.5b	Addressed by framework – no gaps	X. Recommend to WG that a discussion paper be written to show linkages between forest and other sectors. Thematic piece: cross-sectoral links to soil and water Include a soil and water link on website.
2..Precautionary Principle...against soil degradation	Better to take a cautious approach than have to deal with the consequences. Appropriate when there are data gaps or partial data. Also depends on quality of research data. Provides a context for interpreting multiple indicators in complex environments with uncertainty around flow on effects – either positive or negative.	7.1a 4.1a 4.2a 4.2b 4.3a	Addressed by framework – no gaps	Further research or trials could be conducted to identify signs of erosion, especially addressing forest floor cover rate and change, and magnitude of erosion (viz Japan presentation)
3.Landuse change effects	Governments (any level) use Policy to influence landuse change Land use change is important to provide context for SFM MPWG uses the forest 'footprint' as the boundary for reporting	No indicators 1.1a?? 7.1a 4.1a	Lots of work to do to formulate indicators 1.1a does not include use -	X. Australia to propose a supplementary statement in the technical notes with a provision to account for change in 'landuse' if

	Forest cover change strongly linked to landuse change – e.g. Land Use Land Use Change and Forestry			forest cover has been removed (e.g. Drought in forests, conversion of plantations back to agriculture.)
4. Forests within landscapes and land use impacts on each other ... (links to proposed new indicator - Distribution of forests in a catchment #14 below)	<p>Role of forests within catchments and landscapes.</p> <p>Integrated catchment management and the role of forests in provision and maintenance of ecosystem services – water quantity, quality.</p> <p>Close link to cross-sectoral processes.</p>	7.1b	<p>Gap includes no indicator or indicator group that adequately captures the importance of integrated catchment management.</p> <p>Requires further thought around indicators for the following:</p> <p>Water quantity, Water quality</p> <p>See proposed new indicator in issue #14 'distribution of forests in a catchment'</p>	X. Small scoping group to develop indicators that reflect supply of services to 'neighbours' (see following)
5. Population and demand pressures on forests	<p>The supply and demand relationship between forest ecosystem services (provided by soil and water) and the needs of society.</p> <p>Also includes increase in resource use per capita i.e. human footprint on forest resources.</p> <p>And includes demand for the increase in the quality of the resource. Growing expectations around <u>resource provision</u>, availability and accessibility.</p>	(6.1e) water as a non-wood forest product??	<p>Area of forest/per capita – as specific as possible i.e. sub-national or forest unit level. Links to C3 – area of forest affected by pressure on water soil and water resources ...</p> <p>Maybe need to explore with water sector indicators to describe use and quality and include the role of forests.</p> <p>Is concept of FES well enough covered in framework?</p>	X. Small group to develop indicator that covers ecosystem services supply to society i.e. <u>water provision</u> , avoided erosion, flooding etc. – 6.1.c Revenue from FES does not capture value of FES (e.g. Role of forests for provision of potable water vs. Desalination plant)
6. Impacts (water quantity)	The <u>quantity of water</u> flowing from forested areas is commonly regarded as an indicator of the quality of forest management	4.1a (within the forest) 4.3a,	Yes 4.1a, the quantity of water not integrated with agriculture, it is appropriate to watershed (link to other landuses)	Review how forests are incorporated in national water agency monitoring and reporting frameworks in terms of water <u>supply metrics</u> e.g. water flow from forests and catchments

7.Scale: Local vs. National Level	The demands of society (quality and quantity) varies from country level, provincial level and local level	4.1 at national level 4.2a at local and national 4.2b at regional and local 4.3a at national, local level and forest management unit level 4.3b at local level and forest management unit level	4.2 and 4.3 at regional and local level 4.1(national level) We don't have appropriate indicator for national level (4.2 and 4.3) 4.2a & 4.3a: Variation in best management practice and regulations make it difficult to compile the picture to the national level. - as per existing statement in technical notes.	X. C&I Technical notes reflect difficulty of scaling up already. Reflect on/revisit this after next reporting round.
8..Increasing regulation (payment mechanisms)	The quality and quantity of water depends on the upper reaches Links to cross sectoral issues (water rights), competing demands Economic development pressures (food security, urbanisation,) Pressures e.g. Climate change leading to increased regulation Supply and demand **** <i>Links to Population issue</i> Pressure/state response DPSIR = Driving Force/ /Pressure/ State/ Impact/ Response	6.1.c – revenue from forest based environmental services 7.2a – taxation and other economic strategies 6.2a – annual expenditure	Huge gaps , we don't have indicators to take this into account. Only one indicator! Case study to illustrate the issues, pressures and implications for soil and especially water	X. Undertake country case studies. Focus on pressures (as reflected by increasing regulation) and ability to report on impacts on forests water supply and soil. New Zealand to lead/prepare.
9..Methodology (consistent approach)	Different methodology is not consistent with different countries, Even some countries don't have related monitoring the Soil and Water measures. Methods will be country specific, MP gives suggestions only Data gaps Cross-Sector comparability Cross-border/neighbouring-country comparability Consistency over time	7.4b (R&D) 7.5c – Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting	Common framework of methodology is not available. Highlight the importance of the methodologies to the countries how to carry out the measurement S&W. Technical notes could be regularly updated with new information – sharing advances? Some countries do not yet have methods – opportunity for methods development. Raising awareness of importance of methods with Govt etc	X. Continue to share advances in methodologies related to S&W across countries – possibly web site area for sharing method developments. ...On the MPWG website include information on soil and water initiatives from other sectors eg, water valuation, soil measurement/ data systems (eg. ASRIS, Monitor website);

				Japan's soil cover (from Japan's presentation) and assessment of change to soil cover
10..Harvesting and other intervention/ disturbance impacts (Forest degradation)	Climate change – extreme events and shorter winters possibly leading to more forest damage. Damage from harvesting (soil churning, erosion, pugging) and roading at onsite and landscape scale. Also applies to water resources. Question: a fragmented forest may be more susceptible (1.1c??) Changing climate – conditions are changing and therefore impacting SFM – are Codes of Practise keeping up?	4.2b – Area & percent of forest land with significant soil degradation 7.1a – Legislation & policies – provides the opportunity to identify codes of practice or laws for forest harvesting and roading. 3.b – Area and percent of forest affected by abiotic agents (<i>natural and human induced</i>) (eg. Fire, storm, land clearance) beyond reference conditions.	4.2b doesn't include a reference condition (it could be the pre-harvest and post-harvest assessment?) [viz 4.3b – water & reference condition] appropriateness of the activity (ie. type of machinery used or timing/season of activity) – specified in the codes of practice compliance of the forest companies. - Training of forest workers? – unclear if this is covered by indicator 7.4a?	Proposed international workshop on harvesting damage, mitigation, best management practises and training needs. Possibly supported through IUFRO ...consider back to back with other meetings/events
11..Plantation versus natural/native forests	The structure and management of native forests and plantation forests can be very different. Dynamics of water use of native forest compared with plantations is different Includes native forest and planted forest - and other forest types	??? 2.c – Area etc. of plantations	Differentiate between native and plantation forests in 4.1a? Is it necessary to differentiate between native and plantation forests in the rationale of Indicators in C4.2 and C4.3? Gap: Holistic analysis of water intake and output by plantations (water use and water production).	X. Review paper on impacts of planted forests on water Check technical notes to ensure flexibility to report on native and planted forests separately in C4 indicators.
12..Public awareness	See Group 1 response Educational material Using material from MPWG to increase understanding of soil and water Public awareness/ perception drives policy	7.4.a – could education be linked into this? Indirectly linked to C7.5.b – public participation in forest-related decision making [6.5.b – Importance of forests to people		Forests, Soil and Water fact sheet (link to interdependencies graphic suggestion) Refer back to the Cross sectoral issue for a discussion paper Create a portal on the MPWG website, which will include links to

		(measure of public awareness)		Methodology (see issue above)
13..Indicator interdependencies	Create a graphic with soil and water as the core (or base) for SFM with C1.1c, C3 and C7 [See Nagame-san's diagram and Tim Barnard's matrix] Interconnectedness and interdependencies of indicators from different criteria link togetherto communicate the value and role of soil and water' E.g.: growing stock, plantations, water use	1.1c -	inter-connection with other sectors (especially agriculture) – see Group 1 response - Supplement technical notes to identify interdependent indicators – e.g.: 1.1c, 3.b, 7.1a and C4 indicators. Not suggesting new indicators.	X. Develop paper including graphic showing how indicators interact and can be used to evaluate effects of impacts, policy changes etc. – application of pressure state response to soil and water indicators
14..NEW: Distribution of forests in a catchment (links to #4)	The distribution and position of forest in a catchment can influence the flow of water and sediment in a landscape. DTM and GIS needed to do this.	4.1a.....	Need to include into 4.1a Rationale: 'The area, percent and spatial distribution of forest designated or managed.....' But – how to describe the distribution? What metric? What unit??	Consider how to incorporate spatial component into existing (soil and water) indicators – e.g (N.b all countries use maps to present information. This addition may be difficult at national scale.

ANNEX 7: COMMUNICATIONS ITEM DISCUSSION GUIDANCE

Communications Discussion Montréal Process TAC Meeting Sudzal, Russia, July 6, 2012 Prepared by: Peter Gaulke, USA

Advancing the Montréal Process Website

Focus of the discussion is not on the design (look and feel) and architecture of the MP website. Discussion should focus on how we can make the website a more effective web communication tool.

Topics/Questions for discussion:

- What additional content should the MP Website include?
- How can the website be used to more effectively engage in social media networks? What needs to happen? Who needs to do it? What level of management is necessary?
- What adjustments should be made to the MP website to move effectively link and/or engage in the web presence of other C&I and SFM processes?

Advancing the Draft Communications Plan

The Draft Montréal Process, Forest Europe, International Tropical Timber Organization and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Forestry Department Joint Communications Plan was circulated for review and comment.

Based on this plan, the following discussion would be helpful to advance the plan's objectives and actions.

- Based on participant's reviews of the Draft Communications Plan, discuss steps needed to move forward – i.e. approval process for Communication Plan, creating success stories and videos.
- Recognizing the minimal resources available to develop communication products, what specific audiences should the Communication Products initially focus on?
- Does the timetable on the plan seem reasonable, practical? Can MP countries and other process commit to the actions including the plan?
- Provide some context for what success stories and videos would have the most impact today, and into the foreseeable future. What topics, public issues and subject matter would most resonate? Target the videos and stories to specific audiences.
- Identify specific sources for success stories.
- Provide some definition on the role and activities of the Communication Sub-Committee. Roles include the solicitation and development of success stories and videos, as well as the outward communication and dissemination of these products.
- Identify member countries or processes who have access to communication or social media support staff that could assist with the communication action plan?
- What is the best method and frequency for the Communication Sub-Group to convene virtually? What is the best method of communication for the Sub-Group

to do their work? Email, Teleconference? How are decision made and documented?

- By what method and how often should the Sub-Committee report back to the member countries and processes?

Advance Work Established at the Joint Meeting

Substantial dialogue and agreement was documented in the proceeding for the *Joint Workshop to Streamline Global Forest Reporting and Strengthen Collaboration among International Criteria and Indicator Processes*. The Proposed Action Plans for Priority Options (Annex G) of the proceedings set forth two areas of particular focus – (2) Improved Communication, and (3) Working Together.

Discussion on advancing work from this joint workshop could focus on:

- How best to “proactively engage the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and others interested in developing criteria and indicators for forests to determine how the “Forest Indicator Partnership” can help to achieve their forest-related goals.”
- Methods for keeping the processes aware of relevant information and how to encourage attendance of relevant meetings.
- Revisit the list of upcoming (next 6 – 18 months) relevant meetings, venues and activities where the Joint Statement and other communication products could be shared.

**Guidance to the TAC by the
Communications Sub-Group**

TAC Agenda Item – July 2012

Background

1. This item for consideration by the TAC concerns the development of technical background for supporting the following action agreed at the Joint Workshop held in October 2011 in Victoria, BC Canada,

The Workshop Action Plan

Strategy:

- Short-term objective of using existing success stories and materials;
- Long-term objective of establishing a common language across a two-way street (we communicate and get feedback in an ongoing process)
- Long-term communication strategy to enhance and refine our story and keep it relevant with current events and issue to:
 - find out who our audience and end-users are;
 - gather existing stories, communication tools to make our stories resonate with important public issues (e.g. climate change);
 - maintain flow of stories (staying relevant); and
 - monitor the impact of improved communications (communications group)

Actions:

Establish a joint communications group with representatives from each of the criteria and indicator processes (Forest Europe, ITTO, and Montréal Process)

Critical issue:

Resourcing

2. The Communications group will focus on assembling web-based and written narratives aiming to promote, to global audiences, the understanding and benefits of C&I processes, their role in monitoring reporting and assessment of SFM.
3. The stories will need to be topical and technically robust. The four organisations represented in the group cover a significant area of scientific and technical endeavour as well as representing a large number of countries and diverse span of bio-geographic forest types.
4. A key objective of the stories is to reach a broad popular audience with currently topical, challenging issues in forests and forestry forest issues. In doing so we need to demystify the function and applicability of C&I and also cover some of the more technically complex issues, such as the relationship of forests to water management, soil conservation and biodiversity.
5. The scrutiny of both process and content by the TAC is therefore important.

6. There are two matters that the Technical Advisory Committee can provide important input to

Review of the Communications Plan

7. The plan is being finalised by the communications sub-committee and is focused on short-term objectives (as per the above action plan). The final draft of the plan is attached as Annex A.
8. It is requested that the TAC consider and make recommendations on:
 - Development of the long-term strategy elements of the communications plan especially on a process to enhance and refine the C&I and SFM story and keep it relevant with current events, and
 - Technical enhancements that will enable narratives to be published

Technical and theme coverage

9. It is requested that the TAC:
 - discuss and recommend "hot topics" that are challenging and "edgy" stories about developments in SFM where C&I can offer solutions and which have specific relevance for a range of our member countries.
 - Prepare recommendations on a process to ensure the scientific and technical robustness of the narratives, including an editing process

TAC Recommendations

10. The TAC recommendations will be further considered by the Communication Sub-committee and the proposed joint workshop in August 2012 in Jacksonville USA.

ANNEX 8 DRAFT JOINT COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

The version of the plan below is the result of input of various members of the joint group. The plan is expected to be finalised after 3 July

2012	Montréal Process, Forest Europe, International Tropical Timber Organisation and Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Forestry Department Draft Joint Communications plan
------	--

Version 1.2 – Margaret Horner, Scion
11 June 2012

Background

Over the last two decades criteria and indicators (C&I) processes have achieved an important place as globally-recognised systems to measure, assess and report on forests and forestry. The member countries of our four organisations, together represent an accumulated wealth of experiences, expertise and successes in the development and use of C&I and in information and reporting. At a workshop at Victoria, BC, Canada, in October 2011, representatives from the four organisations discussed how we could communicate ideas that address the contemporary challenges in conserving and managing forests at international, national and local levels. In our view C&I frameworks offer an excellent basis for this.

Purpose

This communication plan sets out how our four organisations will work together to help advance understanding of sustainable forest management and raise awareness of the benefits of Criteria & Indicators (C&I). This aim will be achieved by telling relevant, engaging stories about how the C&I are being applied in different countries to achieve sustainable forest management and to enhance forest ecosystems.

Given the global nature of the subject matter and audience, the needs of the four organisations and their member countries could best be served by building a virtual community of followers through social media.

Two key considerations in the plan are:

- The group has limited resources to achieve the communication goals so, in the short term, we need to start with the simplest methods and ready sources of material
- We also recognise that our organisations and member countries already have or are developing communication strategies and are a rich source of both ready made stories and expertise in various media that will assist in conveying these stories to our audiences.

Communication goals

The goal of this plan is;

- primarily to present web-based stories to form the foundation of a social media network. Our intention is to create “go to” places on the internet, such as dedicated spaces on our members websites for anyone seeking good news stories about forest conservation and management, and
- when the opportunity arises, to produce and disseminate hard copy versions of our stories in short paper or brochure format to distribute at events and meetings

The web based stories will be presented through short videos (5-10 mins) that can be posted on YouTube. The videos can be simple and produced at minimum cost. The compelling hook in these videos is the positive message that forests around the world are benefitting from public awareness, government intervention and practical application of the C&I. The focus is on real people doing practical things to help their local forests.

Initial steps in this plan can be achieved without a formal budget. Scion has undertaken to start the process by creating two short videos (New Zealand-based) as starting examples. The Committee will gather other existing “success stories” from among members across a range of topics that can be readily adapted and posted as part of our “C&I story”. The October Workshop in Victoria, Canada also generated a strong list of potential topics upon which stories can be developed.

Links to these videos can be placed on the member websites, Facebook and/or LinkedIn. If these become popular, we could explore the opportunities for extended publicity through twitter accounts and blogs that may be accessible through our respective organisations to notify followers when a new video is posted. A synopsis of each video could be presented on the Montréal Process website so the stories are available in written form.

Browser traffic to the videos can be monitored so levels of interest can be tracked. Specific goals, associated budgets and quality assurance processes can be determined once the committee has a sense of whether this approach is desirable.

Target audiences

- Government agencies worldwide
- Environmental groups
- Organisations and individuals with forestry interests

Key messages (suggested)

- The forests of the world are too valuable to lose; people are working to protect their local resources.
- Criteria & Indicators provide a mechanism for measuring, monitoring and reporting on progress in achieving sustainable forest management. (i.e. you can't manage what you can't measure)

Action plan

Action	Who	When
Create two short videos and upload on YouTube	Scion	July 2012
Develop guideline for video production and quality assurance	Scion	30 July 2012
Create a video that discusses the development of C&I (formation and purpose)	Scion??	
Put links to videos on the Montréal Process website and member websites	Website managers	30 July 2012
Capture list from Sub-committee of other potential video stories and seek access/permission to use relevant material	Sub-committee	30 July 2012
Explore options for linking to existing videos (e.g. Reforestation in China on the Loess country – story used by UNFF John Liu)	Sub-committee	30 July 2012
Develop plan for more videos and budget as required...		

Annex 9: TAC conclusions on the communications item

Montreal Process Website and Joint Communications plan: TAC feedback	
Advancing the Montreal Process Website	
Focus of the discussion is not on the design (look and feel) and architecture of the MP website. Discussion should focus on how we can make the website a more effective web communication tool.	
Topics/Questions for discussion:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What additional content should the MP Website include? 	links to the group web sites, news and articles, one news article per quarter, max 2 pages inc photos. Where possible if translated information make links available.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can the website be used to more effectively engage in social media networks? What needs to happen? Who needs to do it? What level of management is necessary? 	consider intranet for MPWG/TAC 12 country access - password access. As much info public as possible. Make sure countries link to own site. And within country reports - any relevant available.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments should be made to the MP website to move effectively link and/or engage in the web presence of other C&I and SFM processes? 	very technically oriented question so use experts (Peter to solve). Make sure links up front and obvious. Web site designer to provide suggestions. Special pages for useful links - cross sectorial important.
Advancing the Draft Communications Plan	
The Draft Montreal Process, Forest Europe, International Tropical Timber Organization and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Forestry Department Joint Communications Plan was circulated for review and comment.	
Based on this plan, the following discussion would be helpful to advance the plan's objectives and actions.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on participant's reviews of the Draft Communications Plan, discuss steps needed to move forward – i.e. approval process for Communication Plan, creating success stories and videos. 	Creating success stories everyone's responsibility. Sign off process complex e.g. use and approval of logos. Member countries do own success stories and videos - then approval process within country but if has other organisations logos then we need a process developed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizing the minimal resources available to develop communication products, what specific audiences should the Communication Products initially focus on? 	Member organisations - i.e. MP ITTO FE FAO (community of interest). General public at lower level then forest sector including research community. Local forest managers and practitioners - e.g. Constantine. Within country Govt Business managers/DGs etc. - investors. Equivalents in cross sectors - Ag, rangelands, NRM etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the timetable on the plan seem reasonable, practical? Can MP countries and other process commit to the actions including the plan? 	Question mark - not in sufficient position to comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide some context for what success stories and videos would have the most impact today, and into the foreseeable future. What topics, public issues and subject matter would most resonate? Target the videos and stories to specific audiences. 	Whatever is topical! Respond to need. Tell stories around themes - e.g. climate change, soil and water, FES, Russia e.g. biopump case studies and interesting web pages. Map indicator numbers to links. Non wood forest products - understory economy!! Bamboo, chickens and Chinese.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify specific sources for success stories. 	country follow up. Depends on topic. Identify topic and then track down. Further clarification needed.(countries to list)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide some definition on the role and activities of the Communication Sub-Committee. Roles include the solicitation and development of success stories and videos, as well as the outward communication and dissemination of these products. 	Agree with second sentence. Responsibility that countries respond to requests for stories. SC sends out prompt/request for info on specific topics and countries MUST respond.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify member countries or processes who have access to communication or social media support staff that could assist with the communication action plan? 	CBD seems to have a good model - check their site. Russia has support staff but limited availability. Some countries have no access at all...track down resources as stories identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the best method and frequency for the Communication Sub-Group to convene virtually? What is the best method of communication for the Sub-Group to do their work? Email, Teleconference? How are decision made and documented? 	Skype (but access problems in some Govt departments). Comms sub group should really decide what suits them best. Good to make sure calendar is published. Use current MPWG teleconference framework. Some conferences have difficulty to link into the teleconference - technical problems. Email strongly recommended. Potentially MP proposed intranet site - blog - could get round security concerns if member only.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By what method and how often should the Sub-Committee report back to the member countries and processes? 	email. Use existing teleconference framework and schedule. Twice a year (reality). Ideally 4 times per year on an as needs basis.

Advance Work Established at the Joint Meeting

Substantial dialogue and agreement was documented in the proceeding for the *Joint Workshop to Streamline Global Forest Reporting and Strengthen Collaboration among International Criteria and Indicator Processes*. The Proposed Action Plans for Priority Options (Annex G) of the proceedings set forth two areas of particular focus – (2) Improved Communication, and (3) Working Together.

Discussion on advancing work from this joint workshop could focus on:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How best to “proactively engage the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and others interested in developing criteria and indicators for forests to determine how the “Forest Indicator Partnership” can help to achieve their forest-related goals.”	Sub committee responsibility. Make sure of cross fertilising between processes by linking to sites e.g. CBD. Should not be data and tables but analysis of information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methods for keeping the processes aware of relevant information and how to encourage attendance of relevant meetings.	email bulletins. Extend invitations to observers. Hold back to back meetings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revisit the list of upcoming (next 6 – 18 months) relevant meetings, venues and activities where the Joint Statement and other communication products could be shared.	[check list] - liaison office role to contact members and update. [Check timetable of plan] - nb put calendar on website

Annex 10: C&I and Governance presentation (presentation can be found on Montréal Process website)



**Assessing and Monitoring
Forest Governance:
Challenges,
Diagnostics Tools,
Testing experience in Russia**

Presentation based on materials of Moscow workshop (Russia)
Marina Smetanina, Vladislava Nemova (World Bank)
Suzdal, July 5, 2012