



## Aide Memoire

30<sup>th</sup> Montréal Process Working Group Meeting

United States of America (virtual)

14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> September 2021

September 30, 2021

Aide Memoire and accompanying Annexes:

Annex A – List of Registrants

Annex B – Agenda

Annex C – Report by the Liaison Office (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex D – Presentation by Canada (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex E – Presentation by China (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex F – Presentation by New Zealand (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex G – Presentation by Japan (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex H – Presentation by United States Forest Service (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex I – Presentation by Australia (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex J – Report on TAC Activities (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex K – Update on Montréal Process Synthesis Report (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex L – Report on work of IUFRO C&I Working Group (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex M – Update on XV World Forestry Congress Side-Event Preparations (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex N – Update on XV World Forestry Congress by Republic of Korea (to be delivered separately on website)

Annex O – Update on Montréal Process Website Status (to be delivered separately on website)

## Participation

The meeting included 49 participants from 9 Montréal Process countries (Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, and the United States of America). The registrant list is available at [Annex A](#).

### 1) Opening the Meeting

The 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group was opened by the host country, the United States of America (USA).

### 2) Transfer and Nomination of Chair

The Chair of the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group, Thomas Schlichter (Argentina) transferred the role of Chair to the nominated candidate, Linda Heath, United States Forest Service, USA. The group endorsed the nomination.

### 3) Welcome Participants

The Chair welcomed members, and reflected on the history of the Montréal Process, the development of the Criteria and Indicator Framework (C&I), and the positioning of the group's work going forward. The Chair made further statements in anticipation of the agenda items supporting the work of the meeting.

Members viewed a video featuring Angela Coleman, US Forest Service Associate Chief. Ms. Coleman recognized the value of the Montréal Process's work, particularly the criteria and indicators, as integral to the continuing legacy of Sustainable Forest Management as the centerpiece of the US Forest Service's mission. Ms. Coleman emphasized the severe threat of fires, pests, droughts and a changing climate to boreal and temperate forests, and reflected on the interdependence and value of the expertise members of the MPWG in promoting SFM with particular regard to the challenges of managing forest fires through application of the C&I.

### 4) Adoption of Agenda

The Liaison Office introduced the provisional agenda to the group. No changes were proposed, and the Working Group adopted the agenda without amendment. The agenda is provided at [Annex B](#).

### 5) Nomination of Meeting Officers

Representatives from Australia, Canada, China and USA volunteered to serve as Meeting Officers.

## 6) Report of the Liaison Officer

The Liaison Officer provided an update on their activities since the 29<sup>th</sup> Montréal Process Working Group meeting, and the next steps they anticipate taking. Activities reported included assisting with facilitating the production and review of the MP Synthesis Report, and participating in international conferences on behalf of the MP, including the Forest Europe 8<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference and Expert Levels meetings, and the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the United Nations Forum on Forests. The Liaison Officer reported engagement with FAO on development of MP filters in the Global Forest Resources Assessment data.

The Liaison Officer also reported on their work supporting the XV World Forestry Congress (WFC) Chair, and on the previously agreed side event to promote the Synthesis Report at the next WFC. The efforts of the Liaison Office to coordinate actions to attend related meetings and to keep in touch with other International Processes and organizations was also noted. Promoting the work of members in these forums and the importance of transboundary collaboration in data collection to support SFM were highlighted. The presentation supporting this report is provided at [Annex C](#).

### Action Item 1

Liaison Office to extend support to the current chair (USA) in regard to organizing the WFC side event, assisting with coordination of related meetings, and facilitating the production and review of the Montréal Process Synthesis Report.

## 7) Country Experiences with Sustainable Forest Management

Canada, China, New Zealand, Japan, USA and Australia gave presentations on their country experiences with Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) across two days.

### Canada

Members received an update from Canada on their national forest inventory re-measurement, including reflections on first approaches to data collection and inventory, and additive complexities in these systems. The recommendation to generate a new system in 1996 has resulted in a holistic approach with greater statistical application and common approaches to data collection. Members welcomed the news that Canada's first national forest inventory re-assessment data is now available, and an offer from Canada to provide more information on request.

### China

China gave a presentation on current work to undertake comprehensive monitoring and evaluation of forest and grassland resources. Members heard that China is carrying out comprehensive, multi-ecosystem surveys to inform a report expected to be finalized in early 2022 and appreciated China's extensive approach to permanent monitoring. Members heard that the information collected is intended to support management, understanding of ecosystem health and trends, and to feed into carbon related monitoring and reporting systems.

### New Zealand

New Zealand provided an update on their policy proposals for a new timber legality system and supply chain strengthening, and New Zealand's intent to provide assurance to markets on legality of timber harvested in New Zealand. Members heard that legal harvest will consider the environmental and biodiversity aspects of forest management, and they appreciated the link between this work and Montréal Process Criteria 4 and 7. New Zealand also reported on work under Criterion 5 exploring forestry's role in the bioeconomy as well as ongoing afforestation work and carbon forestry, and engagement with Indigenous people under Criterion 6.

## Japan

Japan provided an update on their experiences with SFM and their New Basic Plan for Forest and Forestry. Members welcomed information about the 5 pillars underpinning Japan's SFM approach and associated ambition to reach carbon neutrality by 2050. Japan informed the group of recent forest management innovations, including reduced harvest periods and silvicultural costs as a result of breeding programs, and the increasing use of laser surveying in forest management. Japan also described the new national stadium made constructed of wood for the 2020 Tokyo Olympics and Paralympics games.

## United States of America

USA gave an update on their work combining satellite imagery with ground observation to achieve boreal forest inventory in Alaska. Members heard that this work to collect baseline data is in response to a mandate by US congress to report on the status and resources of forests, and that until recently (2016) approximately 47 million hectares of US forest land lacked a monitoring system. Long term work to increase coverage is now underway, with completion anticipated by 2031. In Alaska, increasing interest in bioenergy production and biomass, this information will also serve to better support subsistence and forest-based economies in the region, as well as broader reporting on carbon and environmental quality aspects. USA reported that, in collaboration with NASA, an airborne system equipped with high resolution imagery, and 3D and thermal scanning capacity was developed over the last 10 years, and that the system is used to estimate above ground biomass including dead wood and ground litter. Members heard how pre and post fire LIDAR is used to explore how satellite derived data relates to LIDAR metrics, improving fine scale understanding of responses to fire and ability to scale-up model-assisted estimates of biomass. The Working Group noted that without forest inventory work, USA would not be able to produce reports and support work on C&I.

## Australia

Australia gave an update on the status of their upcoming national report, due in 2023, including work to modernize data reporting and presentation and development of an online portal. Members heard about Australia's Regional Forest Agreements (RFAs), the recent extension of five RFAs, and how the Montréal Process C&I support management and reporting under these agreements. An update on the status of Australia's National Forestry Plan was provided, including the establishment of nine forestry hubs and work to plant 1 billion trees. The impacts of fire and COVID-19 on production forests was presented, and ongoing impacts of COVID movement restrictions on domestic timber supply. An update on Australia's timber legality system was provided, noting the role of the legislation in supporting SFM via supply chain mechanisms and a current review of said legislation. Australia welcomed feedback from Members on the illegal logging framework review.

## Other Effective area-based Conservation Mechanisms (OECMs)

Australia proposed this discussion topic as an issue that may be emerging for many Montréal Process members, given the G7 commitment to protecting 30% of their land and oceans by 2030 (the '30 by 30 target') and the appearance of this commitment in the zero draft of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework by the Convention on Biological Diversity, which OECMs will likely play a critical role to help meet. Members heard that Australia considers that OECMs have complementary benefits to formally protected areas, and that both OECMs and protected areas together will be key to meeting any 2030 protected area targets. Members were invited to consider the tensions, challenges, and potential inclusion or exclusion of forested areas as OECMs under current Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) decisions and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) guidance, and to consider:

1. sharing approaches to reporting land management as OECMs,
2. what challenges might be involved in applying OECM definitions to non-production forests, and
3. reflect on the role of the TAC in further clarification of these considerations in the future.

Several members, including Canada, New Zealand and USA acknowledged the emerging and growing interest in discussion of OECMs more broadly, and agreed that improved understanding of the contribution of production forests to ecosystem services, values and biodiversity is valuable. Argentina identified Spanish-language resources on biodiversity conservation and forestry plantations in Argentina, focused on Salicaceae, Pinus and Eucalyptus species. Members reflected on the importance of nuance at the management level, noting that in New Zealand, large plantations estates with balanced age class distributions are overall managed for enhanced values while smaller areas are subject to intense management at harvest. The question of the importance of intensity and scale was raised. Australia similarly reported approaching production forestry through long rotations and selective harvesting in small areas. Australia agreed that exploring where a line might be drawn on intensity and impacts compared to longer term benefits would be of interest, particularly in clarifying how such an approach would interact with CBD and IUCN guidance on OECM definition and reporting.

China provided further reflections on OECMs, noting that IUCN's approach to biodiversity conservation appears to be limited to extension of protected areas, and that such limited focus or strategy may result in failure to meet area-based conservation objectives. China also noted that while biodiversity conservation is important, the relationship between the commitments and IUCN objectives is not clear. China expressed interest in the progression of conversations on OECMs, while holding reservations on ease of implementation of the concept and raised the resource needs required to assess Member use of OECMs effectively. Australia agreed that as an emerging issue OECM definitions and applications are a challenge to engage with easily and acknowledged the importance of experience sharing opportunities with other members. Japan noted that it is not appropriate for the Montréal Process to discuss biodiversity in the context of non-forest green spaces and wetlands, nor to develop related technical reports extending beyond the forest-specific expertise Montréal Process participants possess.

Australia, Canada, New Zealand and USA acknowledged the value of further reflection by Members on potential work the TAC could support on OECMs in advance of the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group.

**Action Item 2**

Members to consider approaching Canada directly to organize a webinar for additional details on the technical aspects of their NFI.

**Action Item 3**

Working Group to consider the potential role of the TAC in characterizing member approaches to OECMs. Subsequent action related to OECMs will be subject to discussions led by Australia at the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the MPWG.

## 8) Discussion of Forest-Type Definitions

Canada led a discussion on emerging international pressure to report on primary forests, degraded forests and intact forest landscapes. Members were invited to consider how definitions can inform not only reporting procedures and obligations, but also their responses to international commitments, their forest management practices, and trade in wood products. The Working Group heard that lack of a consistent approach to if, and how, countries report on some of these terms creates a challenge in telling a boreal and temperate forest story. Canada identified that the drivers for increased reporting on these terms primarily come from concerns around tropical deforestation, but expansion of this reporting trend to other forest types might be anticipated, as signaled by recent G7 and G20 dialogues. Members heard that 'degradation' was included as an optional data field for the first time for the Global FRA, and that of those countries choosing to report, inconsistencies in approach were apparent.

Members noted that the definition of primary forest holds additional nuances and challenges, and that the FAO is currently seeking to address this by running workshops to explore and allow for ecosystem specific considerations in definitions of primary forest. A discussion between members followed, with the United States of America, New Zealand, Australia and China appreciating the importance of the topic raised by Canada. Members considered the following questions:

1. What particular challenges do Boreal and Temperate forest Montréal Process WG members have to address when considering these definitions and indicators?
2. How are you as a member approaching/interpreting these definitions?
3. Are there areas where we need a more balanced report on both the positive (enhanced forest management benefits) and negative (losses in productivity due to landings and roads) activities?

While recognizing the importance of internationally consistent definitions for reporting on forest categories, the United States reported that they have experienced challenges regarding the complexity of these definitions when applied to dynamic and evolving landscapes spanning multiple biomes potentially requiring adjustments to the general definitions. The potential for unintended consequences emerging from definitional choices was also noted. Comment was also made on the identifying thresholds for defining degraded and/or effective ecosystem services.

New Zealand agreed with the United States that definition for these terms can be problematic, and that missing thresholds to help define whether a landscape falls within a certain definition creates difficulty. New Zealand also agreed that different land types have different circumstances.

Members heard that in New Zealand, Primary Forest is referred to as Indigenous Forest, and when occurring on private land is subject to strict management that allows for very small amounts to be harvested under strict guidelines and for cultural purposes. Primary Forest on conservation estate cannot be harvested, with non-timber values recognized. These Primary Forests have an important role in supporting tourism, hiking, natural values – and New Zealand proposed that these aspects are not adequately incorporated in definitions so far.

Finally, New Zealand noted that the link between Primary Forest and Intact Forest Landscapes definitions necessarily means that IFL discussions are also limited, and New Zealand noted that these approaches lack consideration of potential services provided by exotic species. The scale at which these concepts are applied to forests, and how this applies to assessment are also of interest to New Zealand.

Australia advised that reporting on some primary forests in their temperate region is undertaken but reporting on primary forests is not extended to their tropical forests. Members heard that Australia is quite a dynamic continent when it comes to influences on vegetation, such as fire and land clearing, which creates its own challenges in classification. Australia does report on 'old-growth' in their State of the Forests Report, a classification which is not a specific growth stage, instead indicating an ecologically mature stand structure.

Members heard that Australia does not report specifically on degradation, and while challenging to report on this explicitly, does make use of related MP indicators in lieu. Australia is interested in progressing the discussion on how Members might draw on indicators in such a way as to provide a global view on degradation. From Australia's perspective, particular value exists in exploring these criteria given emerging issues such as OECMs, and the need to justify inclusion of areas subject to land management interventions such as forestry.

Australia informed the group that they will be Participating in the FAO series on primary forest definition and will be hosting an Asia-Pacific workshop, offering to circulate more details as they become available.

Japan reported that most of forests in Japan have been modified at some point in the past, and their domestic approach is to define Primary Forest as natural forest that is 81 years old or more. Japan also noted that Intact Forest Landscapes are not defined separately from Primary Forest and suggested unifying these concepts into Primary Forest would be helpful, as this is a more commonly used term.

Australia reflected that in their ecosystems and management requirements, enhanced forest management includes allowing fire or burning for ecological integrity purposes, but this is also measurable as degradation. The United States of America echoed this, identifying that prescribed burning in the United States is considered enhanced forest management.

China welcomed Canada's raising the topic and agreed that while these words are useful to forestry as a whole, they are broadly poorly defined. China noted that Intact Forest Landscapes is particularly poorly defined and proposed that Montréal Process countries could progress trying to assess these as a group, with a focus on Intact Forest Landscapes, and take these lessons forward in coordination with the FAO for better reporting in the global FRA. The TAC Convenor responded to China's comments by noting that it would be timely to explore

assessment of existing MP indicators and their potential harmonisation with the FAO to present suggestions or options for reporting on these terms.

## 9) Report on TAC Activities and TAC Convenor Logistics

Members received an update from the TAC Convenor on the progress of work since the last meeting of the Working Group, and broadly expressed appreciation for the efforts of the TAC, noting the challenges and opportunities of working in a virtual format only (presentation available at [Annex J](#)).

Australia referred to the prior discussion on exploring and clarifying definitions, and proposed that, given the status and ambition on Synthesis Report publication timelines, the proposed work on definitions might be better and more holistically served by a standalone piece of work. This proposal was supported by Canada and New Zealand.

The TAC Convenor sought agreement from the Working Group to present a report on COVID impacts as part of the side-event at the next WFC, rather than progressing its acceptance as a full paper. The US endorsed this proposal as practical, and in the absence of objections the matter was considered agreed.

The Working Group heard that Dr Tim Payn is amenable to extend his work as Convenor of the TAC to the 31st Session of the MPWG, and in the absence of other candidates at this time, New Zealand sought endorsement for this extension from members. New Zealand also noted the contributions of some members to the TAC Convenor's work since the 29th session of the MPWG and requested that members reflect on their ability to support resourcing for the coming period. Members were also asked to consider identifying potential candidates for the TAC Convenor role in advance of the next meeting of the Working Group.

The extension of Dr Tim Payn in the role of TAC Convenor was endorsed by Australia, Canada, China, Japan and USA. Canada identified some capacity for financial support in the coming period, which was gratefully received. The United States of America, noting the voluntary basis of the MPWG, encouraged Members to reflect on medium-term funding approaches and suggested a more thorough discussion in the future may be beneficial to the long-term stability and outputs of the MP. The discussion closed with New Zealand expressing openness to discussing this item further intersessionally with interested members.

### **Action Item 4**

TAC to submit the Covid-19 project report for approval by the WG out of session (in concert with the MP Synthesis Report process) and present the report at the MP Side Event at the XV WFC.

### **Action Item 5**

Working Group to explore formal opportunities to capture member use and observations regarding forest-type definitions as a potential project for the TAC in the future following completion of the MP Synthesis Report.

### **Action Item 6**

All members to consider long-term arrangements for TAC Convenorship, including funding capacity and identification of potential candidates, in advance of MPWG 31.

## 10) Montréal Process Synthesis Report

The TAC Convenor provided detail on the status of the Synthesis Report, and a proposed publication timeline leading up to the next WFC in May 2022. This presentation is provided at [Annex K](#).

Members heard of the inclusion of an overall key messages summary based on narrative analysis of indicators and noted emerging trends. Clarification was sought by Australia on the timeline for MPWG review of the draft, and the TAC Convenor clarified that he anticipates members should have December and January to undertake

this step. The TAC Convenor also noted that the WG would have an additional opportunity to review in March, for approximately four weeks.

New Zealand noted that some areas of the timeline appear tight and asked how this might interact with resourcing needs for design and translation of the report. The TAC Convenor agreed that clarity on this was needed, and to review the achievability of this portion of the timeline.

Canada, USA and the TAC Convenor discussed approaches to communicating the Synthesis Report beyond the XV World Forestry Congress, including how the format of the Synthesis Report could support this. The TAC Convenor agreed that development of a Communication Strategy going forward may be beneficial to the dissemination of the work of the TAC. The TAC Convenor also reflected on the structure of the proposed report, and how it will support targeted messaging through discrete areas of content.

#### **Action Item 7**

TAC Convenor to provide clarity on the timeline for resourcing needs for the Montréal Process Synthesis Report production and dissemination, including translations and graphics.

#### **Action Item 8**

TAC to implement the proposed process and timeline for completion of the synthesis report, present the findings at the MP Side Event for the XV WFC, and launch the report (subject to availability of production resources) at the same event.

#### **Action Item 9**

TAC to develop a communications and social media plan to support the launch of the synthesis report

## **11) Review of Global C&I and Related Reporting Activities**

Dr. Stefanie Linser (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna), Coordinator of the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO) Working Party 9.01.05 on Research and Development of Indicators for SFM (the WP), briefly introduced the history, membership and key publications of the WP. Founded in 2014 by invited representatives from all C&I process groups, the WP is made up of 39 experts from 26 countries. A key publication is a paper covering 25 years of C&I for SFM, which explored why some C&I Processes saw success while others did not. Noting that up to 171 countries participate in regional and international forest related indicators (including the Montréal Process), the paper also examined whether C&I have made a measurable difference.

Dr Linser reflected on success factors for C&I Implementation, reporting that enthusiasm for certain processes usually lasted only a few years, with many processes currently inactive. Members heard that factors influencing success for C&I are political support, sufficient and joint data collection, collaboration, and innovative presentation for specific target groups (such as use of targeted key indicators).

Members received an update on recent and planned activities of other C&I processes including work with Forest Europe on the State of Europe's Forests Report 2020. Also reported was work undertaken by the International Tropical Timber Organization supporting development, revision and implementation of C&I, and its joint work with the African Timber Organization to review and update regional C&I, alongside collaboration with the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization on production of the Status of Forest in the Amazon Region (2018), based on 11 harmonized indicators. Members also heard of work by the Teheran Process on low forest cover countries focusing on data collection for SDG15 indicators and support to enhance C&I for SFM. New FAO supported country activities on national C&I for SFM by the Near East and North Africa Process on C&I (NENA) were noted, as were updates on ASEAN working groups, and projects from the INForest data platform of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

Members heard about the development of the 21 Global Core Set of Forest-Related Indicators (GCS), a central part of the UNFF16 flagship publication as a framework for assessing progress towards most of the Global Forest Goals, and which formed the basis of the State of Europe's Forest Report 2020. The combination of 21



GCS indicators were developed as a harmonized approach for reporting on forests and forestry, though some challenges remain in terms of data availability, which in turn impacts formal adoption by the UNFF.

The Montréal Process Working Group expressed interest in hearing about trends in C&I uptake and implementation and learned that since a 2016 Indicator workshop in Canada, interest in C&I has increased tremendously, for both national and subnational processes. Members also heard that within Europe and the European Commission, there was high levels of interest at this time in looking for indicators to support all strategies going forward. This was put down, in part, to increased political interest.

Members were also interested in whether core themes or topics across different processes were emerging, and the anticipated adoption and use of the GCS into the future. The Working Group head that in the absence of a common core theme, there is an emerging necessity towards streamlined forest-related reporting obligations, noting that 17 SDGs incorporate forest-related aspects. Dr Linser suggested that while the GCS may be unlikely to be formally adopted in the near future, the informal status may be sufficient while the indicator list evolves. Members noted that the informal status lessens political mandate limitations, and the importance of harmonization between C&I processes going forward, particularly in regard to data collections.

## 12) Proposal to hold Montréal Process Micro Symposia Related to Specific Topics or Indicators

New Zealand led a discussion on a proposal to hold Micro Symposia related to specific topics or indicators.

New Zealand acknowledged that one of the goals of the Montréal Process is to serve as a network of knowledge and to assist facilitation of knowledge sharing across borders. Members heard that the necessarily increased use of virtual meetings in the past two years by the TAC has led them to identify an opportunity to expand the Montréal Process's network of knowledge. In light of this, the TAC proposed a series of short regular sessions that could explore policy development or other challenges Members may face.

The Working Group was asked to consider whether they saw benefit in Micro Symposia in enhancing knowledge sharing, and also to consider what logistics might be suitable regarding hosting, frequency, administration and associated processes. Members were broadly interested in the concept, but due to time limitations in depth exploration of these aspects was limited. Mindful of overburdening the TAC and noting the importance of clarity regarding administration and potential commitments by Members, the Working Group requested that a paper exploring several administrative and process options be developed for intersessional consideration.

### **Action Item 10**

New Zealand to develop a proposal outlining administrative process options and alternatives to support Micro Symposia and distribute to Members and the TAC for consideration intersessionally.

## 13) XV World Forestry Congress

The United States of America provided an update on preparations for the XV World Forestry Congress Side Event (presentation provided at [Annex M](#)). The Side Event proposal was resubmitted and re-accepted following 2020 WFC postponement. USA noted that the extended timeline and ongoing COVID disruptions may impact presenters' ability to attend, and thus more attention to verifying participation will be needed going forward. Moreover, a Montréal Process presenter must be identified. Noting the tight agenda, with five presenters engaged, the Working Group heard that presentation of the TAC COVID-19 study (as discussed under Item 9, Action Item 4) may be challenging if all presenters remain available.

Members also received an update from the Republic of Korea on the XV World Forestry Congress more broadly. The XV World Forestry Congress is to be held 2-6 May 2022 in Seoul, hosted by the Korea Forest Service in collaboration with the UN FAO. Members heard that the theme will be *Building a Green, Healthy and Resilient Future with Forests*, with six supporting sub-themes, and noted that special events will include a High-Level Dialogue and Ministerial Forum on Financing for Forests, a Private Sector Investment Forum, Forest Fire Forum, Peace Forest Initiative Roundtable, and a forum on Forests in a Post-COVID World.

### Action Item 11

USA to continue to coordinate with current list of presenters and report back to WG through Liaison office (October 2021 and on-going).

### Action Item 12

USA to ask Montréal Process Working Group to identify primary and (if possible) alternate presenters for the WFC Side Event, and to monitor availability of same as WFC approaches (December 2021 and forward).

### Action Item 13

Primary and alternate presenters to work with TAC Convenor to develop presentation for review by the Working Group (via email) and subsequent presentation at WFC.

### Action Item 14

Montréal Process presenters to organize virtual meeting of all presenters and moderator in early 2022.

## 14) Montréal Process Website

The USA explained that access to the Montréal Process has been blocked following loss of the URL (Montrealprocess.org). A new URL (Montreal-process.org) has been secured, and the USA will work to reconstitute the current website on the new URL in the coming months using up-to-date backup files. The USA further emphasized that adequate documentation of URL management is needed, with key contact names identified in Montréal Process Strategic Documents and MPWG Aides Memoire. The current holder of the new URL is MPTAC member Guy Robertson (guy.robertson@usda.gov) who holds a one year "lease" on the URL, which is due to expire in August 2022.

### Action Item 15

Website Administrator to provide regular updates to the Working Group regarding progress towards recovering website.

### Action Item 16

Members to discuss progress on recovering the MP website and long-term support for website management at the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group.

## 15) Next Meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group

The Chair called for volunteers to host the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group. The Republic of Korea volunteered to hold Montréal Process Working Group 31 in conjunction with the XV World Forestry Congress, in May 2022.

### **Action Item 17**

Republic of Korea to begin planning MPWG31 in coordination with the Montréal Process Working Group.

## 16) Review of the Aide Memoire

The Meeting Officer presented the initial Draft Aide Memoire action points to the Working Group for their review. All action items were accepted by their respective countries, though adjustments to some items were suggested. Subsequent draft of Aide Memoire was transmitted by the host country (USA) to the MPWG for their final concurrence prior to finalization of the document.

## 17) Other Business

The Chair asked Members whether any other business remained to be discussed. The USA noted the potential benefits of applying new technologies in order to provide translation services in virtual settings. No specific recommendations were made by USA, and no comments were forthcoming from the Working Group.

The 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group was closed.

## Annex A—MPWG30 List of Participants

Country/Organization	Name
Argentina	Ariel Medina Daniel Maradei Esteban Borodowski Julieta Bono Natalia Acosta Natalia Fracassi Tomas Schlichter
Australia	Claire Howell Claire Wallis Keiran Andrusko Samihah Fattah
Canada	Benoît Pagé Caroline Gosselin Glenda Russo Margot Downey Maureen Whelan Talha Sadiq Tia Tso
Chile	Federico An-der Fuhren Hugo Rivera Mauricio Gomez Rafael Bustamante
China	Jinpin Lei xia Chaozong Xiao wenfa ZHENG Sixian
IUFRO	Stefanie Linser
Japan	Takashi Yamazaki Naoki Hayasaka Yutaka Machida Toshiya Matsuura Hideki Sukanuma Nobuyuki Numakanai

Country/Organization	Name
New Zealand	Chris Wilson Josh Southee Sebastian Klinger Tim Barnard
Republic of Korea	Eun Ho Choi Hee Han Yongjin Kim
TAC Convenor	Tim Payn
USA	Guy Robertson Hans Andersen Kathleen McGinley Lara Murray Linda Heath Tiesha Street

# 30th Meeting of the Montréal Process Working Group Agenda

**September 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020**  
**18:00 to 21:00 pm. New York Time Zone (GMT-4)**

## September 14<sup>th</sup> (Tuesday)

Time	Topic	Moderator
18:00 - 18:05	(1) Opening meeting (2) Nomination of MPWG Chair—Linda Heath (USA)	Tomás Schlichter (Current MPWG Chair, Argentina)
18:05 - 18:20	(3) Welcome participants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement from MPWG Chair</li> <li>• Video presentation by US Forest Service Chief Randy Moore</li> </ul>	Linda Heath (USA)
18:20 - 18:30	(4) Adoption of Agenda, (5) Nomination of meeting officers (6) Report from the Liaison Office	Jingpin Lei (LO)
18:30 – 19:10	(7) Country Experiences with SFM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canada (NFI, 10 minutes)</li> <li>• China (10 Minutes)</li> <li>• NZ Legality Verification System (20 minutes)</li> </ul>	Linda Heath (USA)
19:10 - 19:50	(8) Discussion of forest-type definitions (“primary,” “degraded,” “intact,” and etc.)	Maureen Whelan (Canada)
19:50 - 20:00	Break	
20:00 - 20:30	(9) Report on TAC Activities and TAC Convenor Logistics	Tim Payn (TAC Convenor) New Zealand
20:30 - 21:00	(10) MP Synthesis Report	Tim Payn (TAC Convenor)
21:00	End of day 1	

### September 15<sup>th</sup> (Wednesday)

Time	Topic	Moderator /coordinator
18:00	Entrance of participants	Linda Heath (USA)
18:05 – 18:20	(11) Quick review of global C&I and related reporting activities.	Stefany Linser (IUFRO C&I Working Group)
18:20 - 19:10	(7) Country Experiences with SFM (continued): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USA Boreal forests in Alaska (20 Minutes)</li> <li>• Japan (10 Minutes)</li> <li>• Australia (SOFR, OECMs 20 minutes)</li> </ul>	Linda Heath (USA)
19:10 – 19:40	(12) Micro Symposia proposal	New Zealand
19:40 - 19:50	(13) World Forestry Congress and other meetings	Guy Robertson (USA), Republic of Korea
19:50 – 20:00	(14) Montréal Process website	Guy Robertson (USA)
20:00 – 20:20	Break (compile conclusions and action items for MPWG review of Aide Memoire)	
20:20 - 20:50	(15) The next MPWG meeting (16) MPWG review of the Aide Memoire. (Main conclusions and action items)	Meeting officer or meeting Chair
20:50 – 21:00	(15) Any other business and closure of the meeting	Linda Heath (USA)