



## FSP Implementation: *Apollo's approach*

**ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2005, OUR MULTI-LICENSEE** multi-Forest District Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) was approved. We spent most of the previous year working on plan approval – FSP implementation was not even on the radar screen. It is important to note that the development and management of the plan is a collaborative effort between five licensees in the Prince George Timber Supply Area – Apollo Forest Products Ltd. (Apollo), Winton Global, Lakeland Mills Ltd., L&M Lumber Ltd. and Ta Da Chun Timber Ltd.

The holders of this FSP worked cooperatively together to create a consistent approach to the implementation of the FSP, recognizing that each licensee has specific business needs, unique forest conditions and differing internal forest management systems. Having said that, the remainder of this article focuses on the general approach Apollo has taken to establish a working FSP implementation program. This program pertains directly to monitoring and reporting, as well as professional reliance and accountability for carrying out forest practices to meet specified requirements.

Under Section 197 of the *Forest and Range Practices Act* (FRPA), Subsections 4, 5 and 7 allow the holders of the FSP some flexibility in choosing which blocks and roads apply to the FSP and which would remain in under the Forest Practices Code (the Code). A holder of an FSP may gain some administrative flexibility by varying Subsections 4, 5 and 7 within the FSP. Depending on how Section 197 of FRPA was considered, a comprehensive list of blocks and roads can be created that clearly defines the scope of the FSP, as well as be used to specify the appropriate administrative framework.

The requirements detailed in the FSP need to be examined to determine if there were other company initiatives/programs in place that could be used for monitoring and reporting out on FSP results, strategies and measures. In our case, the vast majority of FSP requirements have been duplicated in other environmental monitoring and reporting programs already in place. Where existing programs did not cover off an FSP requirement, new systems were developed as part of the overall FSP implementation program.

Environmental indicators and associated targets detailed in the Fort St. James Sustainable Forest Management Plan (SFMP) are consistent with the majority of the requirements in our FSP. These similarities reduce some of the duplication of effort for data tracking in our forestry information systems. Essential to the management of the SFMP is the establishment of an efficient monitoring and reporting program for each of the indicators. Licensee's performance relative to SFM targets and indicators are made available to the public. Individual licensee performance may also be subject to third party audits as part of certification efforts (for example: CAN/CSA-Z809-02 standard).

Company specific Environmental Management System (EMS) is another effective program for monitoring and reporting FSP requirements. The EMS is designed to ensure forest practices (for blocks and roads) meet or exceed an acceptable environmental standard. With a little work, most EMS programs can be tailored to accommodate the requirements of the FSP.

The discussion up to this point has been focused on the establishment of a functional

program to deal with FSP implementation. The 'how' part of FSP implementation can be addressed through professional reliance and accountability. Where the Code was heavily focused on prescriptive forest management, the intent of the FRPA was to specify results, not necessarily describe the tools used to achieve them. This point is where the FSP implementation road gets a bit muddy – no pun intended. The tools we utilize to achieve specific results can be taken from previously accepted practices and procedures, relevant scientific research, and local knowledge and experience. As forest professionals, we are professionally responsible to ensure appropriate forest practices are prescribed, implemented and monitored for compliance with the FSP.

FSP responsibilities must be assigned to key staff. For our situation, the majority of the responsibility falls heavily on the shoulders of planning and operational staff. Internal communication with staff, as well as internal tracking of responsibilities, is necessary to ensure consistency between the requirements of the FSP and the carrying out of forest practices.

As a final note, upfront communication of FSP implementation between the holders of the FSP and government staff may make for an easier transition to FRPA. A joint meeting with appropriate government staff will provide licensees the opportunity to present how they intend to implement, monitor, and carry out forest practices to satisfy the requirements of the FSP. 🐼

*Darwyn Koch, RPF, has been working in the forest industry since 1986. He is currently the planning forester for Apollo Forest Products Ltd. in Fort St. James.*