



## Research for profit

At the AGM a number of members commented on the role of the Institute in relation to the Royal Society and the impression that, over the past five years, we have not participated in matters concerned with Science. The reshaping of the Royal Society has taken place at a time when Government introduced a major change to the way public good Science is administered.

Since the passage of the Crown Research Institute Act there has been a perceived fundamental shift in the way research is conducted in New Zealand. This has been due to the appreciation of fund providers that there has to be an identifiable return from research investment. This has long been seen as a natural requirement of private sector funded research. It is only recently that this has become evident in Government funded work and the Crown Research Institutes are now expected to show a return on assets employed, a profit on the research activity, a subsequent dividend to Government and of course pay tax, as does any company in business for pecuniary profit. Thus the SOE mindset is imported into research.

In seeking funds from whatever source, research providers comprehend the contestable quality of the process and therefore the need to be competitive. Therefore they do not tell the competition what they are up to with consequent derogation of the importance placed on cooperation between institutes and other providers. With the entry of the universities into the race for Public Good Science Funds this will be accentuated.

In commercial competition you could expect an output to be provided at a measured cost. However even in products such as electric power or telecommunications, this "cost per unit" is difficult to measure, as parts of the system of provision are more costly than others. For example, the urban/rural cost differential is well understood. In research the measure of output cost/benefit ratio is even more difficult to measure, as it is determined more by quality of output which could well reflect more efficient or experienced researchers but is hard to quantify in a commercialised research environment with constraints as seen in the business concerns over publication of papers.

At this stage it is worthwhile to consider in a quasi-cartel environment the so-called competitive process of provision of either petrol outlets or banking facilities. At some stage of competitive selection of the fittest (i.e. more profitable) provider, the players come to the conclusion that it is not sensible to cut prices which merely reduce margins and do not increase market share. Internationally airlines are the classic example of taking this process too far. Thus we can presume this process must eventually affect research providers with a similar process of rationalisation. In a small country such as New Zealand with as much demand for a diverse range of research capability as any developed country, we should seek to avoid waste of research capability and duplication. The recent MRST move to replace the STEPS process with a New Priorities Panel suggests that the Ministry has recognised that any doctrinaire adherence to competition is "unscientific" and that some better process of ensuring funding levels, allocation and quality of research provision to meet New Zealand needs is required. We have nominated Colin O'Loughlin for this new panel.



Peter Olsen

The Institute's involvement via the Royal Society has been reinforced by Colin O'Loughlin's membership of the standing committees on:

- (a) Primary production sciences and technologies, and
- (b) Science of the NZ environment.

There is now an opportunity to examine the current research provision model and adopt a more open, less competitive coordinated use of research capability.

The involvement with the Royal Society on a more active basis will enable our profession to have a significant input to this processes of research priority setting.

**P.F. Olsen**  
President

### Obituary

## John A. Hayward – 1938-1993

John Hayward, a man whose love of the land brought him into contact with many foresters and others in disciplines associated with forestry, died in Christchurch on December 9, 1993.

John was a man with eclectic interests. He began his career as a soil conservator in Otago, but took up a post at Lincoln College in 1964 with the Tussock Grasslands and Mountain Lands Institute, then under the leadership of Lance McCaskill (an Honorary member of the Institute), who had a major influence on several generations of New Zealand mountain land managers, conservationists and agriculturists. John was in due course to have the same reputation and the same effect on young men and women; they came to him as students and they left as citizens, possessing understanding of, and motivated

to care for, the land.

John's passion was the high country, the pastoral sheep stations and the land that we now know as 'conservation estate', a bureaucratic title for the tussock hills and forests which provided him with a reason for being – a reason he was always willing to share with his fellow men, for he was not averse to thinking and exploring the relationships between the land and the spiritual dimension of the human condition. It was this characteristic that perhaps above all others made him an outstanding leader, and teacher, able to question and explore issues with confidence and display an absolute conviction that, despite the problems that perforce comprised his daily teaching material, there were solutions to them, and a meaning to life. This characteristic he shared

with many foresters.

John's inquisitive mind took him into many areas in which he had an influence on foresters and forestry. Perhaps the first was his address to the Institute in Nelson, about the time he took up a post as Director of the Joint Centre for Environmental Studies (JCES) (Canterbury and Lincoln), in 1978, having been for 14 years Planning Officer with Tussock Grasslands and Mountain Lands Institute (TGMLI). In this address, of which no copy seems to have survived but which has been remembered, he challenged the profession to recognise that, however it may have historically seen itself, it was no longer capable of generating all the answers to the problems and challenges of forest management. New disciplines and new skills were being developed with which foresters must come to terms or be overwhelmed. In retrospect it must be said that the profession was very nearly overwhelmed.

His academic reputation rested on a piece of hydrological research conducted for his doctorate, in which he showed that contrary to the received wisdom of the day it was the riparian zone which was most influential in determining rates and quantities of sediment loss, and subsequent erosion. This work had a major effect on the development of soil conservation policies and practices in mountain lands.

At a time (1972) before such integrated studies became common, John conducted a comprehensive study of land use and recreation in the Waimakariri Basin. The language and concepts of landscape, recreation and multiple use in the final work would not be out of place were they published today.

John's most lasting legacy will be the cohorts of students who passed through the Centre for Resource Management, formed when TGMLI and JCES merged in 1982, with John as the founding Director. Here he made his life's work, developing and running a vibrant research and teaching centre which quickly gained a national and international reputation in integrated environmental management. John's interest in the connections between disciplines led him to explore the possibility of integrating the teaching of forestry into the Lincoln Campus and to teach it as a component of a broad undergraduate resource management degree with opportunities for specialisation.

In this he was not completely successful – and time alone will tell whether in this failure forestry will have been better off.

John's students now occupy positions of influence in many fields of endeavour, but particularly in the fields of land use

# The 66th NZIF AGM

## Nelson – April 27, 1994

Nelson in late April had glorious weather. Quite how the 66th AGM of the Institute attracted about 100 members indoors for the afternoon, I am not sure.

First up it was proposed to have the Rotorua Section stage the '95 AGM and Conference in Taupo with a theme of Technology and Research in the Forest Industry. That decided, we agreed to hold the '96 AGM somewhere in Australia in conjunction with a joint ANZIF Conference.

### Council Reports

Our President, Peter Olsen, gave due credit to the outgoing Council – Lisa Langer, Jolyon Manning, Laurie Halkett, Rob Van Rossen and temporary treasurer Peter Casey – and managed to get in a comment about the Working Groups working harder in future – admittedly not in those words, but it was clear that the progress made by the previous Council would solidify this term. The new Council members are Colin O'Loughlin, Tim Thorpe, Josie Boland (Secretary), Steve

policy and practice. Some departments of Lincoln have been known for their adherence to the so-called Chicago School of economic thinking in which the sum of pursuit of the individual benefit is presumed to optimise the benefit to society. This was not John's way, and not the way of his students, although he was never loathe to let them examine that particular philosophy. They will be found exerting a moderating influence in their professions, imposing control over the untrammelled operation of the market in the interests of the environment, future generations and the less fortunate of today's generation, whether as farmers, foresters, planners or policy makers in central and local government. The Resource Management Act is in large measure a monument to John, teacher, leader, adviser and friend of a generation.

One former student said "... I entered his course a Canadian living in New Zealand and left a New Zealander born in Canada".

No more significant tribute could be paid.

**John Holloway,**  
FNZIF.

Croskery (Treasurer) and Harold Corbett.

Sub-level reviews always seem to bring debate, and this year was no exception. An increase of \$10 for full and associate members and \$6 for students was nevertheless agreed on as a measure to help offset the diminishing accumulated funds.

### Membership Survey

The working groups reported, giving statistics, summaries and recommendations, and this was generally well received by the membership. As expected, the results of the Membership Survey attracted some discussion when the issue of member registration ... are we foresters or forestry professionals, what is the point of registering, who qualifies, why yet another qualification ...? was discussed. John Galbraith directed us through a congenial discussion until Bruce Manley took the floor to discuss changing the Consultants Recognition Scheme to a Registration Scheme.

### Forest Sustainability

Then the topic of Exotic and Indigenous Forest Sustainability and the RMA was discussed. This certainly attracted debate, with a motion to continue monitoring stocking, utilisation and harvest statistics; as recommended by Graham Whyte, having several amendments before being accepted by the floor. It was felt that the Institute should continue to conduct a critical appraisal of NEFD Statistics and suggest the introduction of improved methodology. The Institute should also press for better reporting of the rate of harvest and the pattern of utilisation, as recommended in last year's working group report, and it should encourage the formulation and introduction of Standards for routinely reporting the quantity and maturity of forest resources.

### Open Forum

Finally, the open forum brought discussion on the press, fire insurance, tourism, the increasing political profile of forestry, taxation and economic policy. And may we please hear more from the local sections?

**Josie Boland**  
Secretary