

# LETTERS

## Thoughts on the 1995 NZIF Conference

Sir,

Let's start with the good things. The venue, in particular the auditorium and the trade exhibition hall, was very satisfactory. Overall projection facilities were also satisfactory, apart from the overhead projector getting in the way at times, and insufficient dimming of the auditorium lighting. Catering was well done, and the social functions excellent, particularly the dinner at Manuel's where the food was exceptional for a conference of this size.

The scientific programme produced some thought-provoking and first-class presentations. Regrettably the programme was overfull. There was a total absence of discussion after any paper on both days – a situation that I have never before encountered in any of the numerous scientific meetings I have attended. Absence of discussion is most disappointing to those many speakers who had put so much time and effort into their papers, and diminishes the value to the audience. As always, some speakers ran overtime, but the chairmen were all too gentlemanly! More rigorous chairing would have helped. On the subject of chairmen, it is useful to have them listed on the programme, and all chairmen should be notified well in advance of the contents of their particular session. Slides are always important. When will speakers learn not to put too much on a slide? It was also distressing in a national meeting of this calibre to see several speakers, who should have known better, stand off and read their slides, rather than elaborating on them.

The AGM, held in two parts, was almost six hours in duration. Although at annual meetings such as this, insufficient time is frequently allotted to the AGM, this one was in somewhat extreme contrast. The agenda was too full. Some items which did not need discussing could have been dealt with by handout only.

Finally, could I make a plea for the programme, or at least a summary of it, to be circulated three months before the meeting? It is appreciated that a programme may not be finalised at that stage, but certainly the main topics and speakers should be. Some of us need time to make arrangements, and may also wish to be selective.

**Blair L.J. Treadwell**

## A commendation

Sir,

I would like to commend you and your editorial team on the quality of "New Zealand Forestry". The publication is a real flagship of the Institute and in my opinion one of the most valuable outputs of the Institute. The effort that has been put into the ongoing improvement of the style, presentation and content of the journal is appreciated by this reader. I hope that the high standards that have been reached will continue to be supported by the Council and members. Thank you for all your efforts that you have put into the Journal over the last few years.

**Peter Casey**

## Kauri versus radiata

Sir,

John Purey-Cust (May 1995) asks if there is a flaw in David Bellamy's argument that kauri growth is "faster growing" than radiata pine. The 'evidence' presented is that Tane Mahuta has a Mean Annual Increment (MAI) of 0.2 m<sup>3</sup>/ha/year, whereas a typical radiata pine in a stand of 300 stems/ha has only 0.07 m<sup>3</sup>/ha/year. Assuming that these figures are correct, and in both cases refer to *recoverable* volumes, we must still consider the following.

The figures for kauri come from a selected sample, with a sample size of one. One can seek out individual radiata pine trees that do just as well. For example, the best radiata pine in the GTI demonstration area, Long Mile Road, Rotorua has a volume of 4 m<sup>3</sup> at age 20 – the same MAI as Tane Mahuta.

Tane Mahuta is growing at a very low stocking, thereby giving good individual tree growth but lousy per hectare growth. For example, the final crop stocking trial at Tikitere has a MAI for the 400 stems/ha plots of 35.4 m<sup>3</sup>/ha/year at age 21, but only 0.09 m<sup>3</sup>/tree. By contrast, the MAI for the 50 stems/ha plots averages only 7.0m<sup>3</sup>/ha/year at age 21 but with a respectable 0.15 m<sup>3</sup>/tree/

The MAIs for the two species are taken at two different ages. If you look at the yield tables for radiata pine and Douglas fir (Neuman and Perley, 1992, National Exotic Forest Description Yield Tables, MOF, Wgtn), you will notice that radiata has a higher recoverable volume up to age 50, but after that Douglas fir excels. Douglas fir is therefore a "faster growing" species if a time-frame of 50-80 years is used, but not otherwise.

It is naive to consider that "fast

growth" is synonymous with MAI, and that this is the only criterion for selecting a tree species. "Fast growth" can refer to rotation age, initial height growth, diameter growth or many other things. Moreover, I suggest that there are five criteria that determine a profitable forestry investment: recoverable volume at harvest, average stumpage price per unit volume, cost of production, timing of costs and revenues, and finally the investment risk. "Fast growth" as used by Bellamy refers only to the first of these.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate John on his articles which are always stimulating and extremely well-written, even if I do not always agree with them (as in this case).

**Piers Maclaren**

## NZIF reply to Grant Rosoman

Sir,

I have been asked by the NZIF Council to reply to Grant Rosoman's letter in the May 1995 issue of NZ Forestry. Essentially, Mr Rosoman's letter asks: Where does the Institute stand on the issue of conversion of indigenous forest to plantation forest with particular regard to the Forest Accord? Mr Rosoman quotes two examples of contractors who have allegedly broken the intent of the Accord by clearing indigenous forest for pine plantation.

As Mr Rosoman is aware, the Institute is not a signatory to the Accord, nor has it ratified the Accord. Some discussion did take place on the possibility of the Institute ratifying the Accord at the Institute AGM in Napier in 1993. Opinions were divided on this issue and ultimately the idea lapsed. The Institute is, however, currently providing comment on the *Principles for Commercial Plantation Forestry Management* which is being prepared by the Forest Accord partners. There is a real possibility that the Institute may be asked to be a signatory to this document. The Indigenous Working Group of the Institute will be taking a clean-slate approach to a number of questions regarding indigenous forest management, including revisiting the term 'indigenous forest'. Through this work it is hoped that the Institute may be able to take a firmer position with regard to a number of issues, including those raised by Mr Rosoman in his letter.

With regard to the Institute's role in monitoring consultant activities, Mr Rosoman should be aware that the Institute maintains a consultant recognition scheme for New Zealand forest consultants. This