



## New tax discourages new plantings

WHEN THE GOVERNMENT SIGNED THE KYOTO PROTOCOL IT BECAME PARTY TO SOME VERY ARBITRARY RULES FOR FORESTRY.

As a result, land in forests in 1990 incurs a liability if it is now converted to another use. The size of that liability is massive, with estimates ranging from \$20,000 to \$50,000 a hectare.

Much of the carbon in an actively growing plantation forest will have been absorbed since 1990, but Kyoto doesn't take that into account. It is assumed all carbon in the forest is returned to the atmosphere following harvest as if it were a fossil fuel emission.

Faced with a potentially large bill for signing up to these and other illogical rules, the government has decided to sheet the costs home to the owners of pre-1990 forests by way of a deforestation tax.

As "generous" compensation, they will be grand-parented an allowance equivalent to around 5% of the area normally converted in any year, but only until 2020. In contrast the liability, backdated to 1 January 2008, will apply to the entire pre-1990 estate forever.


About 1.2 million ha of the country's 1.8 million ha of plantation forest is involved and the liability totals at least \$2.4 billion. The government's compen-

sation package offsets only about 3% of this.

Although the liability becomes a cost only when a forest is converted to another use, it has instantly reduced the market value of all pre-1990 forestland. For some forests the loss of value has been massive – \$10,000/ha or more.

"It has been argued that pre-1990



 The deforestation tax is not only unjust – it's not needed

"But that is not a justification for a policy that is retrospective, arbitrarily divides the industry between pre-1990 and post-1989 forest owners, disadvantages forestry against competing land uses and wipes out millions of dollars of land value."

Rhodes says the tax is not only unjust – it is not needed.

"In the absence of a tax, deforestation in the next few years would probably be a little higher than the annual historical level of 5%, because of the currently higher profitability of other land uses. But the vast majority of forests would still be replanted," he says.

"Also, conversion is costly and only occurs where the benefits of a new land use outweigh the benefits of staying in forestry. By disallowing conversion, the government is effectively disallowing innovative activities that are likely to be of greater benefit to the economy."

Most importantly, from a forestry perspective, the area of land with potential for planting in new forests dwarfs the area that is likely to be converted. To get this land planted, forest policies must win back the confidence of those who already own and manage significant forest estates.

Rhodes says abandoning the deforestation tax is the best way to get these people planting again. It will also restore the land-use flexibility which has served New Zealand so well in the past.

"If the government decides the tax must stay, forest owners should be compensated for their losses in land value, based on historic rates of deforestation for a period that mirrors the length of a forest rotation. Exemptions for small block owners should not be deducted from the compensation to be shared by commercial forest owners.

"Also, forest owners should be given the flexibility to replant forests in a new location following harvest, without penalty."

forest owners have to be treated this way, because of the wording of the Kyoto Protocol. But this doesn't wash. A literal interpretation of Kyoto rules certainly hasn't been applied to other sectors such as farming and transport," says NZFOA chief executive David Rhodes.

"Also, the tax is not being applied to an activity started since Kyoto was ratified nor from the start of the first commitment period. It is being applied to forests that were first planted at least 18 years ago and in many cases, up to 80 years ago."

He concedes that the frighteningly large deforestation penalties have stopped deforestation in its tracks.

... continued page 3

### IN THIS ISSUE

WHO PAYS TO STOP THE INVADERS | 2

FIRE: WHAT DOES THE LAW SAY? | 2

CHANCE TO FINE-TUNE RURAL FIRE LAW | 3

CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH DIRECTORY | 4

FOREST OWNERS COMMIT TO CLEANER WATER | 6

IRIS DATABASE UPGRADE | 6

BETTER PEST SURVEILLANCE NEEDED | 7

INDIAN FUMIGANT TRIALLED | 7

GRAEME HALL HONOURED | 8

KERRY ELLEM TO STEP DOWN | 8



# Who pays to stop the invaders?



By NZFOA  
executive director  
David Rhodes

WHEN IT COMES TO BIOSECURITY, FOREST OWNERS ARE UNIQUE.

We are the only primary industry to have a formal surveillance programme for plant pests and diseases, funded by growers themselves (see page 7).

However, the programme is not formally linked with other surveillance programmes – despite the close personal contacts we have with MAF Biosecurity staff and biosecurity researchers at Scion. And it doesn't cover small forest blocks, shelter belts or the indigenous estate.

Linking all the biosecurity strands together, as part of a coherent policy applying to all sectors, is therefore vital. This need was identified in the Prime Report for MAF in 2002 and in the NZ Biosecurity Review of 2003.

MAF plans to do this in its new Biosecurity Surveillance Strategy due to be released for stakeholder comment in May.

As part of the development of this strategy, MAF is reviewing who should decide whether an exotic organism is contained or eradicated, and who should pay. These are important questions.

The budget for painted apple moth eradication in Auckland in 2003/04 was more than \$51 million – a large sum. But it would have been a fraction of the annual economic cost of controlling the moth in forest plantations if it had got away – quite apart from the destruction it would have wrought in native forests, gardens and parks.

A proposal that MAF Biosecurity should work in partnership with affected sectors in preparing for and dealing with incursions like this is to be applauded. But the suggestion that they should also jointly fund such activities is a more complex issue.

In various policy papers, MAF argues that those who contribute to an incursion ('exacerbators'), if they can be identified, may not have the resources to contribute to the response. This draws the ministry to conclude that "funding from importers seems unfair and inefficient" and that "beneficiaries are better placed to pay than exacerbators".

The NZFOA does not accept that this conclusion is logical. Also, it runs con-



Painted apple moth spraying in Auckland

A big price tag, but a fraction of the annual cost if the moth had 'got away'

trary to the polluter-pays principle and sends the wrong signal for influencing behaviour.

Just like trampers and hunters, who have to pay for control costs if their campfires spread to the surrounding forest, importers need to know they will be liable if pests spread from their shipping containers into the surrounding environment.

On a practical level too, an industry battling with a new organism may well have very little ability to pay – especially if leads to the loss of overseas markets, or if yields and quality are severely compromised.

The NZFOA accepts in principle that there can be circumstances where it would be appropriate for an industry to contribute to an incursion response. But ...

- The industry would need to be getting a disproportionately higher benefit than society at large

## FIRE

## What's your legal position?

Forest Owners unsure of their legal position when it comes to fire control issues should refer to the NZFOA website.

*The Legal Rights and Obligations of Forest Owners With Regard to Rural Fire Control Issues in New Zealand*, was written in 2005 by Geoff Cameron of Cameron & Associates.

This was followed by two surveys, completed in 2007, designed to get a better understanding of the nature and extent of rural fire control activities undertaken by NZFOA members.

- Exacerbators would have been identified and required to pay their share

- The efforts of the industry to prevent or minimise the impact of an incursion through surveillance, research etc, would have been taken into account

- Other beneficiaries would be contributing on the same basis.

With forestry, we imagine this might occur if an exotic organism arrived in the country unassisted, with effects that were largely restricted to one or two plantation species – a very unusual event.

Because of this, we believe the policy reviews should focus on ensuring that New Zealand has a coherent and integrated biosecurity framework covering surveillance, readiness, response and recovery. It would indeed be unfortunate if this focus was lost in squabbles over 'who pays' in a range of unlikely hypothetical scenarios.

Both the legal report and the surveys were designed to help inform the NZFOA submission on a government proposal to centralise urban and rural fire control in a single organisation (see article opposite).

*Aspects of Rural Fire Management in New Zealand's Plantation Forests – 2007*, is available on the members section of the NZFOA website.

*Legal Rights and Obligations* is available at [www.nzfoa.org.nz/index.php?/File\\_libraries\\_resources/Fire/](http://www.nzfoa.org.nz/index.php?/File_libraries_resources/Fire/)

## Chance to fine-tune rural fire law

**FOREST OWNERS HAVE WELCOMED THE DECISION OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER RICK BARKER TO REVISIT A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A CENTRALISED FIRE CONTROL AGENCY.**

“We compliment him for his courage in making this decision,” says NZFOA fire committee chair Kerry Ellem.

“There is a fundamental difference between fire in rural versus urban settings. In town, fire is almost always a negative; something that needs to be put out. But in rural areas fire is also used as a management tool and is one of many factors land managers need to take into account when managing their environment. Because of this, a one-size-fits-all model is not appropriate. It may look tidy on paper, but it has been shown to be a very unwise move when attempted in other countries.”

The NZFOA has been lobbying hard to overturn the department’s proposal to centralise all fire services first floated four years ago. Association members have around 350 highly trained fire fighting management staff, backed up by 1900 skilled forestry fire fighters and 1350 trained contractor fire fighters.

“We risked losing their commitment, expertise and the volunteer spirit if the proposal had been allowed to go ahead,” Ellem says.

In his view it would be better to strengthen the existing structure through law changes targeted at specific anomalies.

“For example, rural volunteers at non-fire incidents like motor vehicle crashes need legal protection. Also, all rural ratepayers should be required to pay their share of rural fire control costs.”

He says the driver for change appears to have been anomalies in the treatment

of urban fire fighters, depending on whether they work for professional or volunteer brigades.

“No doubt these things need to be sorted, by not at the expense of a fire fighting structure which works extremely well in most rural fire areas.

“Local bodies, forest owners and government agencies like DoC and the Army work together co-operatively. They are co-ordinated by the National Rural Fire Authority which does a very good job, setting standards and assisting with training.”

Barker told the United Fire Brigades Association conference in March that while no final decision had been made,

it was not the right time to be reforming fire legislation.

“We need to have a strong consensus for change to make things work. But the results of the consultation show that we are struggling to reach a consensus with all stakeholders on the way forward.”

Ellem says he hopes the minister will soon announce plans for the fine-tuning of fire legislation, based on existing structures.

“With climate change bringing more frequent droughts, land managers need to know their commitment to training and fire fighting resources is well-founded.”



A centralised fire agency would struggle to maintain the commitment, expertise and volunteer spirit of existing rural fire services

... continued from front page

This is not provided for in the rules for the first Kyoto Protocol commitment period 2008-12, but is a change the government must seek when negotiating for the period post-2012. In the meantime, the carbon cost of offsetting will be more or less offset by extra economic activity on the former forest land.

Rhodes says forest owners support action on climate change and endorse the principle that the Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) is ultimately intended to include all gases and all sectors. He also sees as positive the fact that post-1989 forest owners will be able to participate in the scheme.

“For these reasons we are co-operating with the government on carbon monitoring in post-1989 forests and are in good faith discussions with officials and ministers about how the ETS and Kyoto can be modified for the benefit of forest owners and New Zealand.”



# Climate change research in full swing

IN CONTRAST TO THE MOOD AMONG PRE-KYOTO FOREST OWNERS, RESEARCHERS HAVE EVERY REASON TO BE PLEASED WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S CLIMATE CHANGE PLAN OF ACTION.

On 20 March agriculture and forestry minister Jim Anderson announced more than \$5 million in funding for the first tranche of research proposals funded by the Plan of Action for Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change (SLMCC).

In addition, numerous other projects with a climate change focus are being – or are about to be – funded by other agencies. Many of these initiatives are outlined in the Climate Change Plan of Action investment sheets on MAF's climate change website [www.maf.govt.nz/climatechange/poa-investment-sheets].

This complements forest research spending under the umbrella of the Forest Industry Development Agenda.

Because so many new projects are underway, few know who's doing what. The following is a list of climate change research projects the NZFOA knows of that have a direct relevance to forestry. If there are gaps, please let us know and we will include them in a future issue of the *Forestry Bulletin*.

NZFOA chief executive David Rhodes says forest owners welcome the government's investment in climate change research.

"Land owners with an eye for the future are already talking about carbon farming, but at present the science underpinning forest carbon trading is fairly thin. There is a lot to learn in quite a short time frame."

## BIO-FUELS

### Life cycle analysis of sustainable biofuel options

*Analysis of the benefits and costs of likely options*

Gavin Fisher: g.fisher@endpoint.co.nz

Endpoint Consulting Partners Limited, Auckland

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

## CROSS SECTORAL RESEARCH

### Carbon stocks and change in NZ's soils and forests

*Determine the implications for NZ of post-2012 Kyoto accounting options (offsets and mitigation) for Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry (LULUCF). Identify and prioritise the knowledge gaps and uncertainties*

Craig Trotter: trotterc@landcareresearch.co.nz

Landcare Research Palmerston North, with Scion, AgResearch, Crop & Food and GNS Science

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

### Carbon storage in vegetation on public lands

*Implications of pest control on carbon stocks in vegetation on public lands and identification of ongoing research needs*

Rob Allen: allenr@landcareresearch.co.nz

Landcare Research, Lincoln

Funding: DoC

### Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the terrestrial biosphere

*Measurement and modelling of greenhouse gas exchange for terrestrial systems, mitigation and adaptation to climate change*

David Whitehead: whiteheadd@landcareresearch.co.nz

Landcare Research, Lincoln

Funding: Foundation for Research, Science & Technology

### Voluntary carbon market opportunities

*Analysis of voluntary carbon market opportunities for agriculture and forestry given current rules and NZ's policy settings and implications for these opportunities under future scenarios*

Simon Young: simon.young@thekarogroup.net

The Karo Group Limited, Auckland

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

## FORESTRY RESEARCH

### Forestry and the ETS

*Research in support of forestry ETS (various projects)*

Steve Wakelin, Thomas Paul, Peter Beets, Chris Goulding:

firstname.secondname@scionresearch.com

Scion Rotorua and Dunedin

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

### Forest and forest land valuation

*Developing a method for valuing forests and forest land in New Zealand in the presence of carbon pricing*

Lew Evans or Richard Meade: Lew.Evans@vuw.ac.nz

ISCR, Victoria University

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

### How changes in how forests reflect light affect their value as carbon sinks

*The effects of differences in albedo (reflectance) on pasture and forest energy balance under New Zealand conditions. Identify key knowledge gaps and consider potential discounts that may need to be applied to carbon sinks.*

David Whitehead: whiteheadd@landcareresearch.co.nz

Landcare Research, Lincoln with Scion

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

### The effect of climate change on New Zealand's planted forests: impacts, risks and opportunities

Thomas Paul: thomas.paul@scionresearch.com

Scion Rotorua, with NIWA and Landcare Research

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

### Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) for building materials in New Zealand

*The results of this project, in combination with greenhouse gas footprinting research for the forestry sector, will lay the basis for fair LCA comparisons of different building types.*

Barbara Nebel: barbara.nebel@scionresearch.com

Scion Wellington, with Victoria University

Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action



**The science underpinning forest carbon trading is fairly thin.**  
Forest owners and regulators have a lot to learn in quite a short time

#### **Forest management for carbon and carbon price risk**

*Identifying how New Zealand forest management practices should change to manage the uncertainty around carbon trading and carbon price dynamics*

James Turner: james.turner@scionresearch.com  
Scion Rotorua with McLaren & Associates  
Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

#### **Carbon trading and forestry decision-making**

*Evaluation of the impact of carbon trading on forest profitability, choice of species, forest rotation length and whether to harvest at all*

Dr Bruce Manley: bruce.manley@canterbury.ac.nz  
NZ School of Forestry, University of Canterbury, Christchurch  
Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

#### **Forest carbon accounting for CP2**

*Explore alternative carbon accounting systems for forests from 2013 on*

Dr Bruce Manley: bruce.manley@canterbury.ac.nz  
NZ School of Forestry, University of Canterbury, Christchurch  
Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

#### **Forest growth rate**

*Creation of models of plantation forest growth that are sensitive to climate and application of models to alternative climate change scenarios in New Zealand*

Dr Bruce Manley: bruce.manley@canterbury.ac.nz  
NZ School of Forestry, University of Canterbury, Christchurch  
Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

#### **How can forest owners manage risk and uncertainty associated with carbon prices?**

*To identify key risks for forest managers in New Zealand for participation in a domestic ETS and to assess management strategies to deal with these risks*

Andre Neumann: andre\_neumann@urscorp.com

URS New Zealand Ltd, Auckland  
Funding: NZ Government SLMCC Plan of Action

#### **Design methodology for the Permanent Forest Sinks Initiative**

*Development of methodology for the PFSI*

Larry Burrows: burrowsl@landcaresearch.co.nz  
Landcare Research, Lincoln  
Funding: MAF

#### **Carbon sequestration in indigenous forests and shrublands**

*Determination of default sequestration rates for Emissions Trading Scheme and Permanent Forest Sinks Initiative*

Ian Payton: paytoni@landcareresearch.co.nz  
Landcare Research, Lincoln  
Funding: MAF

#### **Land-use mapping and LULUCF accounting**

*Determination of land use maps for carbon reporting and LULUCF (land use land use change) accounting*

Craig Trotter: trotterc@landcareresearch.co.nz  
Landcare Research, Palmerston North  
Funding: MfE

### **LAND MANAGEMENT**

#### **The economic impacts of soil erosion**

Haydon Jones: haydon.jones@scionresearch.com  
Scion Rotorua, with the NZIER, CSIRO Forest Biosciences & Landcare Research  
Funding: MAF Operational Research Fund

Thanks to all those who helped in the compilation of this table, including MAF's Gerald Rys, Scion's Tim Payn and Landcare's David Whitehead.



## Forest owners commit to cleaner water

**FOREST OWNERS WILL FURTHER IMPROVE THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE AS PART OF THE GOVERNMENT'S SUSTAINABLE WATER PROGRAMME OF ACTION (SWPoA).**

The NZFOA has been part of a primary sector water reference group chaired by Federated Farmers. After two years of discussions, agriculture and forestry minister Jim Anderton sought meaningful commitments from each of the sector groups.

NZFOA environment committee chair Peter Weir says forest owners led this process, committing the industry to firm water quality targets.

"We did this from the start of the discussions, and for sound business reasons. Our environmental performance is an attribute we use when marketing industry products," he says.

"Also, in a growing number of regions, compliance with the industry's Environmental Code of Practice cuts through the red tape involved in getting RMA consents for normal forestry operations."

The NZFOA is committed to clean water targets which the reference group has agreed will apply to all land-based industries. These include a commitment that by 2010, all forestry land and by 2016, 1.7 million ha of intensively farmed land, will have implemented management programmes to minimise microbial and sediment deposition in waterways.

The NZFOA has also proposed meaningful targets specific to the forest sector. These include a commitment that by December 2009 all forestry contractors operating on members' land will comply with the compulsory rules in the NZFOA Environmental Code of Practice Code.

Forest owners will also support field trials of how environmental impact mitigation methods, like biochar, may be incorporated into common agricultural systems.

In addition, they will help MfE develop, by December 2009, a National Environmental Standard (NES) under the RMA designed to protect water quality during normal forest operations.

Weir says the latter target is up for negotiation with MfE.

"We would prefer to see government develop a NES giving permitted activity status for activities such as road and track construction, or culvert installa-

tion, which applies to all land-based industries. At the moment, standards vary greatly from district to district and from industry to industry," he explains. "A culvert is a culvert, whether it is in a forest or on a farm. So long as engineering standards and installation practices are robust and defensible, and based on the effects-based principles of the RMA, they should apply across the country."

### SAFETY

## Easier input, better data

**FOREST OWNERS ARE ABOUT TO GET A MUCH MORE POWERFUL SAFETY MANAGEMENT TOOL.**

A major upgrade of the industry's IRIS (Incident Recording & Information System) database is nearly complete and has even attracted interest from the Australian forestry sector.

"It will provide members with much better data. At the same time it will greatly reduce the frustrations associated with entering and downloading data," says NZFOA health & safety committee member Wayne Dempster.

A new safety alert library will allow anyone to view and print safety alerts. Registered users will be able to upload new safety alerts as safety issues or trends come to their attention – replacing the informal alerts circulated to email groups.

The database is one of several major forest industry safety initiatives launched in the last decade that have been highly successful at reducing injury and fatality rates.

Now IRIS, along with some of the other initiatives, is being revisited to see if safety can be improved even further.

Dempster says reports generated by IRIS have been improved, allowing users to more effectively benchmark their performance in specific work areas. Data validation tools have been built in and annoying bugs have gone.

"When users log on they will find the whole look has changed. Graphs will show their company's trends compared with the industry as a whole," he says.

Dempster says it is now important for all those responsible for health & safety management to make the most of the revamped site.

Quality input will allow effective industry-wide incident and injury analysis to be undertaken and provide a sound basis for developing injury

In the next phase of the SWPoA, NZFOA representatives will meet with chief executives and senior policy staff of regional councils, to explain the industry's new Environmental Code of Practice.

#### More?

Contact Peter Weir, Tel 0274 547 873, peter.weir@ernslaw.co.nz



An upgrade of IRIS is one of several initiatives designed to maximise safety in the forest

reduction and prevention initiatives.

#### More?

Contact Wayne Dempster, tel 09 357 9145 or 0274 432 507, wayne.dempster@rayonier.com

## Better surveillance needed

THE NZFOA'S FOREST HEALTH SURVEILLANCE SCHEME (FHS) MAY BE THE BEST IN THE WORLD, BUT IT'S STILL NOT GOOD ENOUGH.

That was the feeling of the 60 or so industry, government and research representatives that met in Rotorua in early March for the 7th Annual Forest Biosecurity Workshop jointly sponsored by NZFOA and MAF.

Late last year the FHS, which covers 1.2 million ha of New Zealand's exotic forest estate, was reviewed by international experts Andrew Liebhold and Brenda Callan. It came through with flying colours (*Forestry Bulletin*, Summer 2007/08).

However the report highlighted areas for improvement, including more monitoring of high-risk sites. These and other recommendations will now be tackled by the NZFOA and MAF over the next 12 months.

Liebhold and Callan said the current surveillance programme in commercial forests "nicely complements" surveillance of high-risk areas conducted by MAF. But they pointed out that surveillance in farm forests and in native forests is either lacking or uncoordinated with MAF/NZFOA activities.

"This ... should be addressed at a national level."

Denis Hocking of the Farm Forestry Association says surveillance of small forests is definitely an area of weakness. "The association has put quite a lot of effort into raising member awareness but it's been an uphill battle."

Dean Satchell – the NZFFA representative on the NZFOA forest health committee – has, with help from Scion, created an on-line database of pests and diseases of trees to help address the problem. The Sustainable Farming Fund provided funding.

Using a second SFF grant approved in early April, a biosecurity monitoring and awareness-building programme will now be developed for owners of small forests and large shelterbelts with the aim of reducing everyone's level of risk.

Paul Bradbury of SPS Biosecurity Ltd who is working with Satchell, says risk criteria for monitoring small forests will be identified during the project. A field guide, showing small forest owners how to inspect trees for symptoms of pest and disease attack, and how to collect

samples is also proposed.

"The real challenge is going to be to change the behaviour of many tree owners. Most farm foresters are quite clued up, but this is not necessarily the case with owners of small blocks and shelter belts," says Bradbury.

The adequacy of surveillance of the Department of Conservation (DoC) estate is currently under review.

Joanne Perry, DoC's biosecurity manager says the department used to formally monitor selected sites on its estate for plant pests and diseases. But responsibility for this was transferred to MAF Biosecurity in 2004.

Nevertheless DoC's field staff, who are trained to monitor for unusual weeds, also report any unusual plant pests or diseases they encounter. The regular 'false alarms' brought to her notice indicate that they take their jobs seriously.

MAF still monitors insect traps set up by DoC at 65 high-risk sites, but Paul Stevens of MAF Biosecurity says a revamped programme will be announced soon.

"From MAF's point of view, the greatest border security risks are at the front end – near the border. Other major risk areas are at forest road-ends and at first night campsites, where visitors unpack their packs, sleeping bags and tents.

"It is far more effective to focus on these areas, than trying to monitor the whole DoC estate."

Stevens is MAF Biosecurity's representative on the NZFOA forest health committee.

"Co-ordination between the NZFOA, MAF Biosecurity and forest health scientists at Scion is excellent," he says.

More? [www.nzffa.org.nz/pests/Forestry\\_pests\\_and\\_diseases.html](http://www.nzffa.org.nz/pests/Forestry_pests_and_diseases.html)



The best forest surveillance scheme in the world is being fine-tuned and linked to a new integrated national biosecurity strategy

## New fumigant trialled

PHOSPHINE DIS-INFESTATION OF PINE LOGS IS BEING TRIALLED UNDER THE GAZE OF MAF BIOSECURITY AND THE INDIAN MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE.

The logs are being treated in modified sea containers on land under conditions that replicate a ship's hold. The aim is to demonstrate to the Government of India that phosphine is an effective in-transit log fumigant.

At present, most New Zealand logs and sawn lumber are fumigated with methyl bromide in port before shipment. Under the Montreal Protocol, the gas can no longer be used in food production because it depletes ozone in the upper atmosphere, but it can still be used for biosecurity purposes.

Because there is no international standard for ozone-friendly alternatives like phosphine, its use has to be negotiated with authorities in each individual importing country. So far, China is the only market to accept phosphine as an on-board fumigant for logs carried in the ship's hold.

The trial is being undertaken by the Stakeholders in Methyl Bromide Reduction group (STMBR) which is also investigating other fumigants. Sulphuryl fluoride, methyl iodide and ethane dinitrile are potential candidates, so long as they can be registered for use in New Zealand.

The ideal, says Wei-Young Wang, the NZFOA's phosphine research co-ordinator, would be an on-board treatment that didn't involve chemicals.

Phosphine has the potential to meet the first of these criteria and is cheaper than methyl bromide. Lights of specific wavelengths also have potential to attract and repel insects and, in overseas trials, heat treatment of lumber has been shown to be effective. Both are being investigated in New Zealand.

### More?

Wei-Young Wang, NZFOA phosphine research coordinator Tel 07 921 7207, Mobile 021 609 305, email [wei-young.wang@pfolsen.com](mailto:wei-young.wang@pfolsen.com)



## Industry stalwart honoured

GRAEME HALL, THE NATIONAL SECRETARY OF THE NZFOA FOR 30 YEARS, HAS BEEN HONOURED BY THE QUEEN.

He is now an officer of the NZ Order of Merit for his services to 'people with disabilities and the community'.

An accountant by training, Hall has had a distinguished professional career as a business advisor, professional trustee and board member, and Wellington-based industry representative.

On leaving secondary school he joined Martin Jarvie, an accountancy practice which was heavily involved in industry economic analysis and representation to government. By 1978 he was national secretary of the NZFOA working part-time out of the Martin Jarvie Underwood & Hall office.

In 1990 the NZFOA had grown to the point where it appointed Ken Shirley as



Graeme Hall, ONZM

its first fulltime chief executive. However Hall continued as national secretary, supportive to the chief executive, a role he continues at present.

"These days I am the institutional memory, have an overview of the finances and provide a sounding board for the chief executive," he says.

Although Hall has made a huge contribution to the NZFOA over the years, he was honoured principally for his work for a host of community organisations including the New Zealand Artificial Limb Board.

"Over the years I have chaired 30 or 40 organisations. Some of these have been commercial, but some have reflected my own interests in education,

civic affairs and health and disability particularly. In other cases I have been asked to help – sometimes as a ministerial appointee – when an organisation has found itself in trouble," he says.

This work has been greatly appreciated. For example, he is the only non-physiotherapist to be an honorary member of the Society of Physiotherapists. He is also one of the few non-surgeons to have been invested into the Court of Honour of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons.

These days Hall is retired from Martin Jarvie PKF (its current name) and is quietly shedding his chairmanships and other board interests. But he still enjoys his work with the NZFOA.

A highlight of his investiture at Government House was the attendance of an old colleague and friend, Tony Grayburn, former chief executive of NZFP Forests Ltd, who came down from Tauranga for the event.

"Eventually I will ride off in to the sunset, but for the meantime I'm happy to keep making a contribution for so long as I'm needed. Forestry is a wonderful industry and I am so proud to have played a part in it."

## National Office

THE NEW ZEALAND FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION IS KEEN TO HEAR FROM FOREST OWNERS AND OTHERS WITH AN INTEREST IN THE FOREST INDUSTRY. CONTACT:

David Rhodes, Chief Executive  
email: david.rhodes@nzfoa.org.nz

Glen Mackie, Senior Policy Analyst  
email: glen.mackie@nzfoa.org.nz

Diane Davidson, Office Manager  
email: diane.davidson@nzfoa.org.nz

Jay Matthes, Accounts Administration  
email: jay.matthes@nzfoa.org.nz

## 'Mr Fire' to step down

NZFOA FIRE COMMITTEE CHAIR KERRY ELLEM IS SERVING HIS FINAL TERM IN THE ROLE.

The forest industry's 'Mr Fire' has been chief executive of the Selwyn Plantation Board (SPB) for seven years and has been chair of the NZFOA fire committee for six of those years.

During his time in these roles, he has been a driving force behind fire research and has encouraged best fire management practices throughout the industry.

In the last three years he has led the industry's successful fight against the Department of Internal Affairs' proposal to centralise all fire management in a single agency (see story page 3).

For a similar period he has fought arbitrary restrictions on forestry in low rainfall catchments under Environment Canterbury's water management plan.

On 1 April, Ellem stepped down from his role at SPB, following the conversion of most of the board's forests on the Canterbury Plains to farmland.

"I have had an exciting and very fulfilling role with the board as it has gone through a period of rapid change. Now, as it enters a new era where farming is its dominant role, it's a good time for someone else to take over the helm," he says.

"I've also greatly enjoyed the camaraderie of the NZFOA fire committee. Members make an excellent contribution to the industry."

Ellem will serve as NZFOA fire committee chair until the annual meeting in October.



Kerry Ellem



The New Zealand Forestry Bulletin is published three times a year by the NZ Forest Owners Association, 85 The Terrace, P.O. Box 1208, Wellington. Tel 04 473 4769, fax 499 8893, email nzfoa@nzfoa.org.nz, web www.nzfoa.org.nz. Please acknowledge the NZFOA as the source when republishing stories or abstracts from the Bulletin. Publication date: 20 April 2008