Is there a better way?

If so, better than what?
What do we have?

- Structural lumber in multiple grade SKU’s
- Multiple treatment SKU’s
- Grade substitution to chase price advantages
- Confusion from customers
- Research not the driver to allow “fit for purpose”
- Frequent and numerous changes
- Lack of knowledge by customers
- Etc........

How did we get here? Blame someone.

- Timber not “fit for purpose” (dry timber rotting?)
- Houses falling down for lack of stiffness?
- Government - reaction to the Act they didn’t enforce; make another Act
- Standards NZ reacts over the years and drives changes, not industry
- FRI telling home owners that the resource is changing so don’t huff and puff now (CHH technically wrong)
- Small high cost manufacturing mentality people wish to protect
- Evolution of an industry devoid of leadership
Go forward – Why?

The 4 x C’s;

1. **Cost**-to customer
2. **Competition**-overseas
3. **Cock-ups** – need to decrease the potential of
4. **Customer**-make happy

Now the new leadership

Wants the 4 x P’s

1. **Presentation** (not colours galore) – technicolour dream home
2. **Position** (not confusion) – use what, where & when
3. **Promotion** (not until the first two are sorted)
4. **Price** (will improve with the first three sorted)
Getting it sorted – Position & Presentation - Simplify

- Minimal SKU’s (stock levels everyone)
- Minimal additional costs for “fit for purpose” (value home owner & complete with substitutes)
- Education is easy when there are only a few SKU’s
- No confusion - interpretation Standards
- Rainbow looking houses with treatment and rainbows down the boards

What changes?

Grades

- Some do 6, some do 8, some do 10 and some 12, some verified now, with visual as well
- Idealistic best use of fibre
- Consider size of market and economies of production / marketing
- Stiffness variation in truss and joists gives problems
- Frame not really limiting in majority (gib must be too weak)
What changes?

- Industry should lead and call the answer. Look at the future not the whingers. Look at customers not the Standards
- 6 for nogs, non-load bearing, under-studs etc
- 8 for frame and 10 for Trusses
- No Verified; FRI’s report says it will drop out in 2 years anyway, so why confuse and annoy (typical)?
- 1 colour all down the board, not seagull technicolour

Treatments

- Evolution of dry boron has moved quickly
- Vested interest
- Chase low cost safe option for future of radiata
- Boron is the obvious
- Central Loading
- Boron H&S and cost and “fit for purpose”
- Pick the winner and run
- Boron is 3.1 “fit for purpose”. Cost-wise LOSP 3.1 will struggle
- One treatment for all frame products and one for trusses
- Maybe call trusses 1.2
- Frame is all 3.1 or revise 3602 & 3.1 will disappear so all 1.2
Summary

- Industry makes a case and puts to Standards the answer not let it evolve
- Do it now and don’t allow substitution due to cost-add
- Stop annoying retailers with SKU’s and complication and education
- Stop probability of errors with many SKU’s

Three grades only

1. MSG 6 for non-load bearing
2. MSG 8 for frame
3. MSG 10 for trusses

Summary

- One treatment:
  3.1 with Boron (will prevail due to cost and simplicity) or 1.2 for all frame with no 3.1 in houses

- One colour down full length of board: MSG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trusses</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>MSG 10 (Pink Boron with Green printing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>MSG 8 (Pink Boron with Black printing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-load bearing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>MSG 6 (Pink Boron with Blue printing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Time to move forward
- Think of our customers and low cost manufacturing

THANK YOU