



better outcomes from research. An increased emphasis on environmental outcomes was also required. The Foresight Project was a consultative process which attempted to document a vision of a desirable future and the strategies needed to get there. The new framework for establishing R&D priorities was designed to ensure that government's investment would be managed in a more enabling and less prescriptive way. The new investment framework was based on 'science envelope goals' and 'target outcomes'.

In summary, the science envelope goals identified were:

- an innovation goal – accelerate knowledge creation and human capital
- an economic goal – creation of value in new and improved products
- an environmental goal – knowledge that sustains a healthy environment
- a social goal – knowledge of the physical determinants of wellbeing.

The science envelope goals were to provide overall direction for the public investment in research, science and technology. This seems to be an exercise of organisational rearrangement rather than one of fundamental change in priorities. Despite some initial stability, since 1999 the MoRST have been feeling their way toward more devolution in decision making. The

latest manifestation is the 'Picking up the Pace' document. The portfolio approach stays the same but larger projects and longer terms of contract are to be considered by FRST in allocating research funds. The FRST have delayed the beginning of the 2006 round of bidding while new directions for providers are worked out.

The following section describes the overall framework for R&D funding in New Zealand in this period and where it now stands. To understand where agricultural research fits in it is necessary to look for indirect evidence of trends in funding from the public and the private sectors and in income derived by providers for various purposes.

Developments in the CRIs

The output area format was abandoned in 1999–2000 and the envelope goals were adopted. Emphasis moved to the research funds or portfolios administered by the FRST, and how their benefits could be maximised. This makes tracking agricultural research funding more difficult. The rise and fall in CRI incomes for the 1993–2005 period are explored in Table 5.

Agriculture's share of research resources allocated by government and derived from the private sector has declined slightly in the period from 1993–94 to 2004–05 from nearly 55 to 50%. The agricultural research community has been aware of these trends

Table 5: Trends in CRI funding sources: 1993–2005.

Year	Agricultural Research Funding as a % of all CRI Funding	Public (PGSF) Agricultural Research Funding as a % of all PGSF Funding	Public (PGSF) Agricultural Research Funding as a % of all CRI Income
1993–94	54.7	28.9	36.9
1994–95	54.2	57.9	35.4
1995–96	52.9	57.8	34.9
1996–97	50.6	56.7	32.8
1997–98	51.4	56.3	32.5
1998–99	51.7	55.3	32.3
1999–00	50.8	54.2	31.4
2000–01	51.3	54.4	30.0
2001–02	25.1	53.8	27.8
2002–03	51.8	54.1	27.2
2003–04	20.9	52.7	25.5
2004–05	51.9	50.1	23.0

Source: CCMAU various years