

#112

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 6:52:35 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 12:49:36 PM
Time Spent: 05:57:01

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Geoff Holmes

Q2

Email address

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q3

Yes

Can MBIE publish your name and contact information with your submission?
Confidentiality notice: Responding "no" to this question does not guarantee that we will not release the name and contact information your provided, if any, as we may be required to do so by law. It does mean that we will contact you if we are considering releasing submitter contact information that you have asked that we keep in confidence, and we will take your request for confidentiality into account when making a decision on whether to release it.

Q4

Yes

Can MBIE contact you in relation to your submission?

Page 3: Section 2: Submitter information

Q5

Organisation

Are you submitting as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Page 4: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you a researcher or scientist?

Q7 Respondent skipped this question
Age

Q8 Respondent skipped this question
Gender

Q9 Respondent skipped this question
In which region do you primarily work?

Q10 Respondent skipped this question
Ethnicity

Page 5: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q11 Respondent skipped this question
What is your iwi affiliation?

Page 6: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q12 Respondent skipped this question
If you wish, please specify to which Pacific ethnicity you identify

Page 7: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q13 Respondent skipped this question
What type of organisation do you work for?

Q14 Respondent skipped this question
Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Q15 Respondent skipped this question
Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Q16 Respondent skipped this question
What best describes the use of Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) in your work?

Page 8: Section 2: Submitter information - organisation

Q17

Organisation name

LASRA

Q18

Independent research organisation

Organisation type

Q19

No

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Q20

Manawatu-Whanganui

Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Q21

It does not contain Mātauranga Māori

What best describes the use of Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) in your organisation?

Page 9: Section 3: Research Priorities

Q22

Priorities design: What principles could be used to determine the scope and focus of research Priorities?(See page 27 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

We largely agree with the outlined plan for the designing of priorities. As recipients of SSIF, we have seen the benefit of a 5-year timeline for the setting of priorities and are aware of how dynamic this type of funding can be in addressing emerging priorities. There is an urgent need to coordinate research efforts across what has traditionally been defined as investigator, mission and industry led priorities. These can sometimes act as barriers for collaboration. If the impact of research investment is to become a prime focus, addressing this issue will become a priority.

Q23

Priority-setting process: What principles should guide a national research Priority-setting process, and how can the process best give effect to Te Tiriti?(See pages 28-29 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

The current Strategic Priorities identified in the Gazette Notices are effectively imposed on the wider group of science providers, without any form of direct consultation. There would be an expectation that, in the future, this would be a fully inclusive process and also take business and public/community priorities into consideration. With very limited resources, there will always be a limit to breadth of research funding focus and this will remain a responsibility of an executive group in government to prioritise. based on the information received. The questions raised around Te Tiriti are the correct ones. The process will be one of consultation and Māori research groups would most likely respond well to an inclusive process and extended consultation. An evolving and emerging set of new priorities is the likely to be the positive outcome of such a strong level of engagement. We have seen in IRANZ how Māori organisations respectfully engage with one another to identify and set pragmatic priorities in research.

Q24

Operationalising Priorities: How should the strategy for each national research Priority be set and how do we operationalise them?(See pages 30-33 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

It will be very important to get this right at the start. NSC were a prototype, but hopefully we've learnt a lot from them and will now go for a more operational approach. Strong research leadership might be important, and excellence may be a guide, but impact on Aotearoa is how these Priorities will ultimately be measured. This comes down to the process of defining the key priorities at the outset and then engaging with the wider research sector to determine how outcomes can be achieved. This might take some time in the planning phase. However, the focus needs to shift significantly towards defining outcome benefits for all Stakeholders when setting national research Priorities

Page 10: Section 4: Te Tiriti, mātauranga Māori, and Māori aspirations

Q25

Engagement: How should we engage with Māori and Treaty Partners?(See page 38 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

A refresh around the central purpose and value of mātauranga Māori is overdue. Now is a good time to address this oversight. Listening and learning to current research groups and supporting their objective could frame the critical first steps on the pathway to meaningful engagement. From what we have seen, there has been a stronger emphasis on social and environmental sciences, but clearly there are increasingly much wider opportunities for engagement across the entire science sector.

Q26

Mātauranga Māori: What are your thoughts on how to enable and protect mātauranga Māori in the research system?(See pages 38-39 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Very early days, but involvement in the IRANZ initiative, supported by MBIE, Ngā Ara Mahi me Ngā Mahi Ngātahi is of great interest.

Q27

Regionally based Māori knowledge hubs: What are your thoughts on regionally based Māori knowledge hubs?(See page 39 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

The Pūhoro STEM Academy is just one example of how Māori can elevate their research aspirations and interface with the more traditional science sectors.

Page 11: Section 5: Funding

Q28

Core Functions: How should we decide what constitutes a core function, and how do we fund them?(See pages 44-46 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Core functions are obviously poorly defined at present. The recent COVID-19 outbreak has highlighted how crucial core functions can be in making rapid and informed decisions about factors which will have immediate impact. Therefore, core funding is appropriate where it supports building resilience into the science system around the research Priorities. It may also be seen as providing a strategic advantage, where specific national resources could be better exploited.

Q29

Yes

Establishing a base grant and base grant design: Do you think a base grant funding model will improve stability and resilience for research organisations?(See pages 46-49 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Q30

Establishing a base grant and base grant design: How should we go about designing and implementing such a funding model?(See pages 46-49 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Current recipients could provide the basis for determining the organisations who initially will receive base grant funding and how much this should be. Overheads should be included, but also be fixed and reasonable. Reviews need to be held every 5 years to address Priorities and adjust funding. Grants should be based on both activity and performance and preferably be adjusted annually for inflation.

Page 12: Section 6: Institutions

Q31

Institution design: How do we design collaborative, adaptive and agile research institutions that will serve current and future needs?(See pages 57-58 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Collaboration, adaptability and agility are things that IRO's are very good at, so size may not equate to performance or an institute's ability to serve both current and future needs. It would seem that the CoREs do offer an institutional design that may be suited to these objectives.

Q32

Role of institutions in workforce development: How can institutions be designed to better support capability, skill and workforce development?(See page 58 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Investment in people is a foundation of our institute. It is supported by SSIF-funding and has achieved fantastic results over the past four years. Building capability needs to focus on career progression, skill development and pushing researchers to achieve their most. We engage with other researchers in CRIs and Universities on a daily basis which also offers a way of developing staff, as does visits to research facilities nationally and internationally to use infrastructure for research. Our researchers have developed strong collaborations with overseas research groups in China, Taiwan, UK through their current research on the SSIF Platform.

Q33

Better coordinated property and capital investment: How should we make decisions on large property and capital investments under a more coordinated approach?(See pages 58-59 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

LASRA has benefitted from access to infrastructure nationally through CRIs and Universities on a cost-per-use basis as well as internationally at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center in Taiwan and Diamond Light Source in the UK through international merit-based access agreements. We see this as the ideal model for accessing equipment as it is transparent and fair. It involves cost in preparing samples and visiting facilities, but these have their own benefits too. Large project investment is likely to only happen where there is significant need. In which case, there will be institutes who currently use remote infrastructure to carry out the same and so it is a matter of canvassing opinion. It would be unlikely that a researcher would say no to any investment in equipment or facilities. The CoREs would be a good place to start for defining those to consult.

Q34

Institution design and Te Tiriti: How do we design Tiriti-enabled institutions? (See page 59 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

It would be wonderful to have a central organisation (perhaps Callaghan Innovation) where we could find all the information and contact details for existing groups and their activities.

Is there an opportunity for a Māori CoRE sometime in the future?

The IRANZ executive includes representatives from Te Tira Whakamātak & Takarangi Research Group who add their voice to all proceedings. Mātai Medical Research Institute are also members of the Association.

Q35

Knowledge exchange: How do we better support knowledge exchange and impact generation? What should be the role of research institutions in transferring knowledge into operational environments and technologies?(See pages 60-63 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Research institutions such as our own are effectively an extension of a niche industry. Our research has purpose from the onset and its impact is measured in industry support for its objectives. The relationship and pathways to adoption are very clear, as is knowledge exchange. We are constantly working on initiatives such as the 2021 Collagen Symposium, to widen industry's exposure to a broader range of research activity and researchers. Our role can sometimes be that of a small Callaghan Innovation in this regard. Technical Group overview our research twice yearly and we have a Management Committee and Independent Board overseeing our research activities to ensure they meet industry's aspirations.

Q36

Workforce and research Priorities: How should we include workforce considerations in the design of national research Priorities?(See pages 69-70 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

A recent, highly successful outcome has been the completion of an embedded PhD by one of our research at Victoria University of Wellington under Professor Eric Le Ru. The student completed his PhD as part of our SSIF Platform, working full-time and finishing in 3 years. While he was an exceptional student, he also enjoyed the work and has grown significantly as an early career researcher through the process. This is one example of how exceptional talent can be retained and adapt to working in different research environments on a complex task.

CoREs also offer opportunities for researchers across a diverse range of institutes to work and collaborate on research. Principle Investigators are funded, but it would be good to also encourage the Associate Investigators more.

Our research team collaborate with colleagues in several countries on joint-interest projects, or through utilisation of infrastructure overseas. Having a team which is multi-cultural helps to overcome many of the traditional barriers to international connections, but this could be further assisted through funding collaboration programmes on targeted areas of research through MBIE, such as Catalyst.

Q37

Base grant and workforce: What impact would a base grant have on the research workforce?(See pages 70-71 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

We have seen from SSIF-funding that it does offer significant opportunities to assist with the up-skilling and performance of research staff. It offers a platform for continuous activity in specific areas of research to investigate them at a fundamental level. We do set performance criteria around our research activity already and know it can challenge researchers to perform.

Q38

Better designed funding mechanisms: How do we design new funding mechanisms that strongly focus on workforce outcomes? (See page 72 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

For individuals, the concept of embedded PhDs is something we would encourage. We are mindful of the issues NZ has faced over the past two years in recruiting overseas talent. Do we seek to build a resilient workforce by focusing more on developing and retaining local talent? It should be part of any conversation. There is a need for a healthy balance of local and overseas researchers, but retention is the key metric.

Page 14: Section 8: Research infrastructure

Q39

Funding research infrastructure: How do we support sustainable, efficient and enabling investment in research infrastructure?(See pages 77-78 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Investment in infrastructure will assist with talent retention as well as act as drawcard for overseas researchers to come here. It's a win-win. The issue becomes difficult when the question turns to what infrastructure should we invest in and it is interesting to note the current problems around collections and databases in this context.

Put all the investment in facilities at CoREs and much of the problem with access arrangements would disappear. I'm starting to think they are the answer to a lot of the questions raised here in the Future Pathways document. They aren't perfect.

Thanks for the opportunity to submit something on the Green Paper and we look forward to hearing more.
