Welcome

Kia ora and welcome to the Te Ara Paerangi - Future Pathways Green Paper submission form. This is an important part of the Government's intention to start a wide-ranging and considered conversation about the future of New Zealand's Research, Science and Innovation system. Making a submission provides you the opportunity to help shape the future of this system.

First we ask for information about you, the submitter, and then the form follows the consultation guiding questions as set out on pages 13-15 of the Green Paper. After the submitter information part, each section has several open-ended questions. These reflect key themes about which we want to receive your input and responses.

Section 1: Contact information

Section 2: Submitter information

Section 3: Research Priorities

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

Section 5: Funding

Section 6: Institutions

Section 7: Research workforce

Section 8: Research infrastructure

You do not need to answer all questions, and only questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory. As described on page 10 of the Green Paper, MBIE intends to publish submissions on its website.

If you wish to provide additional information in another format, please send it to futurepathways@mbie.govt.nz and note that you have also provided a submission via the form. If you wish to write more than a paragraph or two in response to the substantive questions, you may wish to draft your response in another document and paste it into the form when you are done because you will not be able to view all the text at once within the form.

The closing date for submissions is 2 March 2022.

Section 1: submitter contact information

1. Name

Ngāti Rangiwewehi - Te Tari Taiao

2. Email address

taiao@rangiwewehi.com

3. 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.

✓ Yes

◯ No

4. Can MBIE contact you in relation to your submission?

✓ Yes

◯ No

Section 2: Submitter information

In this section, we ask a few questions about you as an individual respondent, or the organisation this submission represents. We request this information to help us understand how viewpoints differ amongst different people and types of organisations within the science, research and innovation sector.

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

◯ Individual

✓ Organisation

Section 2: Submitter information - organisation

17. Organisation name

Ngāti Rangiwewehi - Te Tari Taiao

18. Organisation type

○ Crown Research Institute or Callaghan Innovation

○ University

○ Wānanga

○ Te Pūkenga

○ Independent research organisation

○ Business

○ Local government

○ NGO

○ Sector representative body

✓ Other (please specify)

Iwi organisation

19. Is it a Māori-led organisation?

✓ Yes

○ No

20. Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

○ Northland	○ Wellington
○ Auckland	○ Tasman
○ Waikato	○ Nelson
✓ Bay of Plenty	○ Marlborough
○ Gisborne	○ West Coast
○ Hawke's Bay	○ Canterbury & Chatham Islands
○ Taranaki	○ Otago
○ Manawatu-Whanganui	○ Southland
○ Other (please specify)	

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

☑ Mātauranga Māori is the central knowledge system

☑ There is a balance between Mātauranga Māori and other science knowledge

◯ There is some Mātauranga Māori, but it is not the main science knowledge

◯ It does not contain Mātauranga Māori

Section 3: Research Priorities

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand the principles and process through which we should determine the scope and focus of Research Priorities, as well as how we can deliver research most effectively in relation to the Priorities.

22. Priorities design: What principles could be used to determine the scope and focus of research Priorities?

Ko te whiu o te korero i whuia ki Tarimano, ko te Aongahoro, ko te ruahine, a Tawakeheimoa, Ko Rangiwewehi e!!

Ngāti Rangiwewehi have an innate connection to our environment and taonga resources including our people, our knowledge systems and experiences that can further contribute if the CRI environment is compatible. The Treaty of Waitangi is the foundation document of New Zealand and as such provides the validation and right for Māori to work in partnership with the Crown. Ngāti Rangiwewehi view of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Ngāti Rangiwewehi acknowledges the 1840 signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a founding document of New Zealand and further recognises the importance and relevance of the contained within the Māori text of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Cultural values are inherent to Māori, Ngāti Rangiwewehi and New Zealand. There should be no question in why cultural values should be visible in the determining of research priorities. Principles of Participation, Partnership and Protection should be the minimum values inherent to any values and while there are principles that should be discussed between partners and CRIs the "3Ps" are basic foundational values that can be expanded on. Whenua, whānau and whakapapa are other key principles that should be upheld.

23. Priority-setting process: What principles should guide a national research Priority-setting process, and how can the process best give effect to Te Tiriti?

There are two versions of the Treaty of Waitangi. Ngāti Rangiwewehi further maintains through the international law principal of 'contra proferentem' that if any doubt exists in the interpretation of the intent and spirit of the 'articles' between the English and Māori versions of Te Tiriti o Waitangi that the Māori version takes precedence. Te Tiriti o Waitangi refers to a partnership that exists between the Crown and Māori. Ngāti Rangiwewehi accepts and celebrates this partnership and wishes to work with the local communities situated within its traditional boundaries for the wellbeing of taiao and tangata. Te Tiriti also commits to rangatiratanga, while this is a point of ongoing debate the principle of self-determination can be supported through the principles of participation and partnership,

To fully enable and implement these principles there will be a requirement for Te Ao Māori capability to undertake review of relevant submissions so as not to overlook the cultural content that contributors have taken time to express and with an expectation that the correct lens and application for review occur. Hopefully, this is the case across relevant submission assessment and analysis.

24. Operationalising Priorities: How should the strategy for each national research Priority be set and how do we operationalise them?

A national governing group 50:50 partnership with Te Tiriti Partner would help to determine and confer what priorities are prevalent across the areas of science, research, innovation and Te Ao Māori / mātauranga Māori. This national direction would then point to engaging regionally and locally, with Iwi, hapu, mana whenua to further determine their relevance.

CRI's would engage with their respective mana whenua as a positive expression of Te Tiriti-based partnership. We would expect the RSI system to adequately resource mana whenua to firstly determine and define what a successful partnership means for them; and secondly, work with their respective CRI to deliver on localised priorities that have links to the priorities set at the National (50:50) governing group.

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

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand how Māori want to engage throughout the reform process including beyond this consultation, how we can facilitate the application of mātauranga Māori throughout the research system, and views on regionally-based Māori knowledge hubs.

25. Engagement: How should we engage with Māori and Treaty Partners?

This instrument to consult should already be inclusive of Treaty partners. The format of this submission is rigid and individually focused / organisation targeted i.e. there is no 'check box' for Iwi, hapu, whānau, marae. It is unclear how or why individuals or other organisations should be commenting on how you should engage with Treaty partners unless they have a successful record of this. There are many, many pathways to engaging with hapu and iwi and Māori collectives contacted regularly, by local and central government seeking input.

Guided by the Principles outlined above engagement options and mechanisms will become clear and replace the methods used today. The process of reform will require the design of a new system to ensure that the principles embedded are able to be implemented. This will mean a process of co-design with the Treaty Partner present. This will ensure the appropriate engagement process is designed to deliver to the principles.

There are clear cultural messages in the wider reform programme that can be directly responded to if resourcing Treaty partners capacity to participate was enabled. When outside of affiliated organisations i.e. CRIs; those who can participate in this undertaking as part of their funded / resourced role, means that we are required to contribute outside of our work roles, in our own time and unfunded. Ngāti Rangiwewehi, although not resourced to do so, actively participate in a large number of submissions.

26. Mātauranga Māori: What are your thoughts on how to enable and protect mātauranga Māori in the research system?

Partnership frameworks need to be fair and equitable. Partnerships are meaningful and build trust. Partnerships value mātauranga Māori in research planning, scope, application and resourcing. Protection

is adequately incorporated into partnership discussions, planning, contracts, storage, accessibility and attribution.

As per the point above the reformed system will need to ensure it meets the agreed principles. There is an expectation from Ngāti Rangiwewehi (and I am sure expressed by others) that Te Tiriti will feature in these principles. On this basis there is a further expectation that the knowledge systems that have developed and evolved since before our ancestors left Hawaiki and continue to develop and evolve in an Aotearoa context will have a significant role in determining the future of knowledge building and sharing for the next 1000 years. This therefore means that any system that has matauranga maori at its centre will be (co-) led by those who hold that knowledge.

27. Regionally based Māori knowledge hubs: What are your thoughts on regionally based Māori knowledge hubs?

What are these? This design element has pre-empted the principles of partnership, participation and protection and appears as a solution ahead of a co-design process.

To inform the future process these thoughts are offered without prejudice and for inclusion in a future co-design discussion;

- Where Iwi, hapu, mana whenua are able to manage and coordinate their own partnership agreements (administration), they are likely able to manage how they will like to have rangatiratanga over their own knowledge. It does not seem appropriate to establish regional based Māori knowledge hubs although some administration supports might be helpful. Either way, resourcing is critical to enable 'knowledge hubs' both regional and local.

Section 5: Funding

In this section, we ask for information to help us define "core functions" and how they should be funded as well as your views on a base grant funding model.

28. Core Functions: How should we decide what constitutes a core function, and how do we fund them?

Strategic research development should include relationships building as core functions. Core functions should also include base salaries and functionality costs, however, where externals are engaged from within Māori / communities, there should be minimal overheads (funding facilities and management costs) to allow maximum funds to engage and resource Māori / community groups. Māori and community partners should not bear the brunt of funding CRI system administration, when they will largely be managing 'themselves'. Partners are typically incurring high margin costs against their contributions yet they do not utilise all the resources CRIs are responsible for and capitalise on.

29. Establishing a base grant and base grant design: Do you think a base grant funding model will improve stability and resilience for research organisations?

~~Yes~~

~~No~~

Not sure

Again, this is a solution in the absence of a design discussion. We are asked to provide comment without full information and therefore an understanding of the implications or opportunities this solution provides is not clear. This is not aligned with a principle-based design process.

30. Establishing a base grant and base grant design: How should we go about designing and implementing such a funding model?

Co-design to ensure the needs of the parties in the partnership are met.
Consistency across CRIs and 'the system' that is fair and minimises overheads where appropriate and maximises funds for research and partnerships. Some funds should be ringfenced to Māori to enable more genuine 'Māori-led' solutions with applications that do not penalise Māori approaches that do not fit the science 'standards'.

Section 6: Institutions

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand how institutional forms can serve current and future needs, how institutions can support workforce development, and how we can improve coordination of capital works.

31. Institution design: How do we design collaborative, adaptive and agile research institutions that will serve current and future needs?

Strategically developing priorities that are developed in 50:50 partnership at National and CRI levels. This includes boards, that are not 50:50 representative of Te Tiriti partnerships. Research pathways should provide dedicated funds to Māori pathways, to ensure that there are opportunities for Māori and ensure CRIs are working with Māori. Being agile, means minimising barriers that prevent Māori and communities to engage e.g. employment, contracts, fixed term, secondments, service agreements etc. Often the hoops to navigate CRI processes are onerous, time consuming and off putting to what should be nurturing and supportive of relationships, knowledge development, action and meaningful impact.

Institutions prioritise research that is published. It prioritises research that is written in a particular science language and style that conforms with science values and science funding assessment models. They do not value varied approaches to holistic methodologies that are not considered hard science or that uses language that is valued to communities who know what methodologies and language is appropriate. Currently, science needs to be seen as the leading component, not the supporting component of the research. Some research, science, innovation and mātauranga Māori will not be maximised if this is the case, because the inherent approach does not align and therefore would be better in a support role to achieve new knowledge, outcomes and impact. Applications and review process including review personnel are not agile or equipped to do this currently – and should be reviewed itself.

Co-development and co-design are only words on paper. Researchers may indicate this was the situation, with partners details included. This does not mean this is the case. Māori have either an option to take the opportunity presented i.e. participate or not to, thus being excluded. There is no clear definition or assessment to ensure a project is co-developed. A proposal section on mātauranga Māori or engaging with Māori does not constitute this. A clearer approach is having an attestation of the partners who

themselves determine if they are participating, observing as a stakeholder, co-developed, partially co-developed or led by the partner e.g. Māori-led. Another assessment to evidently assess is auditing the spend of the projects in a data / graphical view e.g. identifying the level of co-design resourcing that has been spent to develop, action the research, finalise and produce the outputs (appropriately).

32. Role of institutions in workforce development: How can institutions be designed to better support capability, skill and workforce development?

Capability should not solely be targeting PhD and higher qualifications. Pathways for school age, graduate, Masters, and PhDs should be established. Level dependant, it should not lock students into one pathway but provide a transitional opportunity when at school and graduate level so that they can experience all the varied and exciting opportunity pathways. Not lock them into a technician role that is not easy to progress from or pathways only to a senior role in the same field. Capability development should be built into projects that have certain funding values, so that there will be capability impacts delivered within the project itself. This would help provide more Māori opportunities to grow in science and research fields.

33. Better coordinated property and capital investment: How should we make decisions on large property and capital investments under a more coordinated approach?

This could be regionally assessed and could potentially be shared capital investments. There would need to be cross agency agreements to share resources / services that are fairly available and accessible. If this is not achievable, multiple facilities are likely needed to undertake core work and where assessed as priority at the 50:50 decision making table, should be invested in. Often, capital investments are determined by Executive Management who are prioritising what they think is valuable to research, with community and Māori not included in any such discussions. Many Māori and community groups are not aware of any of the facilities are delivering locally or nationally, or how their own research aspirations can be maximised via the potential of these CRI investments.

34. Institution design and Te Tiriti: How do we design Tiriti-enabled institutions?

Leadership from the top. Boards of CRIs need to understand the role of Te Tiriti in Aotearoa NZ. It should not be seen as an optional add-on but should be embedded as a given. Where elected Boards are not equipped with this cultural competency, they should be required to undertake training. Training should also be an explicit core requirement for successful nominations / applicants and not optional. The flow on discontent or uncertainty from the Board as to the rationale, value or requirement to have regard for Te Tiriti has a trickle-down effect. Executive Management takes their lead from the Board, so when this foundational document is not valued, Executives will likely follow suit, as will other management, team leads, project leads, staff and so on.

Te Tiriti is unique to Aotearoa, NZ and should not be minimised in CRIs who are perceived as Crown Agents. If this is not correct, the name should change from Crown Research Institutes, to Research Institutes (funded by the Crown). Clear foundations and leadership that prioritise Te Tiriti into research,

relationships and resourcing will be seen as enabling active Tiriti research pathways that are based on appropriate cultural values and principles.

Funding allocation and spend should be publicly available relative to each CRI as well as the collective allocations, in particular government investment. Māori resourcing and investment should also be visible (that is significant and benefiting Māori communities) and should not be amalgamated with other non-direct resourcing / partnerships.

Vision Mātauranga funding should be available all year round or at multiple times per year. It should not be limited to a time frame that only suits governments schedule of investment.

Te Ara Putaiao or other mechanisms of science, research, mātauranga Māori exponents can help guide in cultural policy and standards for key taonga species and related explorations to assist CRI staff and outputs to be quality and culturally appropriate. There is no consistant approach held by CRIs in mātauranga Intellectual Property, and how taonga species are treated i.e. no policies or procedures for having regard to kaupapa expressed in Wai262.

35. 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?

This should be a requirement. Research that is only published to targeted science communities does not have a clear benefit to the end user or contributors or grassroots where it is needed and often is created without any local knowledge / communication. Current science environment seems to be focused on building the science community's knowledge and researcher's profile, kudos, and KPIs for advancement. Research should have built into its delivery objectives for developing information that is appropriate to communities, tools that can be applied and resources that are valued for the intended impact area. It is important that consistency in releasing tools and resources also are dated and versioned clearly and appropriate acknowledgements included for transparency and possible future developments.

Technology is advancing and creative methods for sharing usable knowledge-transfer must start now. Working closely with partners can assist with determining what is appropriate for creating impact in the community.

Section 7: Research workforce

In this section, we want information to help us understand how workforce considerations affect Research Priorities and how base grand funding would affect the research workforce, as well as information to help us design funding focused on workforce outcomes.

36. Workforce and research Priorities: How should we include workforce considerations in the design of national research Priorities?

Early Career Researchers should have a fund available to them. This will provide motivation and meaningful opportunity to progress their research concepts. ECRs are more likely to have fresh ideas and approaches to research and often they have more cultural regard and ethically valued methods. ECRs

however, are usually utilised at the discretion of more senior researchers who will direct how they should operate within a project. This can cause demotivation and can also conflict with their values and approaches which often do not get the opportunity for exploration.

Salaries should be more consistant across CRIs and not seen to compete for key staff through remuneration variances. Salaries for CRIs are often under par, comparative to other professional careers. Qualified and experienced Māori staff, like other key specialists or generalists, have broad opportunities and can either work in private or public sector for better paid roles. If we want to have more Māori, ECRs, and keep our talent pool growing, this should be reviewed.

Many researchers are internationally recruited. They do not understand the landscape of NZ's foundational document – Te Tiriti o Waitangi. They are not recruited for any cultural capability and are targeted to produce key research outcomes. In general, they are likely not supported with cultural pathways that will enhance their contribution as well as missing out on the manaakitanga they should have when coming to Aotearoa to help NZ in its research and science priorities. Their time is typically fully allocated to produce and meet KPIs that are void of this cultural opportunity and knowledge. If they want to gain further contracts or increase their employability, they will focus on this aspect and avoid other 'extra curricular' opportunities unless it is built into their role.

All staff are competing for similar career outcomes of progression and permanency. Where Te Tiriti or cultural training is not built into the recruitment process, induction and ongoing training, they struggle to dedicate time and see the value (if the CRI themselves are not valuing it through investment in their staff).

Māori staff should not be the go-to for Māori knowledge and know-how. If this is outside of their role, they should be acknowledged for this additional contribution and have the appropriate skills required. Māori who do have the capability and hold a responsibility for this in their roles, should have the ability to protect their mātauranga (ie. acknowledged for their input through attribution and discussion as to how it is being used or not). This knowledge is often tribal knowledge and while signals of valuing and protecting mātauranga Māori is becoming more apparent, there are no clear pathways for ensuring that staff have the right to protect and have their mātauranga acknowledged as a scientist would.

37. Base grant and workforce: What impact would a base grant have on the research workforce?

This will potentially reduce the pressure to compete for research funds and allow energy and focus to be with relationships, partnerships and the research needed.

38. Better designed funding mechanisms: How do we design new funding mechanisms that strongly focus on workforce outcomes?

Capability that is required (new roles) to create the required impact for NZ, should have discretional funding available and not necessarily be founded on securing a research project to (partly) fund the role. This is not sustainable nor time efficient. Pathways that focus on PhD or higher are targeting science pathways / qualifications that are not typically held by Māori, hence the need to target other levels (e.g.

school and graduate) which will then create enhanced opportunity for Māori to pipeline to higher science qualifications.

Multi-disciplinary skills and expertise are not valued enough. Other skills that enhance research planning, engagement, application, delivery, communications and impact require intersectoral contributions from planning, to social, cultural, entrepreneurial, health, creative and practitioner roles that are not typical to science and research workforce targets.

Section 8: Research infrastructure

In this section, we want information to help us understand how we can improve the efficacy of investment in research infrastructure.

39. Funding research infrastructure: How do we support sustainable, efficient and enabling investment in research infrastructure?

Reviews on impact of research produced locally, regionally, nationally and globally. This requires government direction to be more connected across CRIs and open up access to skill sets, facilities and funding. Collaboration across CRIs should be rewarded and easy. Other government agencies should be better connected to research institutes who should deliver the research and advise on priorities to allow central government departments to get on with the policy and regulation. Is this wider approach efficient? Engaging partnerships are not consistent e.g. some CRIs have a Māori unit, partnerships, kaupapa Māori researchers, some don't. Local government uses IAP2 engagement framework etc. with Māori values and approaches, no direction or training is required in CRIs.

CRI interaction with key Government Agencies around WAI262 should be taking place to keep CRIs abreast of the developments and standards, including pathways for Māori communities.

Ngāti Rangiwewehi have engaged in co-designed research with 1x CRI successfully, yet we understand that every CRI, project and its approach can differ. This research was leveraged off our own treaty settlement to develop research to assist with our water resource management and council negotiations. We were 'fortunate' to have had some funds allocated to assist with this. If we did not have this treaty component negotiated, we would have not had the opportunity to undertake this critical piece of work that has helped inform our own frameworks and also our input into policy and NPS(FM).

Engagement with CRIs based 'on a hope and a prayer' that funding will be sourced in full can be an intensive process. It does not make for great relationships if it is not successful and goes nowhere. Relationships can become tense and or dissolve as the next idea becomes prioritised, when the priority itself has not changed, but the frameworks and competition of accessing funding is not accommodating.

Iwi, Māori and community pathways to partner with CRIs should not require self-funding the research that comes out of CRIs for local, regional, national and global impact. If the research is for commercial value that is likely a different pathway that requires co-funding. Better holistic approaches that enhance our ability to participate and supports Māori aspirations and mātauranga Māori as equal to science should be treated in that way, i.e. equitable.