#110

COMPLETE

Collector:	Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started:	Wednesday, March 09, 2022 8:21:07 AM
Last Modified:	Wednesday, March 16, 2022 11:02:32 AM
Time Spent:	Over a day

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Daniel Tompkins

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

Predator Free 2050 Limited

Q18

Organisation type

Other (please specify):
Schedule 4A Crown-owned charitable company

Q19

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

No

Q20

Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Auckland

Q21

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

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

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We can see no reason not to adopt the Green Paper proposed direction on designing research Priorities. We wish to highlight two principles that we believe are essential for determining fit-for-purpose scope and focus of research Priorities.

The first is Impact Focus. We face issues for which the business-as-usual research processes are not delivering information and potential solutions in a sufficiently timely manner to help make the difference needed.

Leading on from this, the second is Outcome Directed. Real-world goals and objectives should be set for Priorities, with intervention logic for their achievement used to make best use of always finite research resources.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily polished or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We support the thinking around Priority-setting processes that is laid out in the Green Paper. We wish to highlight two principles that we believe are essential for a fit-for-purpose Priority-setting process.

The first is Clean Governance. While decision making on Priority-setting should be guided by research providers, the decision making itself should be independent of research providers to help mitigate self-serving behaviours.

The second is Inclusivity, both in a Te Tiriti sense, and more widely open to the prevalent perspectives of modern-day New Zealand. This is necessary to overcome the canalisation of thinking currently embedded in the research system.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We support the thinking around operationalising Priorities that is laid out in the Green Paper. We suggest scoping an integrated top-down and bottom-up stakeholder-driven approach for both the identification of, and strategy-setting for, Priorities.

Priority governance could be through a unique-in-the-world form of National Science Council that integrates top-down government agency and bottom-up mana whenua and community priority thinking (guided by but independent of research providers).

Operationalisation of each Priority could be coordinated by National Priority Groups, convened jointly by lead government and mana whenua/community stakeholders, with membership from the stakeholders and research providers critical to Outcome success.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We support the thinking around understanding and honouring Te Tiriti obligations and opportunities in the Green Paper. It is our position that this cannot simply be a function of a modern New Zealand research system, but rather integral to its form.

This position is front of mind in our suggestion, in response to Question 13, that the new structures for identifying, strategy setting for and operationalising Priorities are ones that integrate top-down government agency and bottom-up mana whenua and community stakeholder priority thinking.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We support the thinking around enable and protect mātauranga Māori in the research system in the Green Paper. A fit-for-purpose research system is one where the form reflects that research advances come from multiple knowledge systems.

As for our response to Question 14, an integrated top-down government agency and bottom-up mana whenua and community stakeholder approach to Priority identification, strategy setting and operationalising would create a new research system in which mātauranga Māori would be appropriately enabled and protected.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We fully support the concept and implementation of regionally based Māori knowledge hubs, on the proviso that they receive the quantum of funding, resourcing and other support that is realistically needed for their success. They should be a core element of a new research system for New Zealand, not an add-on to existing structures and strategy.

The stakeholder elements of such hubs could provide both the bottom-up ‘people at place’ input needed for the integrated approach to Priority identification, strategy setting, and operationalisation suggested in responses to previous questions, and a powerful avenue for research impact and outcomes.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We agree with the Green Paper proposal that the identification and resourcing of Core Functions is used to reduce problems of unproductive competition. However we cannot stress strongly enough that this approach would only provide benefit over a competitive system if there is Clean Governance of decision making with regards to what constitutes Core Functions and the resourcing linked to them, and governance and performance oversight of Core Functions that is independent of research providers.

We support the initial thinking in the Green Paper around how to decide what constitutes a Core Function. We suggest that the ‘Priority’ model of thinking also forms the basis of Core Function identification, with the extension that they are not only linked to delivery against current priorities, but also maintaining capability for predicted likely future priorities. As inferred above, funding decisions for and governance of Core Functions should be independent of the research providers hosting them (a function of the proposed National Science Council, if such were to be adopted).

Q29

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)

Yes

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We note that funding uncertainty is not the main cause of lack of research organisation stability and resilience. Rather, this is mainly due to organisations maintaining/building capability that is misaligned to what is needed for delivering to national Priorities, and thus lacking the flexibility to be innovative and nimble to respond to changing priorities and means of delivering outcomes.

However, we do agree that a base grant funding model would help improve stability and resilience for research organisations, providing much-needed reassurance for the research, technical and support staff who bear the brunt of capability misalignment. Base grants should not be directly linked to research organisations, but rather linked to Priorities and Core Functions, with Priority and Core Functions sharing among research organisations being determined at the National Science Council level and updated based on a 4-yearly performance review cycle (performance against Outcomes and Impacts).

Stable FTE numbers could be supported on a longer-term basis than the performance review cycle through also providing base funding for the re-training of personnel from old to new capabilities and functions, to best deliver desired Outcomes and Impacts. This would go hand in hand with additional oversight mechanisms that ensure that research organisations are building and maintaining the capability sets required.

Alongside this, a large proportion of funding should remain competitive, as competition is essential for driving excellence, innovation, and best performance. A lot of the unnecessary burden of current competitive funding rounds could be removed (i.e. 80% of key information for reviewers can generally be obtained from 2-3 pages).

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

We recommend that a system of new institutions is designed around appropriate clusters of Priorities and Core Functions (form should always follow function, including determining the appropriate size of different institutions). All institutions should be tasked with the delivery of Outcomes and Impacts as their primary remit, with the science excellence needed to address current and likely future Priorities also supported.

Irrespective of the final form, a complete change of public research system is required to overcome the issues of (1) lack of appropriate alignment to national priorities, and (2) managerial and governance bloat, both of which are entrenched in the current system and greatly impact the research system return on investment to New Zealand.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

As referred to in our response to Question 19, a key cause of many current research system issues is misalignment between the capability that organisations maintain and build and what is best needed overall with regards to current and future national Priorities and Core Functions. Three mechanisms to help address this are proposed.

First, base grants need to be linked to Priorities and Core Functions. Second, oversight mechanisms are required to ensure that research organisations are building and maintaining the capability that is best tailored for delivering Outcomes and Impacts. Third, base funding is also needed for the re-training of personnel from old to new capabilities and functions, to provide better assured stability of employment.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

The National Science Council structure proposed in our response to Question 13, a mechanism that integrates top-down government agency and bottom-up mana whenua and community priority thinking (guided by but independent of research providers), would be the appropriate level at which property and capital investment decisions best coordinated for delivery to national Priorities and support for Core Functions are made.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

As referred to in our response to Question 14, the understanding and honouring of Te Tiriti obligations and opportunities should not be considered a characteristic (i.e. ‘Tiriti-enabled’) of a modern research system but rather integral to its design. The National Science Council mechanism proposed, being a mechanism that would integrate top-down government agency and bottom-up mana whenua and community priority thinking, would be an appropriate level at which institute design decisions could be made. This is because such considerations would be best made across the portfolio of institutes rather than on an institute-by-institute basis, as this would allow for variation allowing best delivery of Outcomes and Impacts (rather than a 1-size fits all approach).

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

When it comes to knowledge exchange and impact generation, the critical gap is not between research institutions, with such connectivity already serviced by a myriad of schemes and mechanisms, but is in the translation and operationalisation of research into real-world outcomes and impacts. This gap can be addressed in two main ways.

First, a refocusing of the public science system onto the delivery of Outcomes and Impacts (see response to Question 11), pulling it back from the drift to academia that has occurred in recent years. Best value from the public science system would be obtained from its primary remit being the translation of knowledge from the national university and global research sector into Outcomes and Impacts for New Zealand. To have impact, science needs to be embedded in the problem or opportunity. Too much research is developed in a vacuum. Thus, implementation planning also needs to be embedded in the design of good science and the progress towards agreed goals should be measured and modelled to understand impact.

Second, supporting the development of ‘Knowledge Brokering’ capability between research providers and end-users / stakeholders, to both ground research with regards to the Outcomes it should be delivering and drive uptake for Impact.

Page 13: Section 7: Research workforce

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

Workforce considerations should not be included in the design of national research Priorities. Rather, as for institution design, form should follow function. However, it is critical that steps are taken to provide much-needed stability for the research, technical and support staff who bear the brunt of capability misalignment. As noted in previous answers these are (1) oversight mechanisms to ensure that research organisations are building and maintaining the capability that is best tailored for delivering Outcomes and Impacts, and (2) base funding made available for the re-training of personnel from old to new capabilities and functions, to provide better assured stability of employment.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

As noted in our response to Question 19, base grants would help improve stability and resilience for research organisations, providing much-needed reassurance for the research, technical and support staff who bear the brunt of capability misalignment. Base grants should build and protect core capability that is relevant to mid and long term science, for which resilience comes from building in the ability to resize, reskill and refocus as the demands for science outputs change.

Thus, base grants alone will not address the fundamental issue of capability misalignment. As noted in our response to Question 25, this could be addressed through (1) oversight mechanisms to ensure that research organisations are building and maintaining the capability that is best tailored for delivering Outcomes and Impacts, and (2) base funding made available for the re-training of personnel from old to new capabilities and functions, to best deliver desired Outcomes and Impacts.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

In the non-university public science sector, we maintain that funding mechanisms should remain primarily driven by Priorities and Core Functions. Under this, two secondary (but still strong) funding mechanism elements that would do much for workforce outcomes have been highlighted in previous responses to questions.

First, base funding should be provided linked to Priorities and Core Functions, with oversight mechanisms that ensure that research organisations are building and maintaining the capability sets required.

Second, base funding should also be provided for the re-training of personnel from old to new capabilities and functions, to best deliver desired Outcomes and Impacts

These would both go a long way to ensuring that New Zealand has the correct workforce (with regards to capabilities and capacities) in the public research sector for delivery to national needs, and that workforce is better assured of stable employment. NZ science should also invest to understand and build relationships with complimentary science capability elsewhere and design in the flexibility to utilise that capability as part of a resilient approach.

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)

Please note that the brief response below does not reflect a lack of thought given to this issue, but an unwillingness to use public good resources to craft a response that is unnecessarily involved or in a high-quality glossy brochure format.

Research infrastructure should be linked to Priorities and Core Functions, and coordinated for sustainability and efficiency, while being kept fit-for-purpose, at the proposed National Science Council level.

This would allow for an appropriately maintained portfolio of infrastructure that could be a mix of (1) infrastructure supporting services to other institutes, (2) infrastructure shared by institutes, (3) infrastructure spread between institutes, or (4) infrastructure held by single institutes. As for institutes themselves, the design of the infrastructure portfolio should be based on the concept of ‘form follows function’.