

#116

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:34:17 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 2:10:47 PM
Time Spent: Over a day

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Andy Philpott

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

Individual

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

Page 4: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q6

Yes

Are you a researcher or scientist?

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q7

Age

Q8

Gender

Q9

In which region do you primarily work?

Q10

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

University

What type of organisation do you work for?

Q14

No

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Q15

Mathematical sciences

Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Q16

It does not contain Mātauranga Māori

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

Page 8: Section 2: Submitter information - organisation

Q17

Respondent skipped this question

Organisation name

Q18

Respondent skipped this question

Organisation type

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Q21

Respondent skipped this question

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)

To determine a process for setting research priorities the New Zealand government should look to successful models in small economies with impressive research records like Denmark and Israel. They should also look to areas where New Zealand has built a research advantage, e.g. agricultural science. Track record is a reliable indicator of future success.

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)

Setting priorities in research does not have simple answer. In some settings, mission-led research will yield positive results. This happens when the goal can be expressed simply. For example the 1-1-1 HydrogenShot is a US DOE Earthshot mission to develop technology to make 1 Kg of hydrogen at a cost of \$1 within 1 decade. This simple aspiration has the potential to motivate researchers to compete to achieve this.

Some missions (such as meeting a restrictive national carbon budget) emerge naturally out of government policy.

On the other hand, trying to create mission led science by consensus can be difficult. It took years for the New Zealand Science Challenges to agree on their initial set of missions, as competing institutions and research groups vied for a slice of the funds. Mechanisms developed by the challenges (such as expert panels or mission labs) to create missions and research teams have not been successful.

The fact is that not all good science is mission-led, and many great discoveries come from curious scientists attempting to unravel some mysterious phenomenon. So there should be room (and funding) for curiosity-driven research. In the New Zealand context this research is supported by Universities and the Marsden Fund. The priorities here are decided by principal investigators, assessed by international referees, and evaluated in a competitive context. It is often said that the low success rate of Marsden is wasteful of resources (which admittedly would be reduced by a funding boost) but the activity of writing proposals and research plans (whether successful or not) is an important ingredient in doing research, so the effort should not be considered wasteful.

To give effect to Te Tiriti, Māori research priorities should be determined by Māori. As stated in Te Pūtahitanga (p. 31) "Growing the Mātauranga Māori continuum and advancing Kaupapa Māori research in our own way is a task that is best carried out either without direct Crown involvement (as an independent activity) or supported, but not governed, by the Crown. The power to set this agenda, to implement it, to benefit from it and to evaluate its outcomes requires an independently resourced and unapologetically Māori space. "

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)

No comment

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)

The document Te Pūtahitanga gives a thoughtful discussion of how the New Zealand research system can give effect to Te Tiriti. This discussion identifies two spheres of influence, the rangatiratanga sphere (Māori) and the kāwanatanga sphere (tauiwi), and explores the relationship between them. The relationship between these two spheres is currently embodied in prescriptions by research funding bodies to include mātauranga Māori in research funding applications.

Such prescriptive relationship models can be flawed. Tauwiwi principal investigators when writing grant proposals seek Māori partners to tick the mātauranga Māori box. Such an approach is superficial, and will do little to give effect to Te Tiriti. Indeed, in the early days of this policy, while universities and CRIs were fully funding their research time in budgets, iwi partners were expected to participate in the research pro bono, with no FTE component for their time or overhead. This is not only an unfair model, but an unsustainable one.

To counter this box-ticking response, researchers engaging with mātauranga Māori are encouraged to build trust with Māori partners over a sustained period of time, during which they develop grant proposals in partnership. There are many documented successes of this approach working in practice. As outlined in Te Pūtahitanga (p. 20)

“As tangata whenua, Māori are the kaitiaki, or custodians, of Mātauranga Māori. The interconnected nature of kaitiakitanga, mana motuhake and whakapapa means that Māori have both the right and obligation to protect and secure the integrity of Mātauranga. It follows then that research, funding and initiatives that promote the application and exploration of Mātauranga Māori should prioritise Māori leadership at all levels of the decision-making process. In practice, this means Māori must have leadership and oversight of funded initiatives that locate Mātauranga as central to research and innovation. Attempts to integrate Mātauranga Māori into the RSI sector have not always been successful. Transactional funding approaches within the sector disregard the critical importance of kaitiakitanga, mana motuhake and whakapapa – Mātauranga becomes something to be extracted and used without understanding its wider context. This instrumental approach risks diminishing the mauri or life force that underpins Māori bodies of knowledge, and the wider Māori knowledge ecosystem.”

However long-term relationship building is not always efficient, especially when research is in areas where the field is evolving rapidly, and researchers compete internationally for attention. Here being nimble can be difficult when navigating long-term relationships with partners. Furthermore, some fields of Western science have no meaningful relation to mātauranga Māori that can be explored. On the other hand, one should also expect that some aspects of mātauranga Māori will draw nothing useful from Western science. The relationship model needs a rethink.

The asymmetry of current tauwiwi-constructed relationship models is identified in Te Pūtahitanga (p. 27)

“While Crown agencies are increasingly comfortable with the notion of partnership in a relational sphere, their understanding of and capability to engage with rangatiratanga is largely untested. Yet, for Māori, the space for self-determined development is critical. As Matike Mai points out, giving effect to the practice of tino rangatiratanga sovereignty in all contexts is an inherent component of Te Tiriti. This is germane to the science-policy nexus, but also has broader implications for Mātauranga Māori, Māori intellectual property rights and Māori data sovereignty.”

This leads to a proposal for a more devolved model (p. 31)

“While creating a relational space where more effective policy can be co-developed by Māori and tauwiwi may improve the status quo, deploying approaches that support autonomous science activity may lead to greater success. Article 2 of Te Tiriti guarantees the right for Māori to maintain rangatiratanga over Māori knowledge, resources and taonga. Protection of these rights through legislation, such as intellectual property rights, is the Crown's responsibility. Growing the Mātauranga Māori continuum and advancing Kaupapa Māori research in our own way is a task that is best carried out either without direct Crown involvement (as an independent activity) or supported, but not governed, by the Crown. The power to set this agenda, to implement it, to benefit from it and to evaluate its outcomes requires an independently resourced and unapologetically Māori space. ”

“Being around the table in a partnership model on the mana of the Crown is not really tino rangatiratanga. We want them to lift out the resources and let us govern ourselves ... and then a Māori lens can be applied to how funding like that can be valued: from its practitioners, from its measure as impact, from what is actually measured, and how it is measured. Science in the rangatiratanga space would need to be properly resourced to enable the development and deployment of science initiatives directly to Māori, where the processes of Māori science methodologies align more directly with the mobilisation of Mātauranga Māori. The power to set this agenda... requires an independently resourced and unapologetically Māori space. “

To give full effect to Te Tiriti, the rangatiratanga sphere must be explored and properly resourced as described above. The corollary to this is that current tauwiwi-constructed relationship models should be reconsidered, possibly with a less prescriptive flavour. With “an independently resourced and unapologetically Māori space”, Western science and mātauranga Māori can co-exist in the New Zealand research landscape, meeting in those research fields where the combination adds value, while pursuing independent research agendas when it does not.

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)

No comment.

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)

No comment.

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)

No comment

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)

No comment

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)

Recent sentiment in the New Zealand research community is that research needs to be collaborative rather than competitive (possibly supported by the successful public health research underpinning New Zealand's Covid 19 response). Though it is clear that needless competition between New Zealand research institutions for funding is wasteful, competition between research ideas, possibly pursued by different groups, is essential for ensuring high quality work.

Recent world events have also given rise to a more inward-looking view of New Zealand research. Collaboration within the country on New Zealand and Pacific problems is considered to be more important than collaboration internationally. Research excellence is being redefined e.g. in the PBRF. This view is limiting. Once the pandemic passes, New Zealand research must again make its way in the world, and be measured by international standards. Exposed to the competitive environment of the world stage, good research should prosper, and poor research should wither and die. This contest is ignored at our peril. The New Zealand research system must accept this and be primed to prosper in this environment.

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)

No comment

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)

No comment

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)

No comment.

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)

No comment.

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)

No comment

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)

No comment

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)

No comment

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)

No comment
