#79

COMPLETE

Collector:	Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started:	Thursday, March 10, 2022 10:33:00 AM
Last Modified:	Monday, March 14, 2022 3:28:58 PM
Time Spent:	Over a day

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Respondent skipped this question

Q2

Email address

Respondent skipped this question

Q3

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.

No

Q4

Can MBIE contact you in relation to your submission?

No

Page 3: Section 2: Submitter information

Q5

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

Individual

Page 4: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q6

Are you a researcher or scientist?

Yes

Q7

Age

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q8

Gender

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q9

In which region do you primarily work?

Q10

Ethnicity

Page 5: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q11

What is your iwi affiliation?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q12

If you wish, please specify to which Pacific ethnicity you identify

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q13

What type of organisation do you work for?

Crown Research Institute or Callaghan Innovation

Q14

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

No

Q15

Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Biological sciences,

Environmental sciences,

Mātauranga Māori (Māori Knowledge)

Q16

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

There is a balance between Mātauranga Māori and other science knowledge

Page 8: Section 2: Submitter information - organisation

Q17

Organisation name

Respondent skipped this question

Q18

Organisation type

Respondent skipped this question

Q19

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Respondent skipped this question

Q20

Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Respondent skipped this question

Q21

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

Respondent skipped this question

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)

NSC challenges have positives and negatives.
Positives include ability to work on a priority area and have a decent amount of funding.
Ability to actually give effect to Te Tiriti through the Challenge process and have Māori coleads and include Māori-lead research, and take the time needed to partner with Māori – example of this is the BHNSC, done very effectively.
Many have been very effective at increasing collaboration.
They can be dynamic, flexible and agile vs programmes like Endeavours.

Negatives include the priorities are so big the effort ends up being fragmented and too thin to cover the main areas of focus, so you end up not really making meaningful progress, or the alternative is major parts of the priority aren't developed as you have to pick areas.
Can be loudest voice wins, hard for early career scientists to figure out how to get in the fold. There's an "old boys club" feeling to the process as you have to know to get in – it's not an open competitive process. This means those who don't get left feeling resentful and left out, going against the collaborative nature they otherwise invoke.

I like the idea of national research priorities but they have to be part of a balanced portfolio of research types, not the only one. There needs to be some funding towards mission-led objectives, some competitive, some for commercial objectives, some that's ear-marked for development of staff in science and some for applied.

Find on the H3-1 spectrum that funding goes towards H3 and H2 with the expectation that industry funds H1. What happens if there is no industry for the H1 research and it's also not a national priority? (the answer is you have a huge and often rather critical gap).

You need to ensure the funding landscape is balanced across H1-H3 and it fits the different types of research needs.

"We are interested in your feedback on whether any type of focus is preferred over another and whether we could have a successful mix of different types of focus." – as someone who has seen both models in the science system, it needs to be "a successful mix of different types of focus". A balanced portfolio is critical.

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)

Again, balance – the priorities cant be solely economically driven but likewise they ultimately need to include support of our primary industries.

Those who need to be at the table for such decisions include: Māori, scientists, industry, conservation groups, govt agencies.

"We will need to consider how a process might be able to deal with emerging, out-of-cycle priorities." – this is critical and COVID-19 has highlighted the need to respond quickly.
Our native estate is often "last to be served at the table" and ends up with the scraps, would be nice to see a change in this.

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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

We need CRI leaders who actually recognise Te Tiriti and understand what a partnership means. The CRI reports that came out before this Green paper were disappointing. Te Tiriti was basically not mentioned and Māori were considered endusers along with industry. This was a sad indictment on our current CRI leaders and going forward this needs to be addressed to allow the change needed.

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)

You should look at what is being done in the BHNSC as an exemplar model for this. I would suggest using the same approach. It not only covers the inclusion of Māori scientists and mātauranga Māori led research, but also includes ensuring cultural authority agreements are in place and engagement that respects sovereignty and adheres to tikanga is undertaken.

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)

I am very supportive of anything that support Māori research and involvement in science. However, my one caution with this suggestion is not removing Māori researchers from the CRI (or whatever it may be) system and have them work separately in a knowledge hub. The current Māori cohort have been highly important (and effective) at highlighting Te Tiriti and helping making intuitional-wide changes, we need to make sure Māori research and researchers are across our science.

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)

"This problem is often cited by both Māori and industry, who are sometimes asked to provide support for funding applications but then experience little subsequent engagement." This stems from the contraints within the funding system that does not support appropriate engagement prior to submission and often has inflexible milestones and deliverables that don't work for proper engagement. Check out what the BHNSC has done to get over these hurdles.

Would support the removal of overheads.

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)

Yes, this should be part of the funding model but shouldn't be the only part – you need a balanced portfolio of types of funding and uses to support the spectrum of science undertaken.

Remove competing systems – Bragato Research Institute (BRI) is a prime example of a competing and pointless research system where a huge amount of govt money has been invested for basically no tangible outcome. Government needs to get rid of these fringe agencies as they fragment the science system. I have no issue if industry want to fund their own research wings but I do not think the government should be.

I'd also suggest at looking at B3 as a model system that has been very effective. Whilst I don't think we should go done the funding model that supports it, I think you should look at the outcomes of this. It's a multi-CRI initiative and through all the funding changes over the years has ensured a core level of funding is directly aimed at border security and has continued. It has allowed ongoing stability and support of researchers in this area whilst delivering on strategic science areas.

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)

Take away the number one focus on money and economics that is a main driver for some of the CRIs. I truly believe the scientists can deliver on what you're wanting. In the main, the biggest hurdles we encounter are institutional.

Many of the current CRIs are too small and overall they're too top heavy. However, if you're going to merge talk to some of the older scientists at PFR about DSIR split versus the Hort/Crop merger. Some interesting take homes of what worked and didn't work. I have asked some I know and the take home message was start afresh – don't merge systems. The merging of financial systems tended to be dominated by one CRI and this led to a feeling of superiority and meant it took a long time to come together. This also had impacts on the cultures as because they didn't start afresh they had to somehow merge them. Comments were the DSIR split was less painful and took less time to recover and bounce back.

Make sure where current CRI-Uni links are present, that these aren't broken.

"Company model of operation for CRIs" I am conflicted on this. The company model makes the CRIs too money focused at the expense of other objectives and values. However, becoming a government research organisation is not a favourable option. Research organisations need to be independent, so a government model would allow government to "instruct" research direction, outcomes and reporting of results – which is not good. I wouldn't want to see our science system subject to the same regulation like I see overseas, which ultimately stifles innovation and progress. I would rather stay under the Company model than change to a government model.

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)

Need to get rid of institutional discrimination (race and gender).

I would rather fewer larger organisations, but would want to see the regional bases retained.

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)

This needs to be retained at the science level. I would also go against some of the suggestions I've heard from individuals about having national hubs of infrastructure and going solely down that route. Again, everything needs to be balance. There is a need for centralised/hubs of science expertise but it shouldn't be done at the expense of keeping regional infrastructure. Regional bases keep the connection to industry and Māori, which are critical. COVID has also highlighted the need to be able to work from a regional base and not rely on "out of town" connections.

Q34   **Respondent skipped this question**

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)

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)

Knowledge exchange is a critical part of the science connection.

One of the biggest issues in NZ is we have national science priorities already and major endeavour programmes but none of these are linked with deliverables/objectives of our regulatory agencies, so there is no pipeline for operationalising. An example is the considerable funding for myrtle rust research, a national priority yet there is no centralised or government agency that is undertaking operations and mana whenua kaitiaki have not been resourced to take on this role. This disjunct needs to be addressed going forward. If it's a national science priority then there should be a clear end-user who has funding to operationalise as the research outcomes flow through to the point they're ready for operationalisation = pathway to impact.

This "pathway to impact" is critical and seems to have been left out of consideration. It currently works well with industry but that's about as far as it goes. There also needs to be careful consideration of research in relation to our primary industries. Recently there is an expectation that industry should be funding anything that's perceived as "industry centric" but I find the understanding of industry centric research versus research being done on a specific crop as a model system but the outcomes are of benefit beyond, limited.

Commercialisation pathways – I think PFR has introduced a good system to address this, would be good to look at that as a positive model.

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)

There are a huge number of intuitional barriers that severely impact developing our workforce. These include structures that actively prevent scientists and staff from progressing within their roles through to things such as the overheads on staff preventing recruitment of post docs. Would be great to see these gone and to see a transparent system in place.

"In particular, we will need to have, attract and grow research leaders who excel at working in multidisciplinary and multi-organisation environments" There are several CRIs where there has been an exodus of science staff or an extreme level of documented discontent. Despite this, I have never seen a board act to reverse any of these. If we stay with the company model then there needs to be greater accountability of the board. I think a CRI losing half of its workforce within a year is not acceptable – no action by a board is also not acceptable.

There continues to be a lot of "old boys club" succession within the CRIs and leadership, until this is addressed we will never move forward or invoke the change that is needed.

Q37   **Respondent skipped this question**

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)

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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

Respondent skipped this question