#86

COMPLETE

Collector:	Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started:	Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:10:40 AM
Last Modified:	Tuesday, March 15, 2022 10:19:43 AM
Time Spent:	00:09:03

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Confidentiality - 9(2)(ba)(i)

Q2

Email address

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q3   **No**

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?

Q7

Age

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q8

Gender

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?

Agricultural, veterinary and food sciences

Q16

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

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

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)

I would like to see research priorities that build long running partnerships with Māori and that aim to tackle some of the bigger challenges we are facing (e.g. climate change). Currently the focus within my CRI is on profit, rather than tackling important science questions. If there isn't a pathway to royalties, the work isn't supported. Using the example of climate change, there are huge issues we face that could be researched via different avenues, but the CRI focus on profit makes this an impossible task to undertake.

I support the idea of long running (~5 years) research Priorities. As reflected in the green paper, my concern focuses on how these will be governed. Having worked in the system for 20+ years, I am well aware of the competition that occurs between CRI researchers working in the same/similar area (e.g. B3 funding) and I believe unless there is a reduction in the number of CRIs, that this unhelpful competition will continue. I believe with good governance we could have a successful mix of different types of focus within the research Priorities. I would like to see governance from outside the CRI system, with the hope that this would reduce any bias in work allocation e.g. 'who knows who' and within CRI favouritism.

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)

I agree with use of the 3 components listed for setting priorities. Ideally priority setting should include Māori in equal numbers to pākehā, the active inclusion of women and people from a broad range of ages.

Q24

Respondent skipped this question

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)

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

Q25

Respondent skipped this question

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

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)

Develop an RSI system that supports and develops more Māori researchers in meaningful ways, not simply in token form. Māori researchers in the system currently are massively over worked. For a start, have allocated funding to employ more Māori researchers into the system. Looking to the future, tertiary education providers with a strong mandate to support and develop Māori ECR. A better, more structured pathway for Māori ECR to move from tertiary study into employment – this could be in the form of developed relationships between tertiary institutes and CRIs, giving the young Māori students the support to work in the system while studying.

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 have concerns that regionally based knowledge hubs will result in isolation from the rest of the research system.

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)

I agree with the 3 categories listed – Critical research; high-priority services; Databases, collections and monitoring. However I also believe that we have a fourth core function which is that of community engagement/outreach. Community engagement has been highly successful during the COVID-19 pandemic, allowing the public to better understand the significance of public health measures and take these on board. For the large challenges we are facing (e.g. climate change) it is an absolute necessity that this knowledge is successfully transferred into the public domain.
Base grants would offer significant stability.

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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

I would like to see a stronger focus on research hubs with multiple CRIs on the same site with shared resources as a means of strengthening collaboration. Labs designed in a way that the function can easily change with changing research needs (e.g. all labs built to PC1 or PC2 standard). Shared communal spaces (e.g. café, conference rooms etc). In my own case, my CRI has proposed moving staff off a central Privacy - 9(2)(a), so that the current space taken by those researchers can be rented out to an alternative CRI, giving the company more revenue flow. Despite arguments from staff that this is a barrier to collaboration having groups disparate from one another, there seems to be a push to increase profit, rather than maximise collaboration for the good of science.

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)

Within my CRI, 'stretchy' ("moon shot") science is supported for internal funding programmes over applied sciences. This is a huge disincentive for those who work in the applied field even though these skills/research are heavily sought by industry. The development of internal funding mechanisms that are aligned with each research area, rather than one single funding 'pot', could be used towards capability growth, including funding more risking applied research not yet ready for industry funding.

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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

Respondent skipped 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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

Within the green paper the importance of recruiting international researchers was mentioned - How can we ensure these international researchers joining our CRIs uphold Te Triti values? Where will the time/funding come from to give these researchers understanding of the values and why they need to be upheld?

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)

Base grant funding would offer stability to the research workforce. This would be of particular significance to those defined as 'precarious workers' in the current system, who often need to hold multiple short term contracts to survive. If institutions knew they had base grant funding this may provide more opportunities to support post-doctoral students.
A base grant could lead to a reduction in overhead costs, thereby making research affordable to more of the smaller/emerging industries which find current CRI pricing too expensive. Along with this, international funding streams often don't cover overhead costs – this would make our system much easier to integrate with international funding sources.

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