#56

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, March 06, 2022 10:27:16 PM
Last Modified: Monday, March 07, 2022 1:30:48 AM
Time Spent: 03:03:32

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

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

Q2 **Respondent skipped this question**

Email address

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?

University

Q14

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

No

Q15

Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Chemical sciences,

Physical 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)

If broad research priorities are chosen (like any/all of the examples provided on page 27) then there no clear way of identifying the success, progress towards success or outcome of a research project. The broader the scope of the research priority, the easier it becomes for less impactful studies to be conducted with little overall benefit to the country.

If research priorities are set, these should be very strictly defined and narrow in scope. An example of this could be, how to decontaminate soil from lead using green/water soluble chemistry. This example makes it very easy to measure success and/or progress whereas a research priority like soil science or environment effectively lets the project proposer/s define their own project aims and markers for success with no accountability.

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)

Priorities can be collected and ranked with regard to potential positive impact on society, R&D, attainment in fundamental knowledge etc... Once a research priority has been completed or sufficient progress has been made towards it, it can be removed, or adjusted in priority. This would only work if sufficiently pointed priorities are set as emphasised above. Setting climate change as a research priority makes it impossible to follow real progress and improve systems towards achieving a specific goal. A more appropriate research priority under the scope of climate change could be, The research of resource efficiency of a specific resource intensive process and a search into real solutions to improve effeciency, reduce waste, improve atom economy etc... of that given process.

Potential priorities could be suggested by researchers from research institutes, universities, private businesses and anyone from the public. This should then be assessed by a diverse committee and ranked. This could be done every 3-4 months initially and less frequently after a year. This would allow direct involvement and active collaboration development with the private sector and minimise funding of specific projects over others due to favourtism.

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)

Good research priorities would by default have great interest from the stakeholders. Involving potential stakeholders by allowing them to suggest research priorities is crucial.

Governance in research priorities will be different for different priorities and so one system could involve loose guidelines with hard check-marks and deadlines for progress and accountability reasons. However, a paper/administrative heavy top down approach would not be suitable.

I believe that fundamentally people do want to do research. Providing sharp and clear priorities which will have significant impact in NZ is most important. Increasing the associated paperwork only further complicates and frustrates the individuals conducting the work while taking time away from the task at hand. Greater priority should be placed on getting the right people on the right task, not how the task should be approached in terms of governance.

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)

"Open and genuine engagement with Māori will be vitally important to the development of a research system that gives effect to Te Tiriti."

"How should we engage with Māori and Treaty Partners?"

The way this has been written is somewhat disturbing, as if this document was written with the assumption that no Maori would voluntarily engage with the green paper or any aspects of research in NZ.

The people that conduct research in NZ through institutes/universities are a finite and relatively diverse group. If there is a desire to increase representation from a specific treaty partner subgroup this would need to be approached by a change in the culture of that group. Discussions of this theme are deeply problematic as it would suggest there is an issue with a specific culture or view rather than accepting all unique perspectives. This would be in direct conflict with Mātauranga Māori. Engagement should be fair with ample opportunity and clear information regarding the intent of the Future pathways goals.

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)

Mātauranga Māori provides a differing perspective from the majority Anglo-saxon perspective within NZ. Protection would mean providing opportunity and sufficient appreciation for Mātauranga Māori. This would be of particularly great importance when dealing with matters regarding the cultivation and use of land resources. A mistake frequently made is the framing and redefining of Mātauranga Māori with alternative (often scientific) perspectives, this can be helpful for people from that perspective to help understand the consequences of Mātauranga Māori through a more familiar framework, but this is not the same as Mātauranga Māori. Redefining of Mātauranga Māori in such a way is not a true adoptions or acceptance of Mātauranga Māori and is the opposite of protection, when this occurs it is the active encapsulation of alternative perspectives and only waters down the meaning.

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)

Regional based Māori knowledge hubs sounds appropriate, I would suggest the consideration of not just regional, but tribal specific hubs to provide all tribes a voice. Not all tribes engage equally and their valuable perspectives could be drowned by a more engaging/populated tribe within a region.

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)

Core functions should initially be chosen to minimise potential impact from a funding restructure. This baseline funding of core functions should then be optimised via some form of iterative cost-benefit analysis. This must involve a consideration of potential gain from funding alternative operations, increasing funding of a function already classified as a core function or decreasing funding of a specific core function which only provides a diminishing benefit from extra funding to NZ.

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)

Not sure

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)

The green paper suggests a performance, activity or negotiated system. Performance based considerations should play a small part towards base grant size as the whole point of a base grant is to provide some sense of security.

Adjusting this based off of activity might be reasonable, but maybe it's better if this is scaled specifically with consideration to the size of the organisation, effective hours of labour and/or people employed. Initial negotiation may be necessary, however, the bulk of this could be conducted internally for larger organisation with multiple departments which likely have varying needs.

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)

Fewer, larger organisations may hinder operational efficiency by encouraging the establishment research monopolies and so hindering healthy competition and preventing smaller, potentially better suited institutes from obtaining funds. Increasingly relying on larger integrated institutions only reduces the potential solutions offered including the perspectives and approaches executed.

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)

Respondent skipped this question

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)

A proposal system to see what there is interest/desire in, this would then need to be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on the capital required, time frame of the project and expertise necessary.

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)

I do not know what a Tiriti-enabled institution would look like, I hope it involves a little more than just the rebranding/renaming of current institutes.

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)

Long-term stability and planning is necessary. It should not be the direct role or responsibility of research institutes to transfer knowledge into operational environments or technologies. Where such knowledge exchanges could occur, the relevant parties should be actively included and incorporated in the knowledge acquirement process. If the knowledge is of such high importance that it needs to be transferred to some other medium or party then that party should have already been involved in the process. If the party was contacted and they did not wish to collaborate then it is quite possible that the project which is being funded is producing redundancy or low value knowledge.

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)

By providing additional weight to research priorities which have the potential to create additional job opportunities. I previously provided an example of a potential research priority focusing on lead decontamination from the environment. In principal, soil remediation would provide thousands upon thousands of hours of work and improve the health of (specifically) children growing up in such environments.

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)

Probably not much when overheads are considered.

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)

This is strongly lacking, the addition of anything would help.

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)

NZ would first need to analyse, on an international scale, where it can be competitive with regard to research focus. Research is often collaborative in nature and not exclusive to one country which allows for sharing of research infratructure.

NZ must first see where it sits, and how it could construct research infrastructure which would both stimulate local and international collaborations.