

#32

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, February 03, 2022 3:19:25 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, February 03, 2022 5:18:42 PM
Time Spent: 01:59:16

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Louis Tremblay

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)



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

Independent research organisation

What type of organisation do you work for?

Q14

No

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Q15

Environmental sciences

Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Q16

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

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)

A key principle to identify research priority should be to consider a system approach. Too often, there's an emphasis on the issue of the day that tends to compartmentalise resources. For instance, the key words of recent RfP has been climate change. It is very important but climate change is the effect of upstream impacts including fossil fuel consumption, deforestation etc. The solutions to climate change require fundamental shifts in our behaviours as individuals and as a society, e.g. how do we reduce our carbon emissions needs to consider better urban designs, our relationship with fossil fuels etc.

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)

We need to recognise that we are not working in a vacuum and that many countries have identified research priorities. We need to tap into the outcomes from these countries and then adapt to our own specific conditions and social and cultural values. We must rank the issues based on what our values and aspirations are as a country/people. One way to assist this process would be to agree on some high level vision(s) we collectively have for Aotearoa/NZ. Where do we want to be in 50/100 years. I believe that we can be leaders in this space and that's where the consultation is important. Once there's a vision, priorities can be more easily identified and ranked and included into a global and cohesive strategy.

This was the intended objective of the NSC's. It just needs to be set up in a way that minimises the backroom political plays so that we ensure we progress towards the agreed Vision.

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)

There has to be a process/structure in place that can ensure that the research priorities are addressed in a cohesive and effective way. As much as I hate too much admin, it may be through something like an advisory panel or board with representation across sectors.

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)

This is a challenging one. The key issue here is that there has been increasing pressure to incorporate MM in research programmes like MBIE. I totally support that it is important to work in partnership with Maori and as a country, we need to ensure that we consider indigenous knowledge and Maori values. To include meaningful engagement with Maori requires a massive amount of resources that are too often underestimated in budget and end up being major stress on the programme leaders. If we are to continue to deliver world class scientific output that will not only address issues of importance to NZ but make contributions to global knowledge, we have to do better at how we balance these. It always look good on paper but the reality is often quite different for a range of reasons including capacity limitations etc

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)

From my point of view, I find it very interesting to differentiate MM- here I mean it in the sense of indigenous knowledge and what is referred to as western science derived knowledge. Knowledge doesn't have a skin colour or religion or anything and it has nothing to do with colonisation. Knowledge is knowledge and it is such a selfish way to try to own it or label it that it belongs to a group or individual. There is some general knowledge that has been collated through observation and that's a major component of MM, e.g. the Maori calendar (maramataka) has been derived over many years through observations and that has led to Maori identifying times when fish can be caught or plants harvested etc. This info does not have a label, it just is, a fish will migrate and reproduce based on a series of physiological and external cues and if you keep observing it, you will decipher the information. Obviously, there are other Maori-specific knowledge that belong to them and I'm not commenting on those. My comment is not to offend anyone but to state the importance of all knowledge wherever it from or how it has been collected. If it can be used for the benefit of the country and its people, so we must use and celebrate it. I fully agree that it is important to acknowledge where it is coming from. In science, knowledge is linked to the authors of publications where it is delivered. A similar system is needed to recognised the origin of IK as it would often involve multiple generations and people. That's something that must be recognised in a respectful way.

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 think this would be an opportunity to acknowledge the owners of MM. The key challenge here is with capability, there is a very limited number of Maori in that space. There is much pressure on the few that are good and effective and they end up being "hui hoppers" as Rau Kirikiri told me one day. This is why, some good mentorship networks would really assist to build and maintain a healthy tangata for these potential hubs.

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)

The main issue here has been identified over and over. It should be quite simple really, we all need to recognise that NZ is the size of a large city. Unfortunately, the country is ran as if it was a large country with so many funding agencies that leads to fragmentation and the unhealthy competition. I know that the comment about needing more research \$ keeps coming up. What I'm saying is that if the current funding available was not divided into so many pies, it would lead to much more efficiency and \$ to do the actual research. I don't need to mention the disaster of CRI's, wow this is the biggest mistake one can think of. Imagine, 7 independent (crown-owned) organisations that function as commercial entities. Just there should be enough to warrant a major rethink. But it has been going for 30 years. There are CEOs that are not even scientists- I don't blame them, good on them but their motivation is not for the benefit of NZ inc but rather their home organisation so that they meet financial targets so that they can get their bonus and keep board members happy. This is where hard earned tax payers \$ are going and if people knew more about it, they'd be quite annoy... So definitely a dose of KISS is needed when you think about CRIs then NSCs and Universities (that's another similar story- why do we have 8 Universities??? Again there's a duplication of VC's, senior management, infrastructures etc.) so that there can be a more strategic use of resources so that we can more efficiently use our limited resources instead of having a bunch of us trying to barely survive from grant to grant...

I realise this is probably beyond the scope of this process but at the same time, it would be good to consider all the science resources from research institutes to Universities and haw can we put in place a more strategic framework where infrastructures and workforce are better organised so that we can have more agility and flexibility to uptake new technologies (e.g. sequencing technologies, AI, etc) and respond to new challenges/issues in a timely and effective manner.

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)

A base grant would be a great way to reduce pressure of researchers that are continuously seeking funding to not only support themselves and their teams but also all infrastructures and upstairs management. But before that, a first step would be to review CRIs and explore alternative options- there would be such a major cost saving that could actually be used for the benefit of NZ! Is it just me or am I totally off?? I've worked in a CRI for 12 years and it is amazing the number of situations where I was totally shocked by some of the behaviour - I should write a book!

I definitely support the concept of a base grant with maintaining some competitive funds to address specific calls and needs and to ensure that scientists remain productive and innovative. Again, making sure that there is no redundancy with infrastructure that can be used more effectively.

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've commented previously on the CRI model as a major fiasco. I don't want to repeat myself but there is certainly room for a better model. Again, there are examples worldwide with institutions like CSIRO and Environment Canada for instance. Again, it's a question of making sure that there is good cohesion across all research sectors including scientists from research institutes, Universities, and local and central government agencies. This is an area where NZ can really be a world leader due to our small size- we end up knowing everyone so we need to take advantage of this specificity to make the outcomes of our research even more fit for purpose and focused on these priority issues identified earlier. Having hubs is a very good way to facilitate exchange. There's nothing like being able to involve colleagues across sectors to step up korero and increase innovation.

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)

In the CRI act, there is a statement about their role in capability building. Many CRIs are located close to Universities. A new model should really consider this model where institute scientists can have the option of joint appointments with Universities so that they can teach in their area of expertise and contribute to the supervision of graduate students in areas of need for NZ. That provides interesting career pathways for scientists that have interest in academia and they can share their knowledge to ensure succession and assist with the development of future workforces.

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)

Again, this is a no brainer. Having hubs where research institutes, universities and even research/science staff from territorial authorities can be housed is the best way to ensure a cohesive use of infrastructures. There could be a couple of these on the south island and 3 or 4 in the North Island with specific core expertise.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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)

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)

Well, that's an interesting one, again, that should be a no brainer and scientists from all levels should be involved. They work at the interface and can provide useful feedback. They would be an important group in the consultation process and that across sectors and the wider community.

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)

That would be a very good outcome- even if that was ending up being the only change from this process... I remember starting my career in a CRI and from day first, there was pressure on me to write proposals etc. Looking back, I estimate that I probably spent over 30% of my time (and that's probably an underestimation) writing research proposals. I must admit I've been fortunate to be quite successful to secure funding or to be part of great research groups but so many times I've witnessed the sad cycles of funding with the winners and losers. It was always a stressful time as when you were successful, you couldn't really celebrate as your colleague next door might have lost their funding. There were the redundancies etc. Anything that can reduce the stress of these dreadful cycles and particularly for ECS, to give them the time to establish themselves and their research would be a huge benefit.

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)

Well, as mentioned earlier, a serious dose of KISS is needed. We're a small country with a limited amount of \$ so let's make sure we get the most out of it. Fewer funding agencies, less reporting processes and allocate the \$ to the research rather than going to a bottom line that end up as bonuses... There's always so much admin costs with any funds, if you think of the NSCs, they all have their boards and management structures etc. We really need to reduce this overhead that is such a major impediment on our productivity.

Page 14: Section 8: Research infrastructure

Q39

Respondent skipped this question

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)
