

Question
Could John explain the point that biodiversity and environmental research outputs are "not relevant to NZ", on his slide? It's not clear from the wording what that means. (Q.1)
What evidence will be used to determine the effect prioritisation is having on system functioning and capability, and how will that evidence feed back into future decisions? Who would decide? And when would changes occur? (Q.2)
How different is the Ignition Fund to the current Smart-Ideas Fund? (Q.3)
In ten years time, if these reforms are successful, could John please describe what outcomes he expects to see. (Q.4)
Thank you, where do you see social science as fitting with these pillars? (Q.5)
Will RFNZ look to standardise the process for applying for funding and reporting across all funding types? (Q.6)
Is there a danger that having a focus on outcomes that other important discoveries are missed, and if the outcomes are too difficult to achieve that a lot of money is thrown at the unattainable? (Q.7)
would these reforms influence international cooperation on R&I - and how? (Q.8)
How much of Ireland's GDP per hour worked is actually influenced by the presence of multinational corporations?
Good morning Sir, thanks for offering us this great opportunity to share visions of our NZ. A quick question, because this recent energy/petrol crisis, do you think our Government will reconsider the incentive policy to boom the electric vehicles market please?
What do you mean by "OUT: research not directly applicable to NZ's population"? For example, how do globally impactful therapeutics fit into this ideology?
If the goal is real economic and societal impact, what will actually change on the ground to ensure this isn't just a reframing of the same system?
Many thanks for your insights and explanation. a) How are "impact" and "strong returns" being defined within the priority pillars, and b) will those definitions be made explicit and revisited over time?
How will the new mission-led funding approach ensure independent contractors and small organisations can participate meaningfully, rather than funding being concentrated in large institutions?
None of these changes in priorities and processes address the most fundamental issue that NZ's international outlier approach of full cost recovery through massive overhead costs has a wide range of detrimental consequences for the "productivity" of the science and innovation system. Are there any plans to address this in the future?
For the advanced tech pillar, is it fair to say a portion of the funding is a "vertical" (specifically to advance the technology itself - e.g. core AI science), and a portion is "horizontal" enabler, feeding into - and supporting the missions of - the other pillars?
Kia ora Dr Roche, Out of Scope here. With a focus on outcomes, what considerations are being given to support the workforce during this transitional time? RNZ is reporting serious concerns for the wellbeing of the workforce that are facing widespread job cuts with few opportunities available locally. Some info: https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/592542/scientists-left-homeless-after-government-s-

job-cuts-advocates-say

How is the science workforce expected to change in the coming years, after multiple restructures under the new PROs.

Thank you. **Out of Scope**

If the HRC goes, NZ will be an outlier in comparable countries (NHMRC Aust MRC UK Health Council Netherlands etc) - and Aust has an Academy of Health and Med Sciences and UK similar How will this gap be filled ?

A lot of the detail is scheduled to come out close(ish) to the election. Is the election likely to derail release of the detail and further information?

Will there be any allocation for science in society projects, similar to Curious Minds, PSP etc? Either within or underpinning the pillars.

People studying for MSc or PhDs had to be highly trained and excellent to get through the competitive process for their programmes in the first place. Job prospects after they get their degrees are dismal. They typically get less than minimum wage for the research work they do. This is exploitation by the Crown. Will this reform process end that? Will it ensure a living wage and all the rights of employment for this group of people?

Are you not concerned that a focus on 'mission led' investments (60% instead of our previous 45%) will actually stifle innovation? Investigator-led research seems far more likely to lead to real breakthroughs, as researchers working at the cutting edge of their specific fields know where the key gaps are better than would the government / MBIE. Researchers are also more likely to be excited and motivated to work hard on projects they develop themselves - it's less like a paid job, more like a passion, when you can research the really exciting ideas you come up with yourself! We can't know or predict where the most impactful innovations will be - we must allow innovation through curiosity / discovery. Think of Australia's (CSIRO) discovery of wi-fi technology, which came about through researchers studying black holes.

so within each type of fund (e.g., Marsden) applicants will identify the pillar that their research best fits into? Will there be "quotas" for each pillar within different fund schemes?

How will the new investment model support early-stage, pilot-ready health innovations that are focused on clinical impact and system integration, rather than purely academic research?

What do you see the role of Independent Research Organisations in the SIT system and how to we need to refocus our activities?

While the slides that were shown be available after the webinar?

Please can Danette go over that timeline she spoke through when the figure was up on the screen? It went by quickly!

Can you recap what is next and what opportunities for engagement there are for industry?

Funding appears to be largely awarded repeatedly to the same people, ethnic groups, and organisations.

How will the 'new' system ensure that funding access becomes available to parties undertaking significant research being undertaken by those not habitually not funded, i.e. non university and private sector.

The report signals significant reprioritisation and acknowledges potential capability loss—how will you ensure critical capabilities aren't unintentionally lost as funding shifts across the system?
Loved the Doudna quote that John shared (to ensure science serves society) and wonder if he can talk to the role of humanities and social sciences (the hearts and minds that can effect change and in translating science to the public)
What investment will be going into capability building? It seems we are losing a lot of knowledge and experience overseas and science is no longer an attractive or stable career for young people to aspire to.
Given that changing clinical practice is often a barrier, how will the new system support adoption and validation of AI-driven tools within primary care settings?"
Does our research need to sit within just 1 pillar or can we address multiple pillars within one research project?
With all this change, there are gaps in funding at the moment. This is making it harder for people on soft-funding such as ECRs and we will lose researchers who cannot be employed. When will new grants be opening and how will the risk of losing researchers be managed with the changes?
What is the time frame for HRC moving into RFNZ? What progress is underway in changing legislation around HRC?
As these priorities are put into action, what might change for organisations like REANNZ that help researchers collaborate and share data?
Assuming the Ignition Fund is similar to Smart Ideas, are there any 'new to NZ' types of investment mechanisms being considered, and if so which ones?
I am looking at point #70 of the report, discussing future "displacement of the SI&T workforce, including postdoctoral positions, fellowships, and researcher roles". For those of us in those positions, how do you suggest we prepare?
For John: How do the funding quantumms for each pillar compare with Australia and Irelands funding in these areas per capita?
Does "TRL agnostic base layer" regarding funding types imply that the ML layer will necessarily be highly TRL?
The report says that PMSITAC will be looking at providing more granular detail of each of the pillars with 6-8 focus domains. Will these be guiding the pillar advisory groups? What is the timeframe for release of information about these domains?
Are you able to comment on the potential for alignment of research funding to Industry/SME-led research?
will there be a streamlined concise and standardized application form for applying for funding?
Can the panel talk to the no man/no woman's land between "science" and "research funding New Zealand" i.e. where does the research that is not science sit.
What are the proposed mechanisms for increasing the investment in the commercialisation processes for the large amount of science that is ready to got to market now?
The recent report on freshwater status discussed last night on National Radio by Troy Baisden indicated that funding for freshwater monitoring is critical to inform future clean up

<p>policies - how will these fundamental monitoring programmes be funded under this new model as councils do not have the required funding for this</p>
<p>In terms of funding mechanisms, how will these split between pillar type investments (many so far not contestable) versus contestable research programmes/projects?</p>
<p>What is the process to determine what the exact priorities for mission-led research will be? Is this driven by wide consultation with experts? Will this be transparent to the sector?</p>
<p>Controversial question, but can we and should we actually compare NZ to other countries in the world? Ireland, for example, may have a similar geographical space and population, but it operates within the European research space and context. As noted, NZ is a long strip of land in the middle of the Pacific - it is not a comparable context to other countries with which we compare ourselves traditionally. Even Australia, the closest to us in a geographic context, has a much larger population and land mass area that they can leverage for GDP outcomes. We may have immense capacity for innovation, but it doesn't seem to be a case of comparing apples with apples when it comes to outputs/GDP...</p>
<p>Is the intention that the ignition fund sits across all priorities and beyond them?</p>
<p>John: I noticed in the Technology for Prosperity area that what is "in" is AI, advanced manufacturing, robotics, space etc. the list is largely physical sciences based. What happened to synbio which comes through clearly in the PMSITAC report</p>
<p>Could you clarify whether the Ignition Fund will only be focussed on Advanced Technologies, or across all the 4 pillars?</p>
<p>Three coupled questions about linking projects to pillars here: with the need for researchers to identify which pillar their proposal adheres to, does this mean that projects may not be funded if their pillar has fully allocated its funding for a year? Will work supported by the Ignition Fund also need to be tied to a pillar and limited by the amount of funding allocated to a specific pillar? How would a project that is across more than one pillar be handled?</p>
<p>Can I suggest that you read questions from the bottom, rather than the top please. Otherwise, you are missing the earliest questions</p>
<p>Kia ora WJ, Danette and John. When will the names of the Pillar leaders and members be released?</p>
<p>Simon Upton is lobbying for a federated data collection, and to drive consistent data for measuring the environment - is this part of where funding will be applied?</p>
<p>With our PRO's (and Universities) delivering major pieces of international development in the Pacific and ASEAN, how does this fit into the pillars and priorities?</p>
<p>Data from the Technology Investment Network (TIN) shows that as NZ tech firms expand, they are hiring more staff offshore than onshore. In 2023, for example, NZ-based jobs among top firms fell, while overseas-based jobs rose by over 2,000. Given our remoteness to major global markets (unlike Ireland or Denmark) how can we be sure NZ will realise similar gains from investing in tech research if in the end the financial benefits move largely overseas?</p>
<p>Danette, any additional clarity/information on Endeavour 2027 timelines?</p>
<p>how will you ensure market perspectives to identify where the money is and how to get it. ie a market back perspective in decision making rather just science push</p>
<p>Could you please describe the motivation for the infrastructure support piece, and what this might look like?</p>

What funding is being put in place to develop researcher skills to support kiwis to work with the reforms?
Earlier iterations of the Advanced Technology pillar included Synthetic Biology as one of the key examples - has this now been dropped because it is no longer a priority?
Will mission-led and investigator-led funding be distributed evenly between Crown Research Institutes and universities, or targeted differently between the two?
Kia ora. How does educational research fit into the new structure?
also have to say that our telco infrastructure underlying all those wonderful AI innovation services could be much better strengthened to address some in-born risks such as centralized cloud centers, separated from the world while with only undersea fibers....so if single failure occurs (for cloud) or being attacked to the undersea fiberswhat we can do for services and business continue to work ? is possible to review the telco infrastructure: physical connectivity backup, single point failure of cloud centers etc....then might re-look at the R&D investment to address future possible network of networks please?
How will New Zealand avoid becoming a testbed whose IP, talent, or firms are systematically acquired by larger jurisdictions once the technology proves viable, and how do we compete for talent with these jurisdictions for advanced-technology talent without materially higher wage ceilings or immigration reform?
Rearranging the deck chairs (funding) will make no difference if the boat is broken. How will this change benefit NZ inc and not just the big monopoly companies that currently control much of the BSI
How are the missions to be determined?
Will all the questions asked here (whether answered or not) be published for the public to see?
The prioritised/deprioritised areas seem very broad. Will there be a mapping of ANZSRC codes to these areas that will be released to give us a more granular view?
How are you going to ensure that the investment into technology innovation is going to stay in NZ? At least investing into other pillars, we will see direct benefits to NZ, but as soon as technology gets big enough it usually benefits global markets more than NZ.
Thanks for the very clear view of how NZ's productivity is well behind other comparable countries. There seems to be no intention to increase NZ's spending on science in terms of % of GDP. Should this not be a priority, along with system reform?
Hello Dr Roche. Out of Scope . Are the economic gains of scientific research being prioritised over other driver like social or environmental, for example? E.g. tying biological+economy together for the Bioeconomy Science Institute. Does this direction risk corporate or commercial players, especially from abroad, receiving state-subsidised research they could otherwise fund themselves? Many thanks. Out of Scope
is enhancing NZs science reputation world-wide considered a worthy output under the new system?
It sounds like the Ignition fund is "fast fail." How will the Ignition fund decide not just which projects to invest in but whether projects are showing sufficient promise for continued investment? What timeframe will these decisions happen over?

Thanks John and Danette. Where do the decisions on PRO funding allocation to mission led programs get made?
Doesn't the decline in education standards undermine New Zealand's science & innovation capability for the future? My own kids have a (recently hired) NCEA science teacher who openly tells them he doesn't agree that climate change is real and carbon dating is valid... How does this new strategy inform or dovetail with New Zealand's education strategy?
Similar to Kathryn - As scientists yourselves, how do you justify this level of divestment in fundamental science? Research and innovation, by definition, cannot be forced into create more successful, applicable outcomes. And likewise, some of the most impactful outcomes of science come via serendipity in the process of doing fundamental research.
What have we learnt from the National Science challenges?
How does your strategy reflect the biophysical reality that infinite growth is not possible in a finite system? Tigerter with the observational reality that we are hitting biophysical limits?
Given the recent consolidation of the research space (pros). How does this plan help avoid essential monopolisation of the research space which can then stifle innovation? What is the role of private research organisations?
How will these changes support early career researchers with diverse research interests?
Genetic engineering presents significant opportunities within pastoral systems to support the transition toward environmentally sustainable, low-greenhouse gas agricultural practices. These opportunities align strongly with the pillar focused on environmental sustainability and resilience. What is the Council's position on investing in research to advance this area?
How do you stop the ignition fund being like the current venture capital funding (75 govt:25venture capital), which is more like gambling, compared to say the SFFF which is more considered but only attracts 40: 60 funding
How will the necessary balance be formed between economic development and social science?
As funding shifts toward cross-cutting technologies, how will success be assessed at the farm and value-chain level - not just in scientific or technological outputs, but in demonstrable productivity and resilience gains for producers?
Although there's comparison to what other countries are doing with their investment in the area of tech and the great advances and benefits they've seen from it, how long have they been investing in this area to realise the benefits? And how far behind is New Zealand? It seems there's a lot of catching up to be done and there needs to significant support to achieve this. This is also an issue for other areas of science. Being an assessor for Horizon Europe it is very clear how much catching up we have to do to be comparable.
Are we considering any potential damage to long term traditional strengths if we look for short term gains? Realigning science focus from now considered "low impact" areas to international trends do we risk under-performing domestically due to contextual differences, funding shifts to new areas ocuring faster than capability building and potential reduction in effectiveness?
Working for Ara Ake- NZ's energy innovation center- we're really excited to hear about the Ignition Fund, as it sounds great and very similar to some of our funding streams we

implement for some of the moon shot energy innovations we support. How do you anticipate this may be administered?
Does our research need to sit within just 1 pillar or can we address multiple pillars within one research project?
The report suggest displacement of SI&T workforce, especially for early career researchers. How will our people just starting in science be supported and retained in a system that will look different from when they started, importantly for those whose area of research could be deprioritised?
John, where do you see long-term research fitting into this new picture? There seems to be a push towards quite short-term (up to 5 year) research programmes, when we know that maintaining capability/capacity and developing new areas of research, necessarily builds upon many years of research
Would funding to collaborate with overseas countries be embedded across the pillars framework?
John, new technology has to be applied to have impact, so, it was good to hear you say that you expect investment in new technology to find its application back in primary sector - and the environment (assuming I heard this correctly). Can you elaborate on this please as I don't think this nuance was in the narrative of the pioritisation report?
How will this reform support early career researchers? To be successful we need to create opportunities for these bright minds to stay in the country.
Can you explain more about how exactly the new investment in "advanced tech" is expected to funnel back into bioeconomy and environmental science?
Kia ora, is this being recorded and will we have access to the slides?

Released under the Official Information Act