

SCIENCE FOR
TECHNOLOGICAL
INNOVATION

Kia kotahi mai –
Te Ao Pūtaiao me
Te Ao Hangarau

Te Ara Paerangi Future Pathways: Green paper consultation

**SUBMISSION FROM THE KĀHUI MĀORI FOR SCIENCE FOR
TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION NATIONAL SCIENCE
CHALLENGE**

Programme Office
Callaghan Innovation Asteron Centre
Level 14, 55 Featherston Street, Wellington 6011

E: sftichallenge@callaghaninnovation.govt.nz
T: 0800 422 552
www.sftichallenge.govt.nz

Illustration designed by Tyler Dixon, Waikato-Maniapoto, Ngāti Porou, Ngāi Tūhoe, Ngāi Tahu depicts a Mangopare (Hammerhead shark). It symbolises the strength in duality to be found in uniting Māori knowledge with western science.

HEI PUAKI

He hōnore he korōria ki runga,
He maungārongo ki te mata o te whenua
He whakaaro pai tētehi ki tētehi. Pai mārire!

Ko te Kāhui Māori o SfTI tēnei e mihi kau atu ana ki a MBIE e whakatuwheratia ana ngā kūaha kia wānanga ai ngā kaupapa nei. Hei te mutunga iho ka mōhio mehemea ka whai hua ngā kōrero nei ka waiho rānei kia pūpūhia noa e te hau.

Me te mea anō ka rerekē te wairua o ngā kupu kua tuhia tuatahitia ki te reo Māori ki tō te wairua o ngā kupu kua tuhia tuatahi ki te reo Ingarihi. Ahakoa te nui o te hiahia me te āhei pea ki te tuhi whakautu i te reo rangatira, i tēneki wā e āwangawanga ana kei kore i rongona whānuitia, kei kore e rongona hōhonutia e MBIE e te Kāwanatanga, nō reira ka huri ki te whakatakoto i ō mātou whakaaro/whakapae ki te reo parāoa me te pata.

Tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou.

1. Research Priorities

The Research Priorities should be reset with one thought front and centre. Mātauranga Māori is a unique indigenous knowledge system that has huge potential for innovation that benefits Aotearoa New Zealand. How can the RSI system be reimaged to recognise how mātauranga Māori has been realised traditionally by Māori, and then to support ongoing knowledge generation in a similar vein?

1 (1.2.2) Priorities design

- *What principles could be used to determine the scope and focus of national research Priorities?*

- The priorities should aim to **contribute to community well-being for all**, including iwi, hapū and wider Aotearoa NZ communities, with a focus across economic, environmental, social and cultural wellbeings.
 - It is important to acknowledge that the RSI system does not exist in a vacuum; it is a key resource from which to draw knowledge and insights that help communities, businesses, and policy-makers ... but the current privileging of the mainstream, Western view of knowledge creation (or science), is at odds with a Te Ao Māori approach which values different forms of knowledge and which has its base in tikanga Māori. The effect of this status quo is that Māori do not and cannot benefit from the RSI system to the extent that non-Māori New Zealanders can.
- With this in mind as the review moves forward, **Māori aspirations** should be front and centre; we must be able to determine our own priorities for a Māori research agenda and have access to equitable resourcing to action this agenda (Rangatiratanga). Taking such an approach will inevitably lead to research outcomes that benefit Māori and all New Zealanders.
- Moderating the mainstream view of Māori as an homogenous group with an **iwi/hapū lens** has the potential to honour the differences between rohe across the motu and reveal the shortcomings associated with 'ticking the box' when committees and project teams involve a single Māori voice.
- The concept of '**Mission-led research**' is appropriate for setting these Research Priorities because they essentially focus on meeting the needs of communities so that those communities are more likely to benefit from research, science and innovation. This has been the approach taken by National Science Challenges to good effect in Māori-led Missions that specifically aim to benefit Māori communities.
- With regard to structure, **Long Term Priorities** (30+ year horizon, with perhaps 5-yearly refreshing) would add longevity and depth to both exploring important Missions and putting strong relationships in place. Also allowing space for **Short Term Priorities** to be added to meet new challenges would enhance this country's ability to respond in an agile manner when needed (e.g. Covid).
- We recommend there is **equity of investment** to develop solutions in response to the most urgent local, national, and global problems. Further, investment that applies longer timeframes will alleviate funding precarity and provide more certainty. It is expected that such an approach will result in new approaches to both fundamental and applied research.
- Finally, there should be careful consideration to **avoid unintended negative consequences** such as exacerbating inequality or allowing systemic racism to continue, for example, through data collection and analysis that uses culturally inappropriate or deficit-based methods.
- **We will know we have succeeded** if and when our communities and our people see themselves in both the new Māori RSI ecosystem and wider recalibrated Aotearoa RSI system.

2. (1.3.2) Priority-setting process

- *What principles should guide a national research Priority-setting process?*

- *How can the process best give effect to Te Tiriti?*

- A key principle must be that Mātauranga Māori and science have equal mana. Further, the process should be a fresh start rather than privileging any aspect of the status quo.
- In order to achieve this, the extensive involvement of Māori, including the Māori research authorities (e.g. Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga and the Rauika Māngai), iwi authorities, and Māori in the science sector, government, businesses and communities is paramount.
- The dissemination of knowledge in a traditional Māori sense, he mea heke iho i ngā tūpuna, should be valued, and supported through funding, as much as the dissemination of knowledge in a Western Tertiary Institution.
- We also recommend establishing a Mātauranga Māori Commission (or other entity) that can provide leadership and guidance on what is mātauranga Māori, as well as the process and guiding principles to best enable mātauranga Māori, and support the development of priorities for Mātauranga Māori. Such an organisation should sit outside of government departments, be independently governed, and have its own suitable-for-the-task budget.
- At a foundational level, the review should acknowledge the complexity of the Māori world and the consequent need for bold thinking and action in order to leverage research, science and innovation to generate solutions. Challenges such as climate change and intergenerational inequality will not be overcome using Western science alone, rather, Aotearoa New Zealand's other primary knowledge system, Mātauranga Māori, is needed. Ideally we will transform from a system that is extractive and deficit-focused to one that is generative and ethical.
- It is the Crown's role as Tiriti partner to enable and invest in Māori-determined priorities and outcomes.
- Mātauranga Māori is a taonga and thus must be protected under Article Two of the Treaty.
- Once Te Ara Paerangi mahi is completed, the recalibrated RSI system needs to hold space for both:
 - **Rangatiratanga**, where Māori including iwi, hapū, whānau, business and independent researchers can determine and drive our own priorities and outcomes, and where Māori see ourselves reflected back; and
 - **Tiriti-based partnership**, where Māori and the Crown share decision making in setting national Research Priorities.

3. (1.4.2) Operationalising Priorities

- *How should the strategy for each national research Priority be set and how do we operationalise them?*

Foundational, systemic changes are needed to ensure Māori are represented as full partners as guaranteed by Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This can be achieved through instituting a number of changes to the existing system. Structurally, this could be supported by establishing oversight organisations such as a Māori Research Commission with more general oversight, and a Māori Research and Science Authority that can take a leadership role in operationalising changes.

- **Establish and comprehensively resource a new Māori organisation** dedicated to Mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori approaches to knowledge generation across the STEAM portfolio. While this organisation will have the fundamental role of protecting Mātauranga Māori, this does not negate the responsibilities of the Tertiary Education Commission to protect mātauranga Māori, for example through the PBRF process.
- **Resource existing Māori organisations** that are sources of technical capability such as the Iwi Leaders Forum. An important consideration will be what wrap-around services (for example, mentoring) might usefully be offered to Māori organisations focusing on this kaupapa, both new and existing, to support them in achieving their purpose.
- **Bake Te Tiriti partnerships into the RSI system through legislative change.** An example of this happening recently is the incorporation of the Māori Health Committee in the Health Research Council Act (1990).

- **Ensure co-governance and co-leadership** is enabled when developing strategies and operational structures:
 - Māori leaders, particularly at iwi level, should be seen across the RSI system and at the table with the Crown and its agents making decisions.
 - BUT currently there is a lack of Māori leaders within the system that have the confidence to step into co-governance and co-leadership roles. Resourcing needs to be allocated to address this; including upskilling in te reo and tikanga, supporting a pipeline of Māori researchers with the requisite wide-ranging skills, providing clear career pathways into co-governance and co-leadership roles, and ensuring iwi are invited and enabled to participate (how this would work in practice needs careful consideration and will likely differ between iwi).
 - Māori Chief Science Advisors should be appointed across government departments to ensure commitment to Te Tiriti and mātauranga Māori, and to set strong relationships with iwi and Māori organisations in place. These role holders would also support the operationalisation of Research Priorities as appropriate.
 - The NSCs have been gradually establishing co-governance and co-leadership structures with some good success – it would be useful to learn from them what has worked.
 - BUT there needs to be an assessment of the effectiveness of NSCs' Tiriti-led practices and outcomes, particularly in terms of how marae, hapū and iwi voices have influenced research outcomes and impact.
- **Support active collaboration between researchers** across organisations and disestablish siloes of power. Again, the NSCs have embraced collaboration with cross-institution research projects, formation of institution-agnostic 'best teams', and drawing Challenge leaders from multiple universities and CRIs.
- **Support active collaboration between researchers and communities.** This requires strong and trustful relationships to be developed and maintained between researchers and communities – the ongoing act of relationship-building should be properly resourced by the RSI system.
- **Measure Māori RSI investment and activity.** This is currently not done well, but is necessary to show a clear link between research investment and positive outcomes for Māori. This is a non-negotiable requirement if Priorities are to be operationalised in ways that are equitable for Māori.

2. Te Tiriti, Mātauranga Māori and Māori Aspirations

4. (2.1) Engagement

- *How would you like to be engaged?*

- **Wide-ranging engagement** is needed across Māori public sector agencies, Iwi Chairs Forums, Māori leaders in science and in business (including sector interest groups such as FOMA), mana whenua, tohunga and Mātauranga practitioners, kaumātua and rangatahi, marae, hapū, and iwi.
- This engagement should be open, consistent and **transparent, with the kōrero being disseminated** across interested parties so people can continue to build on the ongoing whakaaro rather than reinventing the wheel.
- **A long timeframe**, potentially up to two years, may well be needed to use a process appropriate for Māori, especially as a series of wānanga would be needed to bring together Māori leaders with Māori communities to ensure everyone is participating and contributing along the journey. Hui should purposefully take place at the rohe level to strengthen the voices of iwi and hapū in this process.
- This in-depth consultation process should be **appropriately resourced** by the Crown.
- **Te Arawhiti/The Office for Māori Crown Relations** may be a valuable resource to assist with this engagement.

5. (2.2) Mātauranga Māori

- What are your thoughts on how to enable and protect mātauranga Māori in the research system?

- In response to the WAI 262 Claim and *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*, the **government has committed to protecting taonga and Mātauranga Māori**. These words must be followed up with meaningful action.
- Despite the Crown's important role, **Māori must lead the enablement and protection** of Mātauranga Māori primarily through tikanga Māori processes, but also through drawing on data sovereignty principles and setting the scene for IP protection.
- The ability to do this in practice will rely on significantly greater participation by **Māori in governance and leadership** roles; at least 50% Māori on the MBIE Science Board, and at least one Māori Chief Science Advisor. The following four points will support, and be supported by, greater representation in decision-making roles.
- MBIE must actively resource and work to **raise the status of te ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori** within its own organisation and the RSI System as a whole – acting on the recommendations here would contribute to this. Genuine revaluing of things Māori, if achieved, would feed into funding decision-making (e.g. not using Western experts to assess kaupapa Māori research) and outcomes.
- **Recruitment practices** need to change at the senior leadership level, particularly in large research organisations (Universities, CRI and the like) where applicants should be held to higher standards of understanding te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori beyond 'awareness'. Further, HR practices used within these organisations should give effect to Te Tiriti through policies aimed at prolonged commitment to professional development of all academic, general staff and student populations.
- Universities' **assessment of research should embed Māori principles and values**, and focus on Māori research that creates positive community outcomes. For example, there could be dual pathways for doctoral programmes so that research proposals can be assessed through a normal (Māori) process, which uses broader criteria related to how Māori research translates into community outcomes.
- Community researchers and scientists (e.g. tohunga) do not feel welcome to participate in the research system because their knowledge obtained outside of Universities is not given equal status. The current failure of institutions to actively foster and protect Mātauranga Māori means that qualifications gained outside of universities not generally being recognised. We are keen to see this reversed so that Aotearoa New Zealand's **indigenous knowledge base can fully contribute to solving our complex challenges**.

6. (2.3) Regionally based Māori knowledge hubs

- What are your thoughts on regionally based Māori knowledge hubs?

- In the first instance, **we support iwi (rather than regionally) based Māori knowledge hubs** as different iwi have distinct knowledge bases and different research priorities due to iwi/environmental variations and disparities.
- Hubs will require a large degree of **support in the first years** (not just funding, but including teina-tuakana) which will be expected to taper off as the hubs develop and grow. There are opportunities for hubs with specific priorities to bring like-minded individuals together who then share learnings with wider iwi/hapū.
- It would be vital that iwi and hapū in each region are **able to decide for themselves** how such a structure could work – it is not up to the Crown to impose generic terms of reference for either the structure or processes used.
- Te Ao Māori Hubs have the potential to be effective **conduits for thought leadership and research** that contribute to whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori community aspirations. Research that focuses on benefiting Māori communities is both undervalued and under-resourced currently, but iwi, hapū, whānau and Māori community organisations must be properly resourced to do their own research according to their own priorities, in their own communities.
- The Hubs would provide a **bottom-up community-driven approach** to setting RSI Priorities, and drive the agenda for a mātauranga Māori Commission. They would also work closely with Māori Chief Science Advisors across government agencies, who could connect them with Māori researchers, community-based pūkenga (experts), and policymakers.
- **Hub Directors would take on a connecting role**, working at both national level (inside a newly established Māori Research and Science Authority) AND focusing on their rohe within a tino rangatiratanga space, meaning they can generate their own strategic planning and make operational decisions on research. For example, a natural intersection/conduit is iwi using a research-led approach to inform Territorial Local Authorities priorities, especially in the development of Long Term Plans.

3. Funding

7. (3.2.1) Core functions

- How should we decide what constitutes a core function and how do we fund them?

- Our response to this question is really about creating the conditions for making good decisions:
 - First, any changes to the RSI funding system should be founded on **Tiriti-based guidelines**.
 - Second, funding agencies, and those who work within them, must have the **requisite cultural knowledge**, including a clear understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, in order to enact new guidelines effectively.

8. (3.3.2) Establishing a base grant and base grant design

- Do you think a base grant funding model will improve stability and resilience for research organisations, and how should we go about designing and implementing such a funding model?

- The SftI Kāhui note that science organisations based on Western ideals have received significant infrastructural support from the New Zealand government to date, but the same is not true for Māori knowledge generation ... **reducing this inequity will require substantial targeted investment**. Allocating half of the total research and science funding purse to support Mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori research is appropriate, and this approach has already been enacted by some NSCs. Further, funding for Māori knowledge generation should be under Māori control.
- With this in mind, we recommend that independent base funding should be put in place for an entity (or entities), such as a **Māori Research and Science Authority** already mentioned within this submission, that has the purpose of promoting and protecting Mātauranga Māori and for ensuring a Te Ao Māori view is integrated operationally within Aotearoa New Zealand's RSI system.
- In addition, **base funding should be made available to a range of organisations**, big and small, because knowledge and Mātauranga are often created outside of Western institutions and this needs to be funded properly.
- We recommend introducing '**platform grants**' that enable researchers to focus on big issues for a longer time frame than current funding allows, potentially 10-15 years, a practice in place in the EU.
- Finally, detailed and **transparent monitoring and reporting** on base fund use is appropriate, although evaluation parameters will need to be carefully determined in terms of what constitutes Māori research. For example, we need to better understand the link between research and community outcomes, and this should inform future decisions on increasing investment in Māori-led RSI.

4. Institutions

9. (4.4.1) Institution design

- How do we design collaborative, adaptive and agile research institutions that will serve current and future needs?

- Institute design should be carried out **in partnership with Māori**, and the process should reflect Te Tiriti principles. Particular areas for careful consideration include the protection of mātauranga Māori, recognition of tohunga and communities, and the acknowledgement of appropriate IP rights so that benefits will be shared.
- There needs to be **dedicated space for Māori RSI** within the wider system, and clarity around various roles and processes throughout that system, including enablement of self-determination for Māori.
- **Formal support for relationship building and collaboration** will need to be a feature of these organisations, and this new way of working will rely on support from the right leaders, who themselves are enabled to develop relationships over time (for example, through having longer tenures). Māori leaders already come from a place of whanaungatanga and will add significant value here.
- Clear thinking is needed around **career research success metrics**. We strongly recommend such metrics being more balanced to focus not solely on publication in 'leading' journals, but also towards using science and research to make positive real world impacts.

- For a newly designed type of RSI institution to enable meaningful change for Māori, it will necessarily have in place **equitable governance** at the highest level guided by a set of agreed Tiriti-led principles, and **equitable funding** across different levels of knowledge generation.

10. (4.4.2) Role of institutions in workforce development

- *How can institutions be designed to better support capability, skills and workforce development?*

- **Te Tiriti and cultural training and competency** should be a precondition of receiving any public funding across all disciplines. This may go some way to mitigating the negative impact of the double cultural shift expected of Māori researchers, which is currently widespread. Cultural training would ideally be resourced as a base cost, particularly for Rangatahi and ECRs.
- We also recommend that research organisations should be required to **partner with, and be led by, Māori entities** for research prioritised by Māori.
- Of critical importance in terms of enhancing real world benefits is training researchers to **bridge the gap between knowledge generation and impact** – this will require a broader range of skills and, as noted above, different criteria for reward/career advancement (e.g. collaboration over competition, and enhanced community relationships).
- There is a key **role for Māori Chief Science Advisors** in workforce development and Mātauranga protection within Crown agencies, as well as supporting cross-agency collaboration.
- Workforce development activities could usefully be **prioritised in the following order**:
 1. Enlarging the Māori research community (for example, through bulk hires and promotions) to address equity, diversity and inclusion
 2. Providing Māori research leader development (aligned to ASP)
 3. Developing Māori researcher capability & capacity
 4. Creating connected pathways for Māori, from Year 12 & 13 through to ECRs
 5. Providing Te Tiriti and cultural training and competency to all staff and students
 6. Developing all ECRs as needed

12. (4.5) Institution design and Te Tiriti

- *How do we design Tiriti-enabled institutions?*

- There are **several key principles** to strive for here, including: an expectation of equitable research-generated benefits for all; ensuring freedom from bias and racism; ensuring mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers share equal status with Western Science and researchers; and ensuring Māori are not harmed by research.
- Māori must occupy **co-leadership and co-governance** positions to ensure institutions can successfully navigate their Tiriti obligations.
- A fundamental roadblock to Tiriti-enabled institutions is a **lack of Māori staff** to drive tangata whenua perspectives, while the staff that are available are overworked and overcommitted. An essential element of meaningful institution redesign must address both the lack of Māori staff and high workloads.
- Institutions should **develop plans, strategies and performance evaluation criteria** regarding their ability to enact Te Tiriti-based partnerships .. and these should be evaluated by an external authoritative entity in terms of achieving goals.
- A key issue to address is **institutional racism**, which does exist in the RSI system currently. MBIE should refer to the Parata Gardiner Report (2020) for guidance on combating this now and into the future.

13. (4.6) 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?*

- We agree with the Green paper's apparent position that institutions should **move away from an ideology of 'one-way knowledge transfer' towards 'two-way knowledge exchange'** that is based on tikanga Māori values and practices. This would undoubtedly result in more meaningful impacts for stakeholders and communities. For this to happen, trustful relationships must be in place to support genuine collaboration between researchers and communities; this approach will need to be well-resourced.
- Mātauranga Māori must be acknowledged for its role in the creation of new knowledge, and **traditional knowledge holders** must have access to benefits arising from their contributions.
- A significant proportion of funding across the RSI system should be dependent on **impact generation** (which relies on collaboration with communities/end users) – this is something Māori researchers already do well because they are always thinking of their whānau, hapū and iwi. Funding should also be available for 'blue sky' research where the direct impact may not be immediately seen
- The proposed Regional (or Iwi-based) Hubs could constitute a perfect site for knowledge exchange with communities, heightening impact - **bringing in the community** will add fresh eyes to research, science and innovation.

5. Research Workforce

At a foundational level, a Tiriti-driven workforce approach will foster collective pursuits. In practice, this means: an end to lone Māori academics in universities or on research projects (isolating, especially for ECRs); enabling collaborative groups to pursue big picture, system-wide mātauranga Māori issues; and moving away from Māori researchers working in a fragmented fashion across multiple projects. This will require new cross-disciplinary organisational forms and groupings.

14. (5.2) Workforce and research Priorities

- *How should we include workforce considerations in the design of national research Priorities?*

- A useful approach might be **matching existing research skills with the Research Priorities** developed through this review process as a way of identifying where professional and cultural development investment needs to be made.
- There may need to be some consideration of not only what the national priorities are, but also the location for these, where we might typically see centres of excellence/RSI communities. Designing for a **hybrid workforce** should be the norm - this will support options for Māori researchers wanting to live and work in their tūrangawaewae.
- It will be important to **involve Rangatahi and ECRs** into the discussion to ensure decisions are future-focused and support career pathways.

15. (5.3.1) Base grant and workforce

- *What impact would a base grant have on the research workforce?*

- A base grant has the potential to make a significant difference for Māori researchers. In particular it could be deployed to create more **stable employment opportunities**, reducing the precarious, fragmented employment contracts that Māori researchers are frequently subject to. Of course, creating clear kaupapa pathways for ECRs once they are in the system requires more than money, it must be supported by leadership and the provision of cultural training and mentoring.
- Thinking creatively about career development, it may be useful to **fund career transition steps** and secondment opportunities through scholarships or fellowships to allow secure movement within the system as needed. This would have the dual benefit of assisting Māori researchers in managing their careers and inserting more Māori researchers throughout the RSI system.

- **Ongoing cultural training** such as te reo and tikanga would be an excellent use of base funding. We recommend creating a system of authentic funding and support for the professional and cultural development of staff at all stages to ensure the development of Māori to feel comfortable as Māori. Co-development of training by institutions and Māori entities and experts, which would be location- and iwi-specific would be usefully introduced.
- The funding could also be usefully applied to **support whānau, hapū, iwi** and Māori community research workforce priorities – this relies on RSI policy and practices concurrently being receptive to those priorities, for example, recognising expertise not generated through formal university qualifications, fostering collaboration with communities, and recognising community leadership.

16. (5.3.2) **Better designed funding mechanisms**

- How do we design new funding mechanisms that strongly focus on workforce outcomes?

- As already noted above, the current system allows funding proposals to include unrealistically low FTE commitments; this results in Māori being formally included in a time-only capacity, and leads to unrealistic time demands for individuals, as well as fragmentation and insecure work contracts – all of which are counterproductive for the Māori workforce. We advocate for appropriate funding for Māori researchers' research contribution and **greater workplace stability**. Changing from this status quo may require higher budgets to reflect real costs.
- Recognise and account for the significant work being undertaken by Māori researchers, which has so far remained **'invisible'** within the RSI system. This needs to be valued especially when considering promotion.
 - For example, aronga takirua, the cultural double shift. Projects commonly enlist a single Māori researcher, with an expectation they will provide a cultural lens above and beyond their formal, paid role. This work might include creating connections, being involved in unofficial roles, and making contributions to the community.
- Adjusting funding criteria to more obviously support research focusing on **community impacts** will likely attract and retain Māori researchers to stay actively engaged inside the RSI system.
- This submission has also highlighted that **community-based experts provide valuable input** for impact-making science; we call for a funding system that respects and resources this work, both through direct remuneration and providing capacity building opportunities.
- At a finer level, while **postdocs** are a valuable part of the RSI system – they are future science leaders and require skills development opportunities – existing funding mechanisms can make including them meaningfully within research proposals difficult because of overhead costs; this needs to change so that they have more opportunities for paid participation.

6. Research Infrastructure

17. (6.2.2) **Funding research infrastructure**

- How do we support sustainable, efficient and enabling investment in research infrastructure?

- A better understanding of Māori priorities will inform the answers to this question, so we return to the need to engage and partner widely with Māori. We offer two important considerations: **People** must be regarded as an aspect of the infrastructure, and **Māori data sovereignty** must be understood and supported.
- Finally, to reiterate points already discussed in this submission, we recommend a new RSI System:
 - Redresses the **historical imbalance** of significant investment (both funding and infrastructural support) funnelled into Western Science compared with minimal support provided for Māori knowledge generation; a sharp correction is in order.
 - Provides access to solid research infrastructure across a **range of organisations**, large and small, including the proposed Regional (or iwi-based) Hubs; this will require creative thinking and a partnership approach.
 - Recognises that relationship building is an enabling, **intangible aspect** of the RSI system's infrastructure, which to date has not received the investment it requires, and the same can be said for cultural upskilling; both should receive their own dedicated funding.