

Survey response for New Zealand

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for New Zealand to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <https://stip.oecd.org/resgov>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;

Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CRIs	Crown Research Institutes
CSA	Chief Science Advisor
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HRC	Health Research Council
MBIE	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
NSSI	National Statement of Science Investment
PBRF	Performance Based Research Fund
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
RSNZ	Royal Society of New Zealand

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).</p> <p><i>(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)</i></p> <p>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Response B4.</p>	<p>a - b) Missing answer.</p> <p>c) The main body for research and innovation policy making is MBIE, notably the Science, Skills and Innovation Group at the MBIE. The Science, Skills and Innovation Group decides on policy guidelines on education and the science and innovation system. Its mandate includes: -Advising the government on New Zealand's science and innovation system and relevant policy issues; -Overseeing science and innovation investment; -Supporting research infrastructure investment; -and enhancing productivity (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B4).</p> <p>d) No major reforms made.</p>

<p>Q.1.2. Who allocates institutional block funding to a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)</i></p> <p>c) Who allocates project-based funding of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs? <i>(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)</i></p> <p>d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?</p> <p>e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?</p> <p>f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?</p>	<p>a and b) The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) allocates institutional funding (i.e. block grants) to HEIs and PRIs.</p> <p>c) MBIE is also responsible for the allocation of competitive grants for research and innovation at HEIs and PRIs (see response to question 1.5. for further details).</p> <p>Some funds are dispersed and managed on the behalf of the MBIE by the Royal Society of New Zealand (RSNZ) and the Health Research Council (HRC). The Royal Society of New Zealand (RSNZ), for instance, manages the Marsden Fund for research excellence. The Health Research Council (HRC) manages research funding for health research; it is also responsible for maintaining an ethical and safe health research environment (MBIE, 2017).</p> <p>d and e) There are no transnational bodies that provide funding to HEIs and PRIs in New Zealand.</p> <p>f) No major reforms made.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Response B4. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2017). Strategic Science Investment Fund [Webpage]. Retrieved from http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/science-innovation/innovative-new-zealand/budget-2016-funding/details, accessed 03.06.2017.</p>	
<p>Q.1.3. Do performance contracts determine funding of a) HEIs? <i>Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)</i></p> <p>b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?</p> <p>c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?</p> <p>d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?</p> <p>e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?</p> <p>f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?</p> <p>g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?</p> <p>h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs? <i>(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)</i></p>	<p>a and b) Performance contracts are in place for both HEIs and PRIs, i.e. the Crown Research Institutes (CRIs).</p> <p>c) Performance contracts or reviews contain quantitative indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of university performance and of the performance of the CRIs.</p> <p>Regarding HEIs, the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) distributes university funding according to their performance as agreed between the MBIE and the institutions. PBRF were introduced gradually between 2004 and 2007. The main criteria used include quality of research (determines 60% of funding), number of degrees completed (25%), and external research income (15%) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses C5 and B12_d).</p> <p>The Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) constitute the main PRIs in New Zealand. Their core funding model is currently reformed with view to including performance indicators (e.g. Performance Management Framework) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C5).</p> <p>d) The main criteria used include quality of research (determines 60% of funding), number of degrees completed (25%), and external research income (15%).</p> <p>e – g) Missing answer.</p> <p>h) No major reforms made except performance-based funding.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Responses C5 and B12.</p>	

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

a and d) Missing answer

b, c e and f) Evaluation and monitoring of HEIs' and PRI's performance is carried out by the Tertiary Education Commission.

h) Regarding criteria used for PRIs' evaluation, the government of New Zealand established a taskforce group to review the Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) in 2009. In 2010, the CRI Taskforce Report was released that contained recommendations on evaluations. Based on its recommendations annual monitoring and evaluation of performance were introduced in 2011. Criteria of performance include research collaboration, knowledge transfer and industry impact (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses C4 and B12).

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Responses C4 and B12.

Tertiary Education Commission (2017), Monitoring performance and reporting, webpage, Available at: <http://www.tec.govt.nz/about-us/how-we-work/monitoring-performance/> (accessed 10 March 2017).

Q.1.5. Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

In 2011, the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology and the main funding agency, the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology, were merged into the Ministry of Science and Innovation. In 2012, the Ministry of Science and Innovation was merged with the Department of Labour, the Department of Building and Housing, and the Ministry of Economic Development to into the new Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE).

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Response B4.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? <p>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Response B4. Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor (2017) [Webpage], Retrieved from: http://www.pmcsa.org.nz/, accessed 03.08.2017.</p>	<p>a and b) There is no research and innovation council or committee in place.</p> <p>c) There are no other research or innovation councils in place in New Zealand. Some Ministries receive advice by Ministerial Advisory Committees that function as independent and non-temporary advisory bodies. The Chief Science Advisor (CSA) is the Ministerial Advisor of the MBIE. The CSA gives independent policy advice on STI to the Prime Minister and the government (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B4).</p> <p>The CSA's mandate is strictly limited to advisory tasks. This includes the provision of policy advice and advisory on strategic possibilities and threads but no tasks such as decision-making on budgetary allocations, policy coordination or preparation of strategic priorities. The current CSA is Professor Peter Gluckman, former director of the Luggins Institute of the University of Auckland (Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, 2017).</p>
<p>Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?</p>	<p>a – e) There is no research and innovation council or committee in place.</p>
<p>Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts</p>	<p>a – j) There is no research and innovation council or committee in place.</p>
<p>Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) staff and/or its own b) budget? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?</p>	<p>a – c) There is no research and innovation council or committee in place.</p>

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan?</p> <p>b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p>	<p>a and b) The National Statement of Science Investment 2015-2025 (NSSI) is the main national STI strategy. The NSSI was introduced by the MBIE in 2015 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses B1).</p>
<p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for New Zealand. Response B1.</p>	
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?</p> <p>a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; “green innovation”; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.) – Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0) – Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change) – Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science) – Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility) – Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development) <p>b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agriculture and agricultural technologies – Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies) – Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies) – ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy) – Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems) <p>c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)</p> <p>d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)</p> <p>e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)</p> <p>f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?</p>	<p>a and b) The NSSI addresses the themes health, environment and energy; it also defines sectors and disciplines of strategic interest to New Zealand (no order of preference): The health sector, manufacturing, ICT, environment, energy, and biotechnology.</p> <p>c and d) The NSSI does not address specific regions or transnational objectives.</p> <p>e) Quantitative targets include an increase of business expenditure on R&D to 1% as a share of GDP by 2018, and to increase gross expenditures on R&D to 2% as a share of GDP by 2021.</p> <p>f) There were no major changes made to the national STI strategy.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> Ministry of Business, innovation and Employment (2015): National Statement of Science Investment 2015-2025, Available at: http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/science-innovation/pdf-library/NSSI%20Final%20Document%202015.pdf (accessed 10 March 2017).</p>	
<p>Q.2.7. What reforms to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.8. Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?</p> <p><i>(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)</i></p>	Missing answer.
<p>Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the mandate of agencies?</p> <p>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?</p>	<p>a) Missing answer.</p> <p>b) No major reforms made.</p>
<p>Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?</p>	No major reforms made.

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? <i>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private Sector - Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) - HEIs/PRIIs and/or their associations <p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? <i>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private Sector - Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) <p><i>References:</i> University of Auckland (2017), Council, webpage, Available at: https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/about/the-university/how-university-works/uoac-committees/council-committees.html (accessed 09 March 2017).</p>	<p>a) There is no research and innovation council or committee in place.</p> <p>b) University Councils include external stakeholders from the private sector, civil society and foreign experts. The Council of the University of Auckland, for instance, includes representatives from elected staff, students, graduates and external members from civil society, industry; they can be foreign experts as well.</p>
<p>Q.3.2. a) Are there online consultation platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?</p>	<p>a and b) Missing answer.</p> <p>c) No major reforms made.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	No major reforms made.

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.4. Who decides about allocations of institutional block funding for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)</i></p>	a and b) Missing answer.
<p>Q.3.5. Who decides about recruitment of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)</i></p>	a to f) Missing answer.
<p>Who decides about salaries of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)</i></p>	
<p>Who decides about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)</i></p>	

Q.3.6. Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? a to d) Missing answer.

(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. **spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? a to c) Missing answer.

- HEI
- Research unit / laboratory within HEI
- Researchers

c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?

Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research? Missing answer.