

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Question 1: Do the 2011-2016 strategic priorities remain robust and relevant for the period 2016-2021?

Yes, the priorities appear to be robust and relevant.
With respect to the Vision, it seems curious that a Research Strategy focussing on Rural Affairs and Environment has a Vision that omits any reference to the environment, only mentioning people and the economy.

Question 2: Do these 'enabling principles' set the right context or should additional principles be adopted?

They appear to set the right context.

Question 3: Are the high level outcomes sufficiently clear, if not, what changes would you propose?

Under Health & Well-being, 'resilient communities' should explicitly include adaptation to climate change, and modal shift through more active travel should be separated out as a specific outcome.
Under Productive & Viable Land Use, main outcomes should include significantly reduced emissions and amelioration of climate change impacts through appropriate land use is maximised.

Question 4: Are the three broad themes identified an appropriate way of structuring our work? If not, what alternatives should be considered?

Despite laudable endeavours to integrate systems thinking, the reality of day to day activity will pull strongly towards silo working. This means that integration across themes and areas of activity needs to be built into the structure from the outset, rather than grouping natural cohorts together. The 2011-16 structure appeared to better integrate different disciplines than the new one proposed. Separating Land-use/food & drink/agriculture from Ecosystem services/climate change/flood risk & water management is of particular concern. Significant contributions to climate change and means of adapting to the impacts are so strongly inter-linked with land use, agriculture and associated production methods that there should be better mixing of the policy outcomes contributing to each of the 3 broad themes in order to ensure greater collaboration and inter-disciplinary work takes place, as intended.

Question 5: How can the SG maximise the benefits of on-going investment in the MRPs to build and benefit from connectivity with the wider science base?

Sponsor an exchange/secondment system of professionals between organisations

Question 6: What are your views of the performance and operation of the CoEs to date, are there any additional areas that would benefit from such support?

No comment

Question 7: Do you agree with the SG's proposal to end support for SPs and to explore alternative mechanisms to strengthen engagement between its investment in research and the business sectors it aims to support?

No comment

Question 8: Do you have any proposals for how the research portfolio can better link to the business community to deliver the desired outcome?

No comment

Question 9: Is the purpose and value of underpinning capacity sufficiently clear, if not how can it be improved?

No comment

Question 10: Do you have any views regarding the performance and use of the Contract Research Fund including how it could be improved?

No comment

Question 11: Could the overall delivery model be further simplified in a way which still enables SG to meet its strategic priorities for the portfolio, if so how?

No comment

Question 12: Do you have specific suggestions as to how the RESAS research strategy can contribute to the delivery of the objectives of the CAMERAS partnership?

No comment

Question 13: Do you have any suggestions for developing the partnership with other research funders?

No comment

Question 14: Do you have any particular suggestions as to how greater engagement with the HEI sector might be achieved?

As with the answer to Q5 above, establish an exchange/secondment system of professionals between organisations

Question 15: Are the research outputs from the RESAS portfolio of research readily accessible or can this be further improved, if so how?

No comment

Question 16: Is the current performance management approach fit for purpose or can it be improved, if so how?

No comment