

## Committed and *Aspirational* Indicators

**Committed indicators = regular bold black**

**Common committed across all challenges = regular bold grey**

***Aspirational indicators = italic bold khaki***

<b>1. Delivery of Challenge Objectives</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>19/20</b>	<b>21/22</b>	<b>23/24</b>
<b>To what extent has progress been made towards achievement of the Challenge objective?</b>					
<b>1.1. Estimate aggregated value of challenge funding envelope and aligned research</b> <b>Target:</b> Aggregated value of Challenge funding, envelope and aligned research increases annually.	<b>\$12m</b>	<b>\$50m</b>	<b>\$100m</b>	<b>\$192m</b>	<b>\$264m</b>
<b>1.2. Percent of critical steps completed on time to specification</b> <b>Target:</b> A typical Project is expected to have 1–2 critical steps each year, together with non-science critical steps (e.g. outreach) these will form a map of around 30 critical steps evidencing progress at the Challenge level.	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
	<b>70%</b> <i>90%</i>	<b>70%</b> <i>90%</i>	<b>70%</b> <i>90%</i>	<b>70%</b> <i>90%</i>	<b>70%</b> <i>90%</i>
<b>1.3. <i>Public perceptions of biodiversity state and trend moves closer to reality</i></b> <b>Target:</b> <i>Lincoln University's Public Perceptions of NZ's Environment longitudinal survey: for categories where public perceptions of state and trend are more favourable than actual (i.e. Native land and freshwater plants and animals; Native bush and forests; Wetlands; Soils), there is a declining trend in the mean of the 5-point scale response (taking into account statistical significance)</i>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
	<i>Baseline set</i>	<i>↑ trend</i>	<i>↑ trend</i>	<i>↑ trend</i>	<i>↑ trend</i>
<b>1.4. <i>Stakeholders recognise the value of Challenge research and are adopting outputs in order to protect and manage biodiversity, improve our biosecurity and enhance our resilience in order to achieve their own outcomes.</i></b> <b>Target:</b> <i>June 2016: 60% of target agencies and NGOs, 40% of Māori groups, and 50% of industry groups have identified Challenge-wide Intermediate Outcomes that transcend their sectors.</i> <i>Target: by 2019, adoption of Challenge outputs by 80-90% of target agencies, 50–70% of Māori groups, and 60–80% of industry groups have resulted in accelerated delivery of their desired Intermediate Outcomes.</i> <i>Agencies: MPI, DOC, MfE, regional councils, QEII Trust, Predator Free New Zealand, EPA</i> <i>Industry: Kiwifruit Vine Health, Pipfruit NZ, NZ Wine, Dairy NZ, Fonterra, OSPRI, Beef + Lamb NZ, Forest Owners</i> <i>Māori: Ngāi Tahu, Tūhoe Tuawhenua Trust, Otaki Māori Community, Waikato–Tainui, Tai Tokerau</i>					
	<i>60% agencies; 40% Māori; 50% industry</i>		<i>80–90% agencies; 50– 70% Māori; 60–80% industry</i>		
<b>1.5. <i>Trends in five high-priority 'flagship' indicators (identified jointly by each of DOC, MfE, MPI/industry groups, and Māori) have been improved and/or reversed by 2025, resulting in increased environmental resilience, decreased threat to our biological heritage, and clear line-of-sight to the four pillars of wellbeing.</i></b> <b>Target:</b> <i>Baseline indicators to be chosen from current suite of indicators used by key agencies including MfE (e.g. Environment Aotearoa), MPI (e.g. Biosecurity 2025), DOC (Biodiversity Monitoring &amp; Reporting system), etc. Targets to be identified by 30 June 2016 and built into revised Performance Framework for the Challenge.</i>					
	<i>Targets identified</i>				

<b>2. Science Quality</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
<b>To what extent is the Challenge achieving appropriate and world-leading, ground-breaking science?</b>					
<b>2.1. Mean citation score for journals in which the Challenge has published</b>					
<b>Target:</b> No target proposed as there is no logical way of defining what looks good for this measure. Consider idea of target again at later date. The list of outputs will be provided to MBIE. Compulsory bibliometric analysis undertaken by MBIE.	List	List	List	List	List
<b>2.2. Field-weighted citation index of Challenge publications</b>					
<b>Target:</b> No target proposed as there is no logical way of defining what looks good for this measure. Consider idea of target again at later date. The list of outputs will be provided to MBIE. Compulsory bibliometric analysis undertaken by MBIE.	List	List	List	List	List

<b>3. Best Research Team Collaboration</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
<b>To what extent is New Zealand's best research team working on delivering the Challenge objectives?</b>					
<b>3.1 % of publications by collaboration type (NZ institutions, international) on a 12-month rolling average</b>					
<b>Target:</b> >80% with co-authors from more than one NZ-based research organisation >60% with co-authors from more than two NZ-based research organisation >15% with international co-authors	Meet target	Meet target	Meet target	Meet target	Meet target
<b>3.2 Effectiveness of research team, e.g. science leadership, skill mix. Biennial survey conducted by MBIE.</b>					
<b>Target:</b> To be developed following establishment of baseline data. Note that statistical significance must be taken into account.	To be developed				

<b>4. Stakeholder Engagement</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
<b>To what extent is the Challenge engaging with stakeholders and to what extent are stakeholders using the Challenge research results?</b>					
<b>4.1 Satisfaction among stakeholders with research priority setting (biennial survey conducted by MBIE)</b>					
<b>Target:</b> Stakeholder satisfaction equals or exceeds (taking into account statistical significance) the level of satisfaction in the 2016 baseline survey	Baseline set		Equal or exceeds baseline		Equal or exceeds baseline
<b>4.2 Satisfaction among stakeholders with knowledge exchange and technology development (biennial survey conducted by MBIE)</b>					

<b>Target:</b> Stakeholder satisfaction equals or exceeds (taking into account statistical significance) the level of satisfaction in the 2016 baseline survey	Baseline set		Equal or exceeds baseline		Equal or exceeds baseline
--	--------------	--	---------------------------	--	---------------------------

<b>5. Māori involvement and mātauranga</b>	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
<b>To what extent is Māori and mātauranga māori engaged to achieve the Challenge objective? To what extent is the challenge addressing the needs and aspiration of Māori?</b>					
<b>5.1 Number of researchers who identify as being Māori</b>					
<b>Target:</b> N/A (list)	List	List	List	List	List
<b>5.2 \$ value of research and related activities that (1) specifically target Māori needs and aspirations and (2) employ mātauranga Māori</b>					
<b>Target:</b> By Year 5, 80% of envelope-funded projects will have an MBIE Vision Mātauranga classification of 3, 4, or 5			80%		
<b>5.3 Satisfaction among Māori stakeholders with their influence on, engagement with, and value received from the Challenge (biennial survey conducted by MBIE)</b>					
<b>Target:</b> Māori stakeholder satisfaction equals or exceeds (taking into account statistical significance) the level of satisfaction in the 2016 baseline survey	Baseline set		Equal or exceeds baseline		Equal or exceeds baseline
<b>5.4 Co-publication with iwi</b>					
<b>Target:</b> By Year 5, 25% of Challenge publications will have iwi practitioners as co-authors					25% in Publications
<b>5.5 All projects within Challenge envelope are able to demonstrate early engagement and input into project development, design, and implementation. For each project where permission is required, appropriate tangata whenua are consulted before research proceeds</b>					
<b>Target:</b> 100% once standards are set		100%			
<b>5.6 Where agreed within Challenge envelope, there is evidence of collaboration with relevant Māori about how projects, research results, and tools are appropriately presented to tangata whenua (e.g. location, mode of communication, audience, and timing) Feedback from tangata whenua is positive and changes/suggestions are being implemented.</b>					
<b>Target:</b> 100% of participants understand the research, its objectives, its findings, and how it can benefit them Can't set targets until survey design is known (e.g. scales used), but the long-term aspirational target will be in around 80%)	100% understanding				80% positive feedback

<b>6. Effective Governance</b>	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
--------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

<b>To what extent do the right governance and management arrangements exist and work strategically and effectively?</b>					
<b>6.1 Qualitative assessment of governance processes</b>					
<b>Target:</b> Satisfactory or better in all dimensions assessed	Review	Review	Review	Review	Review

<b>7. Public Participation</b>					
<b>To what extent is there effective engagement between the Challenge and the public?</b>					
<b>7.1 Index of public attitudinal and behavioural engagement in science (regular, possibly triennial, survey conducted by MBIE)</b>					
<b>Target:</b> To be developed following establishment of survey methodology and baseline data. Note that statistical significance must be taken into account.	MBIE still designing				
<b>7.2 Public participation in environmental activities increases (evidencing public engagement in the aspirations of the Challenge)</b>					
<b>Target:</b> Lincoln University's Public Perceptions of NZ's Environment longitudinal survey: increase in the average regular participation rate in environmental activities, considering statistical significance	Baseline set	↑ trend	↑ trend	↑ trend	↑ trend