

Please note: the substantive content of the 2026 NRI Roadmap Survey begins at Question 20 (with prior questions dealing with administrative and other information).

As such all submissions that are published include the responses submitted from Question 20 onwards only.

Q20.

Part 2: Research themes

2.1 NRI comprises the assets, facilities and associated expertise to support leading-edge research and innovation in Australia and is accessible to publicly and privately funded users across Australia and internationally. We are seeking your input on possible directions for future national-level investment - i.e., where the requirements are of such scale and importance that national-level collaboration and coordination are essential.

The [2021 Roadmap](#) used a challenge framework to support NRI planning and investment. With this in mind, consider likely future research trends in the next 5 - 10 years, and with respect to one or more of the 8 challenge areas identified in the 2021 Roadmap as listed below:

- describe emerging research directions and the associated critical research infrastructure requirements that are either not currently available at all, or not at sufficient scale and
- describe current national infrastructure requirements that you anticipate will no longer fit the definition of NRI in 5-10 years.

Do not limit your commentary to NCRIS funded capabilities.

Q21.

Resources Technology and Critical Minerals Processing

Q22.

Food and Beverage

Q23.
Medical Products

More investment in scaling up and streamlining data workflows off instruments with a focus on building the Research Software Engineering capability around Australia.

Q24.
Defence

Q25.
Recycling and Clean Energy

Q26.
Space

Q27.
Environment and Climate

Q28.
Frontier Technologies and Modern Manufacturing

Q29.

2.2 The 2024 statement of National Science and Research Priorities (NSRPs) includes outcomes linked to each priority to assist in identifying critical research needed in the next 5 to 10 years.

Consider the priority statements and, with respect to one or more of the 5 priority areas as listed below:

- describe emerging research directions and the associated critical research infrastructure requirements that are either not currently available at all, or
- not at sufficient scale and describe current national infrastructure requirements that you anticipate will no longer fit the definition of NRI in 5-10 years.

Do not limit your commentary to NCRIS funded capabilities, and where relevant, refer to the underpinning outcomes and research identified in the NSRPs document.

Q30.

Transitioning to a net zero future

Q31.

Supporting healthy and thriving communities

As secretary of the Research Software Engineer Australia New Zealand Association, I think the RSE community is one that is slowly gaining traction here and around the world. It would be good to raise more awareness and recognise that this is part of the TCR (Total Cost of Research). Examples is the 4.8 million pound funding recently awarded to the Software Sustainability Institute in the UK.

Q32.

Elevating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders knowledge systems

Q33.

Protecting and restoring Australia's environment

Q34.

Q35.

2.3 The case for a new NRI capability, or enhancements to existing capabilities, typically emerges through advocacy from research communities clustering around rigorously identified needs and goals. Such a concept could respond to a requirement for novel or expanded capacity within a domain, or across domains, and must be such that it could only be made available with national-level investment.

If you have identified such a requirement, briefly describe the need, the proposed infrastructure capability, the medium-term goals, impacted research communities, and the timeframe over which you advocate its establishment. Your response can include links to relevant existing reports.

We have the ARDC that is more focused on Data and Research Infrastructure, yet we don't have a Research Software NRI capability that stands on its own to help others. ACCESS-NRI also has this software focus, but only in the one domain. We need something cross domain. This would be a people capability, similar to ARDC, with the medium-term goals of raising capability across NCRIS, universities, and research institutes, many who are reinventing the wheel inhouse. A good example is the duplication of technical architectures within the MRFF. Many projects get funded to "share" their "reusable" technical architectures yet many of these architectures are not flexible enough to handle different use cases as they are not looking across projects. I would advocate an establishment of a capability over the next 2 years with a small group that could then grow based on demand. ARDC has provided some reports on this: 1. <https://ardc.edu.au/article/research-software-a-first-class-research-output/> 2. <https://ardc.edu.au/article/nurturing-research-software-capability-in-australia/> 3. <https://ardc.edu.au/article/6000-people-develop-and-maintain-research-software/>

Q36.

Part 3: Industry perspectives

This section is seeking input specifically from industry-based respondents. Other respondents can skip this section.

Recommendation 6 of the [2021 Roadmap](#) related to improvements in industry engagement with NRI. To complement work on this topic that has occurred since then, we are seeking additional advice on NRI requirements as perceived by current or potential industry-based users.

Q37.

3.1 Have you (or your organisation) interacted with or used Australia's NRI?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q38.

3.2 If so, please briefly outline the NRI capabilities you (or your organisation) have interacted with or used. Do not limit your response to NCRIS capabilities.

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q39.

3.3 Please indicate your (one or more) primary reasons for interacting with NRI:

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

Q40.

3.4 If you answered no, please indicate your (one or more) primary reasons:

- ☐ I did not know about it
- ☐ Other facilities suit my needs better
- ☐ I would like to, but cannot get access due to geographical location
- ☐ I would like to, but believed that access was only available to academic researchers
- ☐ I am not aware of any capability that meets my needs
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Q41.

Part 4: Other comments

4.1 Please elaborate on any of your above responses or add any other comments relevant to the development of the 2026 Roadmap. Your response can include reference or links to existing reports that you recommend be considered during the 2026 Roadmap development process.

Q49.

4.2 Optional Document Attachment.

Note: Our strong preference is that answers are provided against the relevant questions in the survey. However, this file upload option is available for submissions in file format, where needed. Please ensure the document includes your name or organisation.