THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

CREATE CHANGE

2026 NRI Roadmap Issues Paper – Central UQ Submission - FINAL

1. **Should the proposed definition of NRI in the 2026 Roadmap be modified – such as by elaborating what is meant by 'nationally significant', or by other changes?**

The proposed definition of NRI in the 2026 Roadmap is broadly appropriate. However, we note further that:

- Highly skilled personnel are the single most important component of the NRI, and may be better recognised at the front of the list of components, i.e., "NRI comprises the highly-skilled personnel providing services, nationally significant assets, and facilities that together…"
- The NRI also consists of unique and/or well-curated pipelines and workflows that create important synergies from individual investments. There may be some virtue in integrating this into the definition in some way.

2. **What should be done, and over what timeframe, to ensure future NRI investments respect cultural protocols, and support self-determination and promote benefit sharing, in line with the Australian Government's Framework for Governance of Indigenous Data?**

We commend the ambition to emphasise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledge systems within the context of the NRI Roadmap. This shows that the Department has taken the wealth of Indigenous-focused research infrastructure feedback it received earlier in 2025 as an indicator of the sector's desire to focus on this important topic.

We present below, some core principles for action that we believe will enable a foundational shift in the way the 2026 Roadmap will address challenges relating to Indigenous knowledge systems and their place within our national research infrastructure.

Core principles for action:

1. Redesign core frameworks. Don't simply add Indigenous requirements; infrastructure should be built with Indigenous data sovereignty as a foundational principle, not retrofitted with Indigenous add-ons. Section 2.1.2, Section 2 hints at this ambition, but it must be made clearer within the 2026 Roadmap
2. Recognise Indigenous communities as knowledge holders and leaders - not as subjects requiring 'capacity building' or 'development'
3. Ensure that jurisdictions work together to ensure best-practice re: Indigenous research data management tool, programs, and protocols. Differentiated approaches are needed with respect to ethics and governance.
4. Accommodate Indigenous epistemologies - Infrastructure must support Indigenous understanding of Country as an active entity with agency, and relationships with land, water, and other-than-human beings
5. Evaluate protective measures - Ensure 'protections' serve Indigenous interests rather than creating barriers to Indigenous-led research.

Potential timeframe and actions:

Year 1: Establish a dedicated capability with an ability for oversight of Indigenous data governance standards. Mandate Indigenous governance at decision-making level for all relevant infrastructure. Embed CARE principles alongside FAIR as baseline requirement.

Years 2-3: Redesign infrastructure with Indigenous data sovereignty as foundational principle. Build technical systems supporting Indigenous epistemologies. Implement accountability mechanisms.

Success measure: Indigenous researchers find infrastructure naturally responsive and supportive, without constant negotiation.

We note that some of the actions relating to Indigenous Research Data Commons capability are already being undertaken under existing NCRIS investments. A brief, exemplar case study is presented below.

The Social Science Research Infrastructure Network (SSRIN; https://ardc.edu.au/project/social-science-research-infrastructure-network), a new project led by UQ, with co-investment from ARDC, ABS, Monash University, ANU and UWA, includes an Activity Stream on developing Indigenous Data Guidelines in the context of government administrative data.

Some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have had limited trust in data collections due to not experiencing any benefits, but in fact sometimes harm, from data collecting, analysing, and reporting. Additionally, researchers are lacking guidance on the appropriate use of Indigenous-identified data in administrative datasets. Collecting and using Indigenous-identified data may not demonstrate (Indigenous) social license and may undermine ethically responsible research, in turn creating uncertainties in research processes and tensions with Indigenous communities

The SSRIN is developing valid and accessible protocols for analysing and reporting Indigenous-identified data that increase the likelihood that Indigenous people and communities benefit from government administrative data research, while in turn minimising the risk of inappropriate use. This aims to contribute to a long term vision where Australia leads in ethical and inclusive data use, ensuring Indigenous peoples and communities directly benefit from how administrative data are analysed and reported.

3. **How might an appropriate balance be achieved between investment in a dedicated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Research Data Commons capability, and provision of uplift in capability across relevant discipline and theme-oriented NRI?**

Australia needs both capabilities, but each must have a clear authority structure.

Why both are necessary:

- Indigenous knowledge intersects with every research domain (environment, health, language, social systems) - requiring distributed capability
- Indigenous priorities need independent infrastructure serving their interests - requiring dedicated capability
- Siloing Indigenous research reproduces problems, and so does making it a tick-box add-on.

The dedicated capability should have:

- The knowledge and ability to set standards for Indigenous data governance across all research conducted in association with NRI projects
- Decision-making power in approving developments affecting Indigenous data
- Resource allocation authority to direct investment toward infrastructure demonstrating genuine Indigenous governance
- Independent funding not dependent on other infrastructure priorities
- Active research capability serving Indigenous priorities.

This distributed capability must mean substantial structural change:

- Infrastructure rebuilt with Indigenous data sovereignty as foundational principle (not adapted with add-ons)
- Indigenous governance at decision-making level as baseline requirement
- Default operating procedures assume Indigenous governance; exceptions require justification
- Accountability to Indigenous authority on how well infrastructure serves Indigenous interests.

The relationship:

The dedicated capability sets standards, while discipline-oriented infrastructure operates within those standards and demonstrates an accountability to Indigenous authority. This ensures Indigenous knowledge systems shape what's considered normal in research infrastructure, rather than perpetually negotiating accommodation, as referenced in response to Item 2.

The approach must also be interdisciplinary, with investment beyond humanities. We draw reference to the examples presented by the Department in Section 2.1.2 of the Issues Paper, i.e., supporting existing NRI capabilities including areas such as biodiversity, ecology, and land/water management.

Additionally, there may also be Indigenous health/medical data and social science administrative data that are in scope for consideration, which all go beyond the humanities disciplines. A central capability, with multi-disciplinary expertise would allow for core cultural capacity and oversight. This central capability would also be able to liaise with the multiple area-specific NRI/NCRIS facilities with the disciplinary diversity that they bring.

4. What are the current top 3 priorities for NRI investment for the humanities?

1. Continued investment in humanities and social sciences

Until recently, HASS disciplines were largely overlooked by NRI funding. This has now changed with the substantial NCRIS investment into the ARDC HASS & Indigenous portfolio, which is starting to provide tangible benefits and uplift across the HASS & Indigenous disciplines. It is critical to continue that investment – both in the Humanities and Arts, and the Social Sciences, to keep the momentum gained and to bridge the infrastructure and workforce capability gaps between the HASS and other disciplines. This investment could continue via ARDC, or could move towards supporting stand-alone NCRIS capabilities with a dedicated focus on HASS.

- Future investment should enable infrastructure designed for complexity and evolution, not tidiness.
    - The principle: Humanities data is inherently complex, contextual, and evolving. Infrastructure designed on assumptions that data should be 'clean', 'standardised', and 'stable' fundamentally misunderstands humanities research and constrains what questions can be asked.
    - In practice: - Storage and analytical systems that accommodate ambiguity, multiple interpretations, and changing understandings over time - Governance frameworks recognising that meaning is contextual - what's appropriate access or use depends on who, when, why, and how - Infrastructure that supports ongoing curation and re-interpretation, not just preservation of fixed datasets - Recognition that 'messiness' isn't a problem to be solved but reflects the actual nature of human cultural life
    - Examples: - Systems for managing qualitative data where context determines meaning (interview transcripts, cultural materials, historical sources) - Infrastructure supporting Indigenous data governance where access and interpretation rights depend on relationality and cultural protocols - Platforms enabling communities to continuously engage with and recontextualise cultural materials, not just access static archives

2. Facilitating connections with other disciplines, beyond HASS.

It is imperative that the Humanities and Arts engage more outside of their broad discipline, and to build connections – including interoperable infrastructure – that connects our disciplines to the 'outside world'. Otherwise, the discipline is at risk (or continuing to be at risk) of being siloed and isolated. HASS disciplines have a major role to play in multidisciplinary approaches and collaborations that are needed to tackle the big challenges facing our global community – the disruption caused by AI, the democratic crisis, the role of higher education, for example. Ensuring interconnectivity with other disciplines, including in terms of interoperable research infrastructure, is a key platform to enable that kind of multidisciplinary collaboration.

- Humanities infrastructure must also enable intersectionality and relationality
    - The principle: Complex social and cultural questions cannot be addressed with siloed data sources. Infrastructure must enable humanities research to intersect with other

disciplines while respecting different epistemologies. It must also accommodate Indigenous and other relational ways of knowing that don't separate 'environmental', 'cultural', and 'social' data.

- In practice: - Technical interoperability allowing humanities researchers to connect their data with health, environmental, administrative, and other data sources - Governance frameworks enabling ethical integration of sensitive data from multiple domains - Infrastructure supporting research about relationships - between humans, between humans and Country, between humans and other-than-human beings - Platforms where different disciplines can work together without forcing humanities data into STEM formats
- Examples: - Capability to link language data with health outcomes, educational data, environmental monitoring - Infrastructure connecting cultural heritage collections with contemporary social analysis (synthesis of preservation and observation) - Systems supporting Indigenous knowledge about Country that integrate what Western frameworks separate into environmental/cultural/social categories - Collaborative platforms enabling policy-makers to access integrated humanities and social science insights

3. Building capacity across the HASS disciplines.

Further investment in a dedicated, but interoperable outside the discipline, workforce for the HASS disciplines is a priority. As per the priority outlined above, this relates to capability for uplift across HASS researchers, but also with respect to a workforce with the requisite knowledge of modern infrastructure, technologies, and computational methods in addition to a deep understanding of HASS-specific disciplinary issues. This workforce would be able to work with HASS researchers, and also with other disciplines and, and with other research stakeholders such as industry, government, and community groups, to build cross-disciplinary linkages.

- Workforce that embraces complexity and facilitates connection
  - The principle: Infrastructure is only as good as the people who design, operate, and support it. Humanities needs workforce with deep domain expertise who understand why complexity matters and can facilitate connections across disciplines - not technicians trying to standardise everything.
  - In practice: - Specialists who understand humanities epistemologies, research methods, and ethical requirements - Bridge roles connecting humanities with other disciplines and with technical infrastructure - Skills in facilitating collaboration, navigating ambiguity, and working with culturally sensitive materials - Recognition that the most valuable innovation happens at intersections, requiring people who can work across boundaries
  - Examples: - Infrastructure specialists expert in Indigenous data governance and cultural protocols - Roles explicitly designed to translate between humanities researchers and technical systems - Professional development supporting people to work across disciplinary and cultural boundaries - Career pathways valuing connection-making AND tech expertise"

5. **What new or emerging areas of humanities research will require NRI investment in the next 3-5 years?**

Humanities research is entering an era defined by large, multi-domain data, and powerful AI tools. Over the next 3 – 5 years, this will create new and emergent needs for our NRI. Emerging humanities areas that will require targeted NRI investment potentially go outside the traditional disciplinary boundaries, and may include areas such as digital cultural analytics (e.g. large-scale analysis of literature, film, music and visual culture), computational historical geography (integrating historical maps, place-based archives and population records), language and discourse studies at scale (e.g. social-media language mapping), migration studies (linking administrative migration records and geospatial traces), and links between humanities and social and health data (e.g. combining historical/archival material with electronic health registers to study long-term social determinants of health). Each of these areas becomes feasible only when humanities data are integrated with other data, like the social-science administrative datasets, such as the Person Level Integrated Data Asset (PLIDA), electronic health registers, and contemporary internet/social-media streams.

Integration across disciplines requires interoperable data standards, rich metadata, secure linkage mechanisms, and tools that respect domain-specific sensitivities (for example, Indigenous data governance). Humanities data are diverse, covering free text, handwritten archives, audio-visual recordings, geospatial layers, and digital social media data. Such data needs to be made FAIR in ways that work with other data, including social-science administrative linkages and clinical registers. PLIDA-style infrastructure shows the value of curated, well-documented modules; NRI investment could expand that model to include metadata schemas tailored for humanities but interoperable with other disciplines, and developing pathways to multi-source data integration that preserve privacy and legal compliance.

Emerging AI capabilities can dramatically accelerate the integration, cleaning, annotation and analysis of such multi-domain data. Our NRI should invest in shared AI toolkits and compute platforms that enable reproducible pipelines for key humanities data. NRI investment that treats integrated, multi-domain data as first-class research infrastructure, coupled with responsible, transparent AI services and skills development, has the potential to unlock transformative humanities research over the course of the Roadmap's implementation.

Specific investment is needed in relation to:

1. AI ethics and epistemology

Alongside infrastructure investment, humanities capability in the critical examination of data sets, AI and algorithmic systems will require NRI investment. Specialist expertise in the ethics, epistemology and biases of research using large-scale models and linked data sets is particularly critical, as mentioned below in relation to workforce capability needs.

2. Enhancement of mature cultural data assets

Australia has established cultural data assets that serve as leverageable national infrastructure. For example AustLit, widely known and respected across the sector for research engagement, exemplifies best practice as evidenced by its sustainable business model and active research community. Investment is needed for enhancement activities including indexing, development of digital tools and technologies for query and data analysis. Building on proven models such as AustLit provides a foundation for developing other keystone humanities data assets.

3. Infrastructure for data donation and crowdsourcing

New models of data collection including data donation and crowdsourcing are essential for observing social and cultural life in real-time, but require infrastructure that makes participation accessible and trustworthy. This includes systems to collect, audit, and analyse data from digital platforms, devices, and the Internet of Things, built on networked open technology standards with public-interest governance frameworks that demonstrate clear community benefit and ethical use, encouraging participation through transparency and trust.

4. Cross-domain data integration infrastructure

Complex social and cultural questions require connecting humanities data with administrative, environmental, health, and educational data sources. Infrastructure that enables ethical integration across sectors is essential - for example, understanding wellbeing outcomes requires linking social science, cultural, health, and educational data; and climate responses require Indigenous ecological knowledge integrated with environmental monitoring and cutting edge predictive modelling methods.

6. **Should Australia focus on developing a specialist humanities research infrastructure workforce or a generalist research infrastructure workforce with humanities domain expertise and ability to bridge across disciplines?**

As we outlined earlier, there is a need for a capability uplift across the HASS researcher workforce. This must be complimented by a workforce with expert knowledge in terms of modern infrastructure, technologies, and computational methods, and with enough understanding of HASS disciplinary issues who can complement and support HASS researchers.

We present pros and cons of adopting a generalist and specialist approach, below.

Specialist humanities workforce:

- Pros: Deep domain expertise in humanities epistemologies and research methods; credibility with humanities researchers; expertise in culturally sensitive governance; may prevent infrastructure defaulting to STEM-centric assumptions.
- Cons: A risk of siloing and a potential disconnect from broader infrastructure ecosystem; may miss technical innovations from other domains; much smaller talent pool.

Generalist workforce with humanities domain expertise:

- Pros: Facilitates knowledge transfer across disciplines; better positioned to leverage technical innovations; supports interdisciplinary research; easier to achieve critical mass.
- Cons: Risk of undervaluing humanities-specific expertise; may default to STEM-centric approaches; humanities researchers may not trust them to understand complex or nuanced requirements that are extant with their disciplines.

Australia needs both, working together in a hybrid model:

- Core specialist capability in areas unique to humanities (cultural protocols, Indigenous data governance, qualitative data, archival methods, information management and custodianship)
- Potential for bridging roles that are designed to connect humanities with broader infrastructure ecosystem
- An investment in professional development, enabling specialists to develop these bridging skills, and generalists to develop the necessary domain depth

Career pathways that value boundary-spanning work:

The most valuable workforce capability combines deep domain expertise with ability to work across boundaries. Any investment should focus on creating opportunities for specialists and generalists to collaborate on complex problems; innovation happens most effectively at the intersections of disciplines.

Embedded humanities expertise across projects has been shown to work well in other schemes, such as the ARC Centres of Excellence Program, and provides an excellent model by which we can build greater societal impact.

7. What are the critical skills that the NRI workforce should have regardless of their technical expertise?

Critical skills for all NRI workforce:

- Ethics and epistemology: In addition to technical expertise, the NRI workforce needs strong skills in ethics and critical data literacy. As more research incorporate large datasets and AI-driven tools, including machine-learning models and LLMs, the workforce must be equipped to recognise and critically engage with the biases, assumptions and limitations embedded in these systems. This capability is essential not only for responsible practice, but for ensuring that research outcomes produced through data-intensive or AI-enabled methods are valid, transparent and worthy of public and scientific trust.
- Relational capability: Building trust across diverse research communities; cultural competency, particularly for Indigenous research; navigating competing priorities. Building trusted and authentic relationships across a range of sectors (beyond researchers) will also be critical, e.g. industry (from small, entrepreneurial entities to multinationals with mature R&D roadmaps), government and community sectors.
- Translation skills: Explaining technical capabilities to researchers (industry) and research needs to technical specialists; making infrastructure accessible and visible. Ability to translate research or industrial problems into technical programs that can provide solutions.
- Strategic thinking: Understanding research landscape and emerging directions; anticipating future needs rather than only serving current demands.
- Collaborative facilitation: Enabling others' success; working across institutional and disciplinary boundaries and working more seamlessly across NCRIS projects.
- Adaptability: The NRI workforce needs to keep pace with the rapidly changing environment in which they operate and be up-skilling or re-skilling to meet these demands. This adaptability applies to both technical and non-technical skills and includes an ability to move projects through differing research or translational pathways, with requisite specialist skillsets in IP, commercialisation, and market impact

Noting that *highly-skilled personnel* are a cornerstone of NRI (see Q1) and that their technical abilities are often unique and difficult to replace on a time scale that matches the needs of the community. These foundational skills, however, enable technical expertise to be deployed more effectively in service of the broader organisational research endeavour.

8. **What is the best approach to retain staff and add to new capabilities to the current NRI workforce?**

Ultimately, the NRI projects need to be seen as attractive environments in which to begin, develop, and sustain a rewarding career. Specific elements include:

- Recognition and Respect: Valuing and communicating the impact that the NRI workforce contributes to research or translational outcomes and global and economic success. Actively supporting and funding activities that allow the NRI workforce to participate in and disseminate information at national and international meetings, workshops, and other fora would enhance this aspect.
- Career Pathways and Growth: Creating an environment that provides both the pathways and opportunities for professional development to continually grow meaningful careers within the NRI ecosystem within Australia (and globally). More commonality of workforce frameworks across NRI environments will be crucial to allow cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral mobility at scale.
- Cornerstone Technologies that Drive Innovation: Enhancing the engagement of the NRI workforce with the leading industry capabilities they support, and ensuring the environments in which they operate are aligned to industry standards, would enhance career satisfaction and mobility between sectors.
- Sustainability: Ideally, funding and budgets would allow for greater job security of NRI staff (particularly within the cyclically funded NCRIS facilities). However, if this cannot be achieved, then an effort to ensure more timely securing of cyclic funds, and subsequent communication with the workforce, are essential.
- Future Workforce: Given the highly specific technical skills required within the NRI workforce, the facilities themselves have an important role in training future generations of skilled research workers for Australia. Consideration should be given to funding the establishment of ECR fellowships, apprenticeships, and internships that occur in partnership with research organisations and tertiary education providers.

9. How can NRI facilities ensure their capabilities are made widely known and available to potential users in relevant industry sectors across Australia's cities and regions?

- Digital Tools: Support for tools that make searching for RI nationally simpler and more efficient. Include AI tools and functionality that allow non-experts to connect appropriate RI with known research or industry problems.
- Cross-Facility Access Models: Simplified cross-institutional access models that allow industry a single point of contact for: project design and management, provision of the deliverables, and financial transactions. Domain champions that can engage, communicate, and effectively manage projects across areas with partners should also be built into these models (see expertise section, below, also).
- Expertise: NRI experts that span multiple disciplines and that build trusted relationships/partnerships with industry to ensure both greater understanding of capability available (in language understood by industry), and surety in the delivery of meaningful outcomes.
- Communicate: Ensure there is a unified communication plan that speaks to the impact of NRI, particularly in terms of the economy, employment, health, and other societal outcomes. Promote the benefits of highly impactful NRI partnerships with research, government, and the community to enhance future engagement.

10. How can NRI facilities build the know-how and support that will lead to an increase in productive research-industry collaborations?

- Foster meaningful and long term partnerships -> build trust and demonstrate excellence
- Highlight quality and assurance -> ISO, GMP, GLP; demonstrate reliability in service and partnerships
- Flexibility to meet demanding environments and the dynamic research ecosystem -> Be open to different modes of operation; through workforce stability, ensure rapid transition within and between project goals for partners
- NCRIS Translational Round of funding should underpin major initiatives -> increase the funding quota to these initiatives that demonstrate long term partnerships and economic uplift
- Develop strategies to better correlate with other government funding bodies, including MRFF, AEA, ARC, NHMRC, etc. Leveraged contributions will lead to stronger linkages and partnerships
- Leverage existing strong collaborations and partnerships to highlight what NRI can achieve using the established frameworks -> exemplify impact to attract new partnerships

11. To improve research translation capability, can you identify and briefly describe needed enhancements of existing NRIs, and/or new NRI?

The existing fabrication and measurement NRIs (for example, ANFF, MicroAu, NIF) have enabled access to world class tools and instruments, strongly supporting rapid prototyping and the development of advanced devices. These facilities should continue to be well-supported as a national priority, especially with regards to maintaining staff, organisational knowledge, and expertise in the projects.

However, we highlight that enhanced translational research support requires flexible pilot-scale facilities. We suggest that the NRI work closely with state and local governments to support ecosystem development for manufacturing advanced devices at scale. This complementary infrastructure to the existing ANFF, MicroAu, and NIF will permit rapid prototyping and standards testing. This capability is crucial for deep-tech translation across the rapidly advancing quantum, bio, and medtech fields.

Additionally, the Department might consider opportunities to:

- As exemplified above, leverage other government and private schemes to align funding into areas to achieve critical mass; e.g. ACRF co-funded capabilities with NIF
- Build relevant accreditation into NCRIS facilities, and support facilities to adopt these capabilities (GMP, for example)
- Put translation at the centre of major funding priorities
- Promote opportunities for industry buy-in to schemes, offering opportunities to co-contribute into areas of strategic importance to particular sectors. This may also allow NRI facilities to become part of the national voice with respect to their integration into our sovereign objectives.

12. How should research translation be planned for in the development of new NRI?

- Workforce: Ensure that staff are sufficiently trained to engage with all partners of NCRIS projects. Consider opportunities to build in dedicated industry-facing staff for those facilities that are more translationally-focussed
- National and International alignment with other government and private schemes; NCRIS should be a partner on MRFF-NCRI and ARC grants, for example. Better leverage NCRIS projects to support industry schemes such as AEA and Trailblazer; philanthropy and charitable foundations
- Promote cross-cutting initiatives that highlight Australia's pipelines, most of which require contributions from multiple different projects within the NCRIS scheme. For example, biotherapeutics translation builds across fundamental discovery, manufacture, GMP, imaging, and Phase 1 trials that can be achieved totally using NCRIS capabilities in Brisbane.

13. Review the full set of available suggestions for potential new or enhanced capabilities from the published Survey responses (Question 35) and identify up to 3 that you regard as most important to consider for inclusion in the 2026 NRI Roadmap. Please provide a brief rationale for your view and include the response number(s) for your selection.

UQ supports a comprehensive range of research activities; however, we wish to highlight one area that was also referenced in the 'New Capabilities' section of the earlier UQ submission to the NCRIS roadmap. This relates to the MATRIX research facility case study that was presented there and a number of submissions from national groups as well as individuals in the current process; for example, Submissions #096, #100, #101, #164, and #165.

NCRIS has an admirable history of reacting to the needs of the research community in order to ensure infrastructure suitable to a wide range of disciplines is in scope. However, the specific research infrastructure of a national residential mathematics research institute has up until now been out of scope. Such institutes are key components of national research strategies for a number of leading OECD countries.

As a residential mathematics research facility, MATRIX fosters world-class mathematics research and collaboration, significantly impacting national priorities such as *'Building a Secure and Resilient Nation'*, and would provide the ideal starting point for such infrastructure. MATRIX serves as a facilitator and incubator for emerging fields, including AI, cybersecurity, forecasting (weather, finance, epidemics, natural disasters), optimisation, space research, and quantum research.

Without reliable long-term investment led by the Federal Government, Australia risks falling behind other countries with established and growing investments in mathematics research infrastructure of a similar structure, such as the United States, China, the UK, Germany, Canada, and Japan.

14. **If you wish to propose an additional priority suggestion for a new or enhanced capability, that was not in the Survey responses, please name it here, and briefly describe the need, the capability, the medium-term goals, impacted research communities, and the timeframe over which its establishment should occur.**

Nil response.

15. Anything else you would like to add?

Further to our response to Item 13, UQ is also supportive of a broad, considered, and comprehensive uplift against a range of research infrastructure capabilities.

Across all disciplines and fields, UQ is one of the nation's top research-intensive universities. The University sees enormous opportunity to connect the strengths and leadership of our multidisciplinary excellence to deliver mission-driven research that is aligned with government, industry, and social and community priorities. And contributing to the development of the 2026 National Research Infrastructure Roadmap is a key enabler of this core mission.

UQ manages 70 world-class research facilities and services, 13 internal collaborative research platforms, 22 capabilities across 17 NCRIS facilities, and over $300 million in research infrastructure. It is this access to highly skilled and experienced staff, advanced equipment, and expertly-crated facilities and systems available through our multi-million dollar research infrastructure portfolio that allows our researchers to consistently deliver some of the nation's most transformative, impactful and groundbreaking research outcomes.