CFI Update

2017 CARA regional meetings
Agenda

New & improved
- Policy updates
- Program improvements

Learning from ...
- The 2017 Innovation Fund review
- Institutions
- Multi-institutional project working group

Looking to the future
- After the Naylor Report
Policy & Programs Guide

- Minor updates
- Streamlined
- Improved clarity
- Reflect addition of CAMS tools
- Leverage dynamic CFI web content
- Expand content on O&M support
- Clarify expectations for acknowledgement of CFI support

Version
November 2017
### Fund Improvements

**John R. Evans Leaders Fund**

#### Guidelines
- Compute Canada condition
- Eligibility of workhorse-type equipment

#### Proposal forms
- Streamlined
- Attraction vs. Retention

#### Merit review
- Assessment scale
- SRPs

#### Allocations
- Available in CAMS
**Benefits:**
- Raise the profile of your facility
- Attract research talent
- Attract potential project partners

> 550 profiles

Observations from the 2017 Innovation Fund
Funding & success by project size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Size</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= $800k</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$801k to $2M</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M to $3.5M</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.5M to $5M</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5M to $7.5M</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.5M and above</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding rate: 
Success rate:
Collaborations across Canada

Funding by administrative institution

- East: $87,692,596 (21%)
- West: $188,819,740 (44%)
- Ontario: $126,298,926 (30%)

Funding by administrative & collaborative institution

- East: $20,850,446 (5%)
- West: $96,602,923 (23%)
- Ontario: $147,594,579 (35%)
- Québec: $154,053,655 (36%)

East

West

Ontario

Québec
Distribution of Expert Committee ratings

The graph shows the distribution of ratings for different areas: ICTR, Research, Team, Infrastructure, Sustainability, and Benefits. The x-axis represents different areas: NS, PS, SW, SA, and EX. The y-axis represents the number of proposals, ranging from 0 to 200. Each area has a distinct line color and marker style, indicating the distribution of ratings for each area.
Learning from the 2017 Innovation Fund

Weakness identified by expert committees

- Not well justified; wrong equipment; not linked to research
- Availability of similar/existing infrastructure
- Missing expertise, lacks critical mass of experts
- Work as team, track record, funding history
- Pathway not well detailed
- Insufficient revenue
- Lack of focus, too broad or ambitious, not integrated
- Not innovative
- Details on activity, grantsmanship
- Feasibility, approach, methodology
- Lacks O&M, access, data plan
- Institutional capacity & track record
- Research or tech dev
- Team
- Infrastructure
- Sustainability
- Benefits to Canadians
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

suggested reviewers
Good practices

What is a good practice?
• tested, validated and proven
• produces good results and repeated
• shared and recommended as a model

www.innovation.ca/awards/sharing-good-practices
Newest additions

1. Access to key project information by relevant stakeholders
2. Managing the JELF allocation
3. Risk-based management approach
4. Important considerations for items involving an in-kind contribution
Multi-institutional projects working group

- Objectives:
  - Identify key challenges
  - Identify solutions and good practices
  - Identify CFI tools and approaches

- Membership
Key challenges

Pre-award

@ CFI
- CAMS alerts
- Contact list of CFI liaisons
- NOI → NOI posting → proposal

@ Institution
- Communications among institutional liaisons
- Internal review & selection processes
- Envelopes allocations
- Provincial regulations & processes

Post-award

@ Institution
- Purchasing practices
- IOF allocation
- Inter-institutional agreements
- Reporting responsibilities
CFI’s ongoing advocacy strategy

- An investment horizon proposition for research infrastructure
- Strengthens the two core principles of the CFI’s service delivery model:
  - Respond to the evolving needs of Canadian researchers, their institutions and their partners across all sectors
  - Provide contributions at the pace of infrastructure acquisition and installation.
Questions?
Additional information
2017 Innovation Fund
Weaknesses identified by the Expert Committees
## Weaknesses identified by EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional capacity and track record</th>
<th>Research or Technology Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cohesion between track record and project</td>
<td>Details on activity &amp; grantsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of detail / supporting documentation needed</td>
<td>Feasibility/ approach/ methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/institutional track record</td>
<td>Lack of focus, too broad/ambitious, not integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from institution</td>
<td>Not innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing details on comparable programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Weaknesses identified by EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td>• Missing expertise / Not</td>
<td>• Not well justified / not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>critical mass of experts</td>
<td>connected to RTD / wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td>• Track record of working</td>
<td>• No details on availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a team</td>
<td>of similar/existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td>• Missing details on</td>
<td>• Weak RTD/Team to justify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td>• Canadian/International</td>
<td>• Location of infrastructure /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaborations not included</td>
<td>division between collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td>• Missing details on team</td>
<td>• Not enough equipment / budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>member roles</td>
<td>too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure development/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementation not well detailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Weaknesses identified by EC

**Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Infrastructure, access or data management plan missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Revenues not sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Costs/revenues not detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Underestimated costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Governance/Management structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Plans beyond 5 years not detailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits to Canadians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Pathway not well detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Missing details of benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Weak research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Overstated impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>HQP plan not well detailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Innovation Fund
Weaknesses identified by the MACs
Weaknesses identified by MACs

**Objective 1: Global Leadership**
- 27%: Lack of detail
- 18%: Missing expertise
- 13%: Lack of cohesion between projects/too broad
- 10%: Issues with feasibility of approach/methodology
- 11%: Comparison to external research programs
- 11%: Not innovative

**Objective 2: Enhance Research Capacity**
- 22%: Weak justification for infrastructure
- 13%: Collaboration
- 12%: Sustainability plan missing details
- 11%: Management/governance/access plan missing details
- 6%: No details on availability of similar/existing infrastructure
Weaknesses identified by MACs

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadian

- **16%**
  - Pathway not well detailed

- **10%**
  - Overstated/weak benefits

- **6%**
  - Weak RTD/Team to produce benefits
Distribution of MAC ratings

- Objective 1: Strive for global leadership (IF 2017)
- Objective 2: Enhance research capacity (IF 2017)
- Objective 3: Generate benefits for Canadians (IF 2017)