

Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis

December 2021



### Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis (Expert Committee)

### Major weaknesses - 2020 IF

- 1. Lack of details on methodology
- 2. Feasibility of the approach
- 3. Not innovative
- 4. Research plan lacks focus
- 5. Missing expertise
- Missing evidence for track record of investment
- 7. Infrastructure not well justified
- 8. Issues regarding governance or management plan
- 9. Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization

### Major Strengths - 2020 IF

- 1. Outstanding research track record
- 2. Innovative research program
- 3. Impressive breadth and depth of expertise
- 4. Team leads the field internationally
- 5. Investments in people
- 6. Rare, world-class infrastructure
- 7. Strong governance/oversight plans
- 8. Strong O&M plan

### Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis (MAC)

### Major weaknesses - 2020 IF

- 1. Lack of detail for RTD
- 2. Feasibility of the approach
- 3. Missing expertise
- 4. Not innovative
- 5. Weak justification for infrastructure
- 6. Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
- 7. Sustainability planning
- 8. Management/governance/access plan
- 9. Overstated/weak benefits

### Major Strengths - 2020 IF

- Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership
- 2. Leading researchers
- 3. Unique infrastructure
- Integrated into sustainable existing facility
- Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
- 6. Unique HQP opportunities

# **Expert Committee Strengths**

# Research or Technology Development

13 %

Highly innovative

11%

· Leads the field internationally

9%

Strong breakthrough potential

#### **Team**

22%

Outstanding research track record

17%

Impressive breadth and depth of expertise

11%

Strong track record of collaboration

9%

Team includes established and emerging leaders

9%

Strong leadership

# Expert Committee Strengths (continued)

#### **Research Capacity**

17%

Extensive investment in world-class infrastructure

11%

• Significant investments in people

9%

• Significant financial support from institution

7%

Well aligned with institutional strategy

Infrastructure

8%

Does not exceed the standard

4 %

Unique facility in Canada

3%

Timely investment in infrastructure

# Expert Committee Strengths (continued)

**Sustainability** 

**Benefits** 

4%

• Strong governance/oversight plan

15%

High importance to Canada

4%

Strong O&M plan

12%

Credible and proven pathways to benefits

3%

 Integrated to existing facilities with proven TR of sustainable operations 7%

Strong track record of training HQP

## **Expert Committee Weaknesses**

# Research or Technology Development

39%

Lack of details on methodology

23%

Feasibility of approach

16%

• Research program is not innovative

16%

Research program is not integrated or lacks focus

14%

Lack of overall details on research program

**Team** 

38%

Missing expertise or critical mass of experts

10%

Missing details on roles

9%

Missing details on collaboration

## Expert Committee Weaknesses (continued)

#### **Research Capacity**

42%

Not well justified / not connected to RTD / wrong equipment

Infrastructure

12%

• Missing infrastructure development/implementation plan

12%

· Missing detail on similar/existing infrastructure

8%

Not enough equipment requested based on research program

13%

• Missing evidence of track record of investment

4%

Unclear commitment from institution

## Expert Committee Weaknesses (continued)

#### **Sustainability**

#### 27%

• Infrastructure access or data management plan missing

#### 22%

Weak governance/management structure

#### 21%

Missing contingency planning

#### 21%

Missing planning for equipment life/warranty beyond 5 years

#### 15%

Costs/revenues not detailed

#### 10%

Estimated O&M costs too low

#### **Benefits to Canadians**

#### 27%

 Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization

#### 17%

Missing details of benefits

#### 9%

Overstated impact

#### 8%

HQP plan not well detailed

## **MAC Strengths**

Objective 1: Global Leadership

Objective 2: Enhance Research Capacity

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadian



• Integrated into sustainable existing facility

Unique infrastructure in Canada

Importance of benefit to Canada

 Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization

 Unique HQP training opportunities

8%

5%

### **MAC** Weaknesses



- 20% < Lack of detail for RTD
- Missing expertise
- 13% < Feasibility/approach
  - 8% < Not innovative
  - Lack of cohesion in research program
  - Weak compared to international programs

# **Objective 2: Enhance Research Capacity**

Weak justification for infrastructure

- Weak sustainability planning
- Weak management/ governance/access plan

# Objective 3: Benefits to Canadian

16%

- Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
- Overstated/weak benefits