**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
6. 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major weaknesses – 2020 IF</th>
<th>Major Strengths – 2020 IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of detail for RTD</td>
<td>1. Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feasibility of the approach</td>
<td>2. Leading researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Missing expertise</td>
<td>3. Unique infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not innovative</td>
<td>4. Integrated into sustainable existing facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Weak justification for infrastructure</td>
<td>5. Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization</td>
<td>6. Unique HQP opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sustainability planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management/governance/access plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overstated/weak benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

- **4%**
  - Strong governance/oversight plan

- **4%**
  - Strong O&M plan

- **3%**
  - Integrated to existing facilities with proven TR of sustainable operations

#### Benefits

- **15%**
  - High importance to Canada

- **12%**
  - Credible and proven pathways to benefits

- **7%**
  - Strong track record of training HQP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research or Technology Development</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of details on methodology</td>
<td>• Missing expertise or critical mass of experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility of approach</td>
<td>• Missing details on roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research program is not innovative</td>
<td>• Missing details on collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research program is not integrated or lacks focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of overall details on research program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Capacity

13%

• Missing evidence of track record of investment

4%

• Unclear commitment from institution

Infrastructure

42%

• Not well justified / not connected to RTD / wrong equipment

12%

• Missing infrastructure development/implementation plan

12%

• Missing detail on similar(existing infrastructure

8%

• Not enough equipment requested based on research program
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

- Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership (20%)
- World leading researchers (20%)

Objective 2: Enhance Research Capacity

- Integrated into sustainable existing facility (10%)
- Unique infrastructure in Canada (6%)

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadian

- Importance of benefit to Canada (11%)
- Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization (8%)
- Unique HQP training opportunities (5%)
MAC Weaknesses

Objective 1: Global Leadership
- Lack of detail for RTD: 20%
- Missing expertise: 14%
- Feasibility/approach: 13%
- Not innovative: 8%
- Lack of cohesion in research program: 7%
- Weak compared to international programs: 6%

Objective 2: Enhance Research Capacity
- Weak justification for infrastructure: 17%
- Weak sustainability planning: 15%
- Weak management/governance/access plan: 7%

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadian
- Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization: 16%
- Overstated/weak benefits: 10%