Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis (Expert Committee)

Weaknesses

- Lack of details on methodology
- Approach not feasible
- Not integrative/lack of focus
- Missing details on activity
- Missing expertise
- Plan for equity, diversity and inclusion missing or lack of detail
- Equipment wrong or not justified
- Missing user base or business development

Strengths

- Impressive breadth and depth of expertise
- Innovative research program
- Outstanding research track record
- Breakthrough potential
- Concrete actions/tangible activities
- Outstanding justification
- Strong governance/oversight plans
- Strong operation and maintenance plan
## Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis (Multidisciplinary assessment committees)

**Weaknesses**
- Lack of detail for research or technology development
- Weak evidence of action on equity, diversity and inclusion
- Suffers from comparison within the competition
- Approach is not feasible
- Weak justification for infrastructure
- Poor sustainability planning
- Underdeveloped management/governance/access plan
- Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
- Overstated/weak benefits

**Strengths**
- Leading researchers
- Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership
- Unique infrastructure
- Exceptional synergies
- Pathways clearly defined
- Importance of benefit to Canada
Expert Committee strengths

**Research or technology development**

- **64%**
  - Highly innovative

- **43%**
  - Strong breakthrough potential

- **41%**
  - Leads the field internationally

**Team expertise**

- **72%**
  - Impressive breadth and depth of expertise

- **63%**
  - Outstanding research track record

- **31%**
  - Strong leadership

- **31%**
  - Strong track record of collaboration

- **28%**
  - Team includes established and emerging leaders
## Expert Committee strengths (continued)

### Team composition

- **67%**
  - Concrete actions and tangible activities
- **41%**
  - Commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion

### Infrastructure

- **53%**
  - Outstanding justification
- **29%**
  - Unique or innovative infrastructure
- **16%**
  - Rare facility in Canada
- **16%**
  - Optimal use
Expert Committee strengths (continued)

**Sustainability**

- 52% • Strong governance/oversight plan

- 48% • Strong operation & maintenance plan

- 37% • Robust business model

**Benefits**

- 66% • Credible and proven pathways to benefits

- 48% • Strong partnership with end users

- 41% • Potential for societal impact
## Expert Committee weaknesses

### Research or technology development

- **34%**
  - Lack of details on methodology

- **22%**
  - Approach is not feasible

- **22%**
  - Research program is not integrated or lacks focus

- **14%**
  - Lack of overall details on research program

- **14%**
  - Research program is not innovative

### Team expertise

- **22%**
  - Missing expertise or critical mass of experts

- **7%**
  - Missing expertise on data management

- **6%**
  - Weak evidence of working as a team, track record or funding history
Expert Committee weaknesses (continued)

Team composition

16%
• Missing or lacking detail on equity, diversity and strategy or action plan

9%
• Statements on equity, diversity and inclusion and related barriers were generic

5%
• Relevant marginalized groups excluded from discussion

Infrastructure

33%
• Not well justified / not connected to research/wrong equipment

10%
• Missing infrastructure development/implementation plan

8%
• Missing detail on similar/existing infrastructure
### Expert Committee weaknesses (continued)

#### Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Potential user base or business development plan missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Costs/revenues not detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Weak operation &amp; maintenance plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Weak governance or management structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Insufficient personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Weak infrastructure or data management plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benefits to Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Missing details of benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Overstated impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multidisciplinary assessment committees strengths

Objective 1: Global leadership
- World-leading researchers
- Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership

Objective 2: Enhance research capacity
- Unique infrastructure in Canada
- Exceptional synergies

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadians
- Pathways to benefits clearly laid out
- Importance to Canada
- Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
Multidisciplinary assessment committees weaknesses

Objective 1: Global leadership
- Lack of detail for RTD 25%
- Weak evidence of equity, diversity and inclusion activities 25%
- Suffers from comparison within the competition 14%
- Approach not feasible 12%
- Lack of cohesion in research program 12%
- Missing expertise 11%

Objective 2: Enhance research capacity
- Weak justification for infrastructure 14%
- Weak sustainability planning 10%
- Weak management/governance/access plan 5%

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadians
- Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization 11%
- Overstated/weak benefits 9%