



Assumes Call for Proposals has been read

Agenda



- Consultation findings
- Purpose and objectives of fund
- LEF vs NIF
- Review process
- Highlight changes
- Timeline
- Questions

Should take 20-30 minutes for the presentation.
Remaining time for Q&A session.

2007 Consultation



- \$510M announced in 2007 budget
- Consultation process throughout summer/early fall of 2007
 - Challenges
 - Findings
- Result: LEF/NIF Competition 2009

Consulted: Institutions (universities, colleges, polytechnics, hospitals, institutes), governments (federal, provincial), industry, research funding agencies

The challenges we faced were to:

- ensure attraction of transformative proposals
- sustain existing infrastructure and invest in areas of emerging importance
- support both new capital investments and the operation of existing installations
- promote strategic investments in areas of national or regional priority
- promote knowledge translation

Findings:

- current suite of programs well aligned with needs
- continue to focus on core mandate
- continue to rely on institutional strategic priorities in delivering our mandate
- continue to base funding decisions on excellence and merit at the highest international standards
- support the best LEF and NIF proposals, without setting a ratio between the two
- enable international collaborations throughout all programs, rather than through a separate fund
- current level of operating support from CFI is adequate for majority of projects (for state-of-the-art lifetime of infrastructure)

Unmet needs:

- funding for mid-sized projects that fall between a typical LOF and large-scale LEF/NIF
- enhanced coordination among funding agencies

2009 Competition



- Seeks innovative and transformative infrastructure projects that will lead to breakthroughs and to advantages for Canadians
- Two streams: Leading Edge Fund (LEF) and New Initiatives Fund (NIF)
- Single budget \$400M (+\$120M IOF) with no predetermined distribution between streams

One timeline for submission dates and decisions
Harmonized application and review processes

Common Characteristics LEF+NIF



- Competition seeks projects that:
 - demonstrate world-class excellence;
 - foster partnerships;
 - focus on priorities;
 - generate impacts.
- Proposals should clearly address the availability of, or access to, similar infrastructure.
- Institutions must demonstrate the unique nature and value-added of the project.

Demonstrate World-Class Excellence:

- Currently beyond the means of Canadian institutions – important not to duplicate already available resources

Foster Partnerships

- Enhancement of existing networks and new regional, national, and international networks and partnerships.

Focus on Priorities

- Evidence of substantial institutional support and commitment;

Generate Impacts :

- Can be economic (e.g. development of new products/services, commercialization)
- Or improvements to society/quality of life (e.g. new public policies)

Exclusions: Projects should not request infrastructure covered by existing National Platforms (HPC, Synergies, Canadian Research Knowledge Network).

•For projects requesting computing equipment in excess of \$500,000, the CFI will require a letter from the applicant institution detailing the reason(s) why the current high performance computing resources offered by Compute Canada are unable to meet the needs of the project. The CFI expects this letter to be submitted only after there have been substantial discussions between the applicant and Compute Canada.

Leading Edge Fund



- Leading edge activities that build on past investments the CFI has made at the applicant institution through:
 - Innovation Fund
 - International Joint Venture Fund
 - Research Development Fund (College and University)
- LEF projects build on either the:
 - results and outcomes of the research activities performed using past infrastructure projects;
 - infrastructure that was acquired through the previous CFI investment.

- Expected to strengthen activities that have been particularly successful and productive
- Cannot build on an investment that already gave rise to a successful LEF project in the 2006 LEF/NIF competition
- Performance report in the application form has been tweaked and is much more focused
- LEF projects must build on past successes – unsatisfactory past performance will kill a project.

Examples of LEFs



- Upgrading facilities
- Building on established strength
- Extending established research leadership
- Extending research collaborations
- Moving from research to technology development

Upgrading facilities : ensuring that infrastructure acquired through previous investments continues to be state-of-the-art;

Building on established strength: building on leading-edge research or technology development opportunities resulting from important scientific or technological advances from the previous CFI investment;

Extending established research leadership: pursuing additional or unforeseen research or technology development avenues now possible as a result of previous CFI investment(s);

Extending research collaborations: providing wider access, and extending or building new partnerships that enable the exploration of new research avenues;

Moving from research through development to demonstration: assisting with technology development through prototyping or pilot-scale demonstration.

See Call for Proposals Annex 2 for examples of LEFs.

New Initiatives Fund



- Promising innovative directions in research and technology development that do not build on past CFI investments
 - Exceptions:
 - New Opportunities Fund
 - Canada Research Chairs Infrastructure Fund
 - Career Awards
 - Leaders Opportunity Fund
- Must still be in areas of strategic priority for the institution

Basically, if it's not a LEF, it's a NIF.

New Initiative means “New to the CFI’s major funding mechanisms”, not necessarily new to the institution. We still expect to see the project fit the SRP and the institution to **have a demonstrated commitment to the project and area of research.**

LEF vs NIF



- Infrastructure Advisory Group
- Decisions based on:
 - Notice of Intent
 - List of past investments by the CFI at the institution
 - Summaries of the relevant projects previously funded by the CFI

For situations where it is not clear whether a project should be submitted as a LEF or a NIF, the CFI will convene a committee to look at the NOI and make that choice.

Note: NOI form changed from the last competition and now includes a justification of the stream chosen. Also includes more information on the research/tech development proposed

•will be used for LEF vs NIF and also for suggested reviewers therefore importance increased vs old NOI

Envelopes



- Limit the total amount of CFI support that an institution can request in this competition
- Overall envelope ~\$1.2B therefore success rate expected to be approximately 25-30% for competition
- No preset allocation between two streams

- Envelope in place to encourage strategic priority setting at the institution and reduce burden given the time and effort required to design major projects and prepare applications

- Envelope based on tri-council funding

- Envelopes include affiliated research hospitals and institutes

- Institutions can share envelopes for multi-institutional projects

- Must inform the CFI by **October 3, 2008** of the split and the rationale

- 2 exemptions from envelope:

- 2 or fewer projects submitted that would draw from the same envelope

- National/Regional projects

National/Regional designation



- National:
 - ≥ 10 institutions with at least one from each geographic region
 - Consistent with each institution's SRP
 - Aligned with federal S&T priorities
 - Involve a commitment by each institution towards partner funding and O&M
- Regional:
 - As with national, but ≥ 5 institutions and;
 - Propose the creation of a platform serving users at participating institutions
 - Aligned with federal **and provincial** S&T priorities
 - Build on tangible and demonstrated **pre-existing** collaborative activities

- Regional projects don't have to be multi-provincial anymore (change from draft call)
- Infrastructure Advisory Group (IAG) to determine if project fits regional designation
 - more on IAG to come later in presentation

Review Process



- Admin review and envelope verification
- Assessment criteria as before
- Merit review in 3 stages

Admin review – to ensure adherence to form (e.g. # pages etc), eligibility of institutions and infrastructure, and envelope

Merit review in 3 stages:

Expert committee (will NOT review the benefits to the country – this is different from the past)

Multidisciplinary Committee (will be the only cmt to review the benefit section – this is different from before)

Special Committee

Assessment criteria (as before):

Quality of research and need for the infrastructure

Contribution to strengthening the capacity for innovation

Potential benefits to Canada

LEF only: past performance

Greater emphasis on:

Institutional priorities and commitment, including support for O&M costs (actually the section about O&M costs has been moved to the project module section and beefed up a little to reflect the increased importance of that criterion)

Fostering partnerships

Expert review



- Expert review to assess:
 - quality of the research and need for the infrastructure;
 - contribution to strengthening capacity for innovation;
 - performance report for LEF proposals.
- Expert committees will review small groups of similar or related proposals.
- Proposals requesting >\$7M from the CFI will involve face-to-face meetings with representatives of the applicant institution(s).

Key changes from last time:

- Experts NOT reviewing Benefits to Canada
- CFI \$ requested for face-to-face meeting increased from \$4M to \$7M

Multidisciplinary Committee



- Receive input from the expert review process and provinces
- Assess:
 - LEF-only: outputs and outcomes from previous CFI awards in the area
 - Benefits to Canada criterion, considering provincial input
- Compare proposals relative to other competing requests

Main differences from last time:

- MACs review Benefits to Canada rather than expert committee
- Provinces asked for brief (250 word) text describing how specific proposals align with their S&T priorities – will factor into assessment of Benefits to Canada
- LEFs and NIF considered by the same MACs
- MACs divided up by size/complexity of proposal
- 4 categories:
 - <\$2M requested from CFI
 - \$2M to \$7M requested from CFI
 - >\$7M requested from CFI
 - Applied technology development (irrespective of \$ requested)
- i.e. no longer comparing big and small projects together
- Responds to concerns that mid-size projects are disadvantaged

Special committee



- Ensures consistency among the MACs
- Should the MAC recommendations exceed available resources, recommends projects that represent most effective portfolio of investments
- **Excellence is paramount!**
- Consider alignment with institutional, federal and provincial S&T priorities

The S-MAC is charged with the challenging mandate of assessing the excellence of projects with full consideration of:

- intrinsic scientific considerations, as well as the likelihood that the project (whether research or technology development) will lead to unique and seminal advances;
- extrinsic considerations: the potential value to Canada of the likely outputs, outcomes and impacts of an initiative, including the quality of research training opportunities;
- structural considerations: how the area or discipline of research or technology development would be affected by support, or lack of support, of the project in question.

The work of the S-MAC will also entail the following actions:

- Advise on and ensure consistency among the MACs;
- Ensure that the applications recommended for funding provide for a rich portfolio of investments in infrastructure of various sizes and across diverse fields of research and technology development;
- Should the MAC recommendations exceed the available resources, recommend to the CFI Board, among proposals recommended for funding, those that most effectively support the mandate of the CFI and represent the most effective portfolio of investments in infrastructure for Canada. This entails strategic consideration of the alignment with institutional, national, and provincial priorities and contributions to regional and national systems of innovation.

Collaboration with others



- Coordinate with federal research funding agencies for large (>\$10M CFI) projects
- Share information with provinces to minimize duplication of review
- Provincial input to the MAC and S-MAC

- For large initiatives with substantial downstream funding requirements, the CFI will invite the federal granting agencies to attend the review of projects requesting more than \$10 million from the CFI, and will share with the appropriate agencies the outcomes of the CFI review process. This is intended to assist the granting agencies in their planning efforts.
- Granting agencies will not have input into decision making process.
- CFI will share of information (e.g. reviewers and committee comments) with the provinces to avoid duplication of review
- Provinces are given the opportunity to provide a brief text (a maximum of 250 words per project) describing how specific initiatives align particularly well with their respective S&T priorities.
 - This input will be provided to the MACs and will be factored into their assessment of the Benefits to Canada
 - The S-MAC will also use the same provincial input in its decision process.

Recap



- Objectives of competition
- Key differences compared to 2006 LEF/NIF

Competition seeks projects that:

- Demonstrate world-class excellence
- Foster partnerships
- Focus on priorities
- Generate impacts

Key differences:

- One timeline with identical submission deadlines for LEF and NIF streams
- Institutional envelope for both LEF and NIF combined
- Regional projects exempt from envelope (emphasis on partnerships)
- Expert review does not consider Benefits to Canada
- MACs divided by size/complexity of project (CFI \$\$\$) and/or type of project (tech develop) to compare apples with apples
- Federal funding agencies will observe review process for large projects with significant downstream costs to the agencies

Timeline



| Date | Activity (both LEF and NIF) |
|-------------------------------|---|
| May 9, 2008 | Institutional letters regarding national and regional projects submitted to the CFI |
| June 13, 2008 | CFI response for national/regional designation |
| June 30, 2008 | Notice of intent to apply (NOI) submitted |
| July 31, 2008 | CFI response to choice of stream LEF vs NIF |
| October 3, 2008 | Applications submitted |
| October 10, 2008 | Institutional Strategic Research Plan Summary submitted |
| November 2008 – February 2009 | Expert Committees Meetings |
| March 13, 2009 | Provincial input to the CFI |
| March/April 2009 | MAC meetings |
| May 2009 | SMAC meeting |
| June 2009 | CFI Board decisions |

Questions?



Additional information:

www.innovation.ca