Strengths and weaknesses statistics

2017 Innovation Fund
Distribution of expert committee ratings

- ICTR
- Research
- Team
- Infrastructure
- Sustainability
- Benefits
Institutional capacity and track record

Aspects exceeding the standard

- Impressive capacity: 32%
- Impressive research track record: 16%
- Impressive technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization track record: 14%
- Does not exceed the standard: 13%
- Track record not demonstrated: 6%

Weaknesses

- Lack of cohesion between track record and proposal: 8%
- Missing details / supporting documentation needed: 7%
- Project/institutional track record (1st): 7%
- Previous commitment from institution: 5%
Research or technology development

Aspects exceeding the standard

- Innovative: 11%
- High breakthrough potential: 7%
- Leads the field internationally: 6%
- Does not exceed the standard: 5%

Weaknesses

- Missing details on activity: 42%
- Feasibility / approach / methodology: 35%
- Lack of focus / too broad: 30%
- Not innovative (2nd): 20%
- Missing details on comparable programs: 16%
Team

Aspects exceeding the standard

- Impressive research track record: 22%
- Impressive collaboration track record: 13%
- Impressive depth and breadth of expertise: 5%
- Does not exceed the standard: 12%

Weaknesses

- Missing expertise / not critical mass of experts: 34%
- Track record of working as a team: 20%
- Missing details on collaboration: 9%
- Canadian/international collaborations not included: 9%
- Missing details on team member roles: 8%
Sustainability

Aspects exceeding the standard

- Integrated to sustainable facility: 6%
- Secured revenues / high chance of securing revenues: 3%
- Very strong long term plan: 1%
- Does not exceed the standard: 6%

Weaknesses

- Infrastructure or data management/access plan: 22%
- Revenues not sufficient: 19%
- Missing details on costs/revenues: 15%
- Underestimated costs (3rd): 13%
- Governance/management structure: 12%
- Missing details on plans beyond 5 years: 9%
Benefits to Canadians

Aspects exceeding the standard

- High importance of benefits 8%
- Proven pathways (e.g. partnerships with end users) 6%
- HQP: unique training, impressive track record, high number 5%
- Highly credible pathways (e.g. partnerships with end users) (2nd) 4%
- Does not exceed the standard 18%

Weaknesses

- Missing details on pathways 21%
- Missing details on benefits 12%
- Weak research/team to produce benefits 9%
- Overstated impact 7%
- Missing details on HQP 7%
Distribution of MAC ratings

# proposals

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

Aspects exceeding the standard

Innovative research in an area of global leadership 19%
World leaders 19%

Does not exceed the standard 4%

Weaknesses

Missing details on research or technology development 22%
Missing expertise 14%
Lack of cohesion / too broad 11%
Comparison to external research programs (1st) 9%
Not innovative (3rd) 9%
Objective 2: Enhance research capacity

Aspects exceeding the standard

- Highly productive partnerships (5th) 6%
- Unique in Canada 3%
- High number of users / optimal use 3%
- Integrated to sustainable facility 3%
- Does not exceed the standard 2%

Weaknesses

- Weak justification for infrastructure 18%
- Collaboration 11%
- Missing details on sustainability plan 10%
- Missing details on governance /management/access plan 9%
Objective 3: Generate benefits

Aspects exceeding the standard

- High importance of benefits: 7%
- Proven pathways (e.g. partnerships with end users): 6%
- Highly credible pathways (e.g. partnerships with end users) (2nd): 5%
- HQP: unique training, high number: 5%
- Does not exceed the standard: 7%

Weaknesses

- Missing details on pathways: 13%
- Overstated/weak benefits: 8%
- Weak research/team to produce benefits: 5%