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Agenda

1. About the CFI
2. 2020 Innovation Fund
3. Competition objectives
4. Review process
   - Before the meeting
   - CFI online portal
   - At the meeting
5. Questions
Mandate

To build our nation’s capacity to undertake world-class research and technology development that benefits Canadians.
Funding model

CFI provides 40% of infrastructure costs (remaining 60% provided by provinces, institutions and private sector)

O&M support

30% of CFI award through the Infrastructure Operating Fund (IOF)
Competition budget & objectives

OBJECTIVES

• Enable global leadership by supporting world-class research or technology development.

• Enhance and optimize the capacity of institutions and research communities to conduct the proposed research or technology development program(s).

• Lead to social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians.

$400 million Capital + $120 million Infrastructure Operating Fund
Merit review process

- **Expert review**
  - Assessment criteria
    - Strengths
    - Weaknesses
  - Competition objectives
    - Excellence
    - Exceptional merit

- **MAC**
  - • Mandate
  - • Competition objectives
  - • Portfolio

- **SMAC**
  - Decision

- **CFI Board**
Before the MAC meeting

Review materials (CFI online portal)
- Expert committee reports
- Proposals
- MAC report template

Individual review assignments
- Each proposal assigned to 3 members
- Multidisciplinary perspective
### Competition objectives

1. Enable global leadership by supporting world-class research or technology development

2. Enhance & optimize the capacity of institutions and research communities to conduct the proposed research or technology development program(s)

3. Lead to social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians

### Assessment criteria

- Research or technology development
- Team
- Research capacity
- Infrastructure
- Sustainability
- Benefits
Rating scale

EX  The proposal satisfies and significantly exceeds the objective.

SA  The proposal satisfies the objective.

SW  The proposal satisfies the objective, but has a few minor weaknesses.

PS  The proposal partially satisfies the objective and has some significant weaknesses.

NS  The proposal does not satisfy the objective due to major weaknesses.
Preliminary Assessments in CAMS

by September 3, 2020

What to do with the ‘other’ proposals?
MAC meetings

September 9 – 11

Videoconferences
At the meeting

For each proposal
- Discussion
- Consensus ratings
- Funding recommendation

At the end of meeting
- Exceptional Merit (up to 2)
Funding recommendations

**Infrastructure:**
- Full funding
- Partial and/or conditional funding
- No funding

**Additional O&M for multi-institutional projects:**
- Full funding
- No funding
Team criterion – Equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI)

- For information, not for assessment
- Feedback on EDI considerations at MAC policy session discussion
MAC report

- MAC consensus ratings for each objective
- Comments on each objective
- Justify funding recommendation
- Justify exceptional projects
Questions?
Conflicts of interest

• Relative, close friend, or have a personal relationship
• In a position to gain or lose financially or materially from the funding of the proposal
• Long-standing scientific or personal differences
• Currently affiliated with the candidates’ institutions, organizations or companies
• Close professional affiliation - in the last six years:
  • frequent and regular interactions
  • supervisor or a trainee
  • collaborated, published or shared funding
  • been employed by the applicant institution
• feel for any reason unable to provide an impartial review of the proposal.

Confidentiality

Review committee members, external reviewers and observers must ensure that:

• Maintain all documentation and information in strict confidence at all times.
• Only use the documentation and information for the purpose for review of proposals.
• Destroy the review documentation in a secure manner when it is no longer required.
• Do not contact the candidates for additional information or disclose matters arising from the review process to the candidates.
• Review deliberations are confidential.
West & Territories (85) $309M
Québec (90) $292M
Ontario (120) $487M
Atlantic (12) $35M

307 Proposals
$1.1B CFI request
58 Institutions
$2.9B Total project costs
63 3+ collaborators
Large universities

Small universities

Colleges, CÉGEPs and non-profit research org.

SSH (1%), $14 M

Environment (6%), $69.12 M

Science (18%), $205.49 M

Health (47%), $526.5 M

Engineering (27%), $307.29 M

Histogram showing the number of proposals by project size [

Project size [CFI Request] ($ Million)]

- Grand Total: 307
- ≤ $1: 36
- $1 - $4: 175
- $4 - $6: 47
- $6 - $10: 40
- ≥ $10: 9

Bar chart showing the sum of CFI Request by project size [CFI Request] ($ Million)

- Grand Total: $1.042 B
- ≤ $1: $27 M
- $1 - $4: $431 M
- $4 - $6: $236 M
- $6 - $10: $305 M
- ≥ $10: $123 M

INNOVATION.CA
For short discussion at the end of each proposal assessment:

- Were institutional EDI plans or policies considered in composing the research team?
- Were concrete steps to taken to follow EDI plans?
- Are there actions taken that could be considered effective or good practices?
- Were any barriers to diversifying teams identified? Any suggestions for mitigating these barriers?