



CANADA FOUNDATION FOR INNOVATION

2023 Innovation Fund

Analysis of strengths and weaknesses

January 2024

INNOVATION

Canada Foundation
for Innovation

Fondation canadienne
pour l'innovation

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 planz

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

14%

- Potential user base or business development plan missing

13%

- Costs/revenues not detailed

10%

- Weak operation & maintenance plan

8%

- Weak governance or management structure

7%

- Insufficient personnel

6%

- Weak infrastructure or data management plan

Benefits to Canadians

14%

- Missing details of benefits

16%

- Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization

5%

- Overstated impact

Multidisciplinary assessment committees strengths

Objective 1: **Global leadership**

48%

- World-leading researchers

47%

- Leading-edge and innovative research in area of global leadership

Objective 2: **Enhance research capacity**

21%

- Unique infrastructure in Canada

20%

- Exceptional synergies

Objective 3: **Benefits to Canadians**

36%

- Pathways to benefits clearly laid out

25%

- Importance to Canada

25%

- Strong plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization

Multidisciplinary assessment committees weaknesses

Objective 1: Global leadership

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

Objective 2: Enhance research capacity

- 14% { • Weak justification for infrastructure
- 10% { • Weak sustainability planning
- 5% { • Weak management/governance/access plan

Objective 3: Benefits to Canadians

- 11% { • Weak plan for technology transfer/clinical transfer/knowledge mobilization
- 9% { • Overstated/weak benefits