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CFI Innovation Fund

Transformative infrastructure projects that would underpin cutting-edge, globally competitive research

- Conduct world-class research or technology development activities.
- Forging productive partnerships within and among institutions, sectors and disciplines for effective use of research infrastructure.
- Generate social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians.
U of S: Capacity & Funding

- UofS envelope: ~ $15M to $20M (2017 = $17.7M)
  - For both UofS-led and partnered projects
  - Minimum total project $1M (UofS minimum)
  - CFI covers 40% of costs

- Innovation and Science Fund (ISF)
  - Historically provided a full match of CFI award (40% total project)
  - Future is uncertain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 October</td>
<td>Call for Expression of Interest (EOI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December</td>
<td>Deadline for EOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec to Jan 2019</td>
<td>Test Your Concept workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 January</td>
<td>Deadline for final EOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-February</td>
<td>UofS decision: CFI-IF projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>CFI NOI Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Internal Review Deadline for full proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Submission to CFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFI Criteria

• Institutional capacity and track record
• Research and/or technology development
• Team
• Infrastructure
• Sustainability
• Benefits to Canadians
Institutional capacity and track record

Builds on existing capacity and track record of key investments in people and infrastructure

- Describe institutional capacity on which project builds
  - People: researchers, HQP
  - Infrastructure

- Explain how investments have led to
  - Research / technology development results
  - Knowledge or technology transfer
  - Benefits for Canadians
What key investments and commitments have been made in **people, infrastructure and research** (by CFI or other partners, programs)

- How have they contributed to the capacity to attract and retain HQP (researchers, technicians, students, post-doctoral fellows)
- What financial support is there for the operations and maintenance of existing infrastructure?
- Are there collaborations/partnerships among researchers/institutions/sectors at the national or international level?
- Have the research results or technology development outputs provided a competitive international advantage?
- What evidence is there of social, economic or environmental benefits?
Institutional track record: Shortfalls

- Lack of cohesion between track record and proposal
- Missing details / supporting documentation needed
- Project/institutional track record weak
- Previous commitment from institution weak
Research / technology development

Activities are innovative, feasible, have the potential to lead to breakthroughs, and will enhance international competitiveness

- Describe the proposed world class research or technology development program (vision, objectives, activities)
- Demonstrate the program’s innovativeness, feasibility and breakthrough potential by positioning it in the national and international context
• How are the proposed research and technology development activities **transformative** and **innovative**?

• How does the research program differ from comparable programs being conducted both nationally and internationally?

• Why is the research timely? How will it enhance the competitiveness of the institution and the researchers on an international scale?
Research / technology development: Shortfalls

- Missing details on activity
- Feasibility / approach / methodology
- Lack of focus / too broad
- Not innovative
- Missing details on comparable programs
- Grantsmanship
Team

Has established and emerging leaders with the expertise and breadth, including relevant collaborations, to conduct the research or technology development activities.

- Present principal users’ track records, including their most significant contributions and relevant measures of output.
- Highlight team members scientific and/or technical contributions to the program
- Describe collaborators and partners contributions
- Are the principal users established or emerging leaders in the field?
- Does the team have the expertise/ability to lead the research/technology development activities? Why are they the best people to lead this initiative?
- How will the team’s technical expertise be used to make the best use of the proposed infrastructure?
- Are there collaborations/partnerships (both national and international) which are essential to the success of the research technology development activities?
- Who are Canada’s leading experts in this area? Should they be part of the team?
Team: Shortfalls

- Missing expertise / not critical mass of experts / do not demonstrate the capacity for all themes/proposal aspects
- Track record of working as a team
- Missing details on collaboration
- Canadian/international collaborations not included
- Missing details on team member roles
Infrastructure

Is necessary and appropriate to conduct the research or technology development activities.

- Describe each item and justify its need to conduct the proposed activities. (Provide specifics)
- Describe the availability of similar equipment within the institution, the region and the country.
 What equipment/construction/renovation is being requested? Where will the infrastructure be located?
 How does the infrastructure enable the research or technology development?
 Is there similar infrastructure available within the institution, the region or the country? If so, why does the team need dedicated access?
 How will the use of the requested infrastructure be maximized?
 How will this strengthen multidisciplinary approaches/collaboration/partnerships within and among sectors?
Infrastructure: Shortfalls

- Not well justified / not connected to RTD / wrong equipment
- Missing details on availability of similar / existing infrastructure
- Weak RTD/team to justify infrastructure
- Missing details on location of infrastructure / division between collaborators
- Not enough equipment / budget too low
- Missing details on infrastructure development / implementation
Sustainability

The infrastructure is optimally used within and among institutions, sectors and disciplines and is sustainable through tangible and appropriate commitments over its useful life

- Present a management plan commensurate with the project’s size and complexity - it needs to address the optimal use and operation and maintenance.

- Provide detailed information on the O & M costs and revenue sources, including institutional commitment.
What are the operating and maintenance (O & M) needs of the infrastructure over its useful life?

Which personnel will be involved in day-to-day operations and facility management?

What financial resources are available to support the O & M needs of the infrastructure? What is the contingency plan if these resources are not available?

What is the management plan for project implementation, ongoing operations and maintenances, and for managing user access?

For larger projects, what is the proposed governance model, including decision-making bodies?

For computing infrastructure, are there any implications with Compute Canada?
Sustainability – Shortfalls

- Data management / access plan
- Revenues not sufficient
- Missing details on costs / revenues
- Underestimated costs
- Governance / Management structure not compelling
- Missing details on plans beyond 5 years
Benefits to Canadians

The research or technology development results will be transferred through appropriate pathways to potential end users and are likely to generate social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians.

- Briefly describe the potential socio-economic benefits, including training of highly qualified personnel

- Delineate the knowledge mobilization plan and/or technology transfer pathways, including partnerships with end users, and the teams ability to transfer results
What are the expected benefits to Canadians and why are they significant? (New products, services, HQP training, public policies, job creation etc.)

What pathways will be used to realize these benefits and over what timeframe?

Who are the potential end users of the research and technology development results?

What partnerships exist or are planned to achieve these outputs?

What are the institution's plans for knowledge mobilization, technology transfer, or commercialization for the outputs of the research program?

Does the team have the skills and experience, and are there structures in place, to ensure successful transfer of the research and technology development results?
Benefits to Canadians: Shortfalls

- Missing details on pathways
- Missing details on benefits
- Weak research / team to produce benefits
- Impact of project was overstated
- Missing details on HQP
National Success and Funding Rates

SUCCESS AND FUNDING RATES

- NOIs: 392, $1.2B
- Proposals: 351, $1.2B
- MACs: 138, $504M
- S-MAC: 117, $425M

Recommendations (#): 39%  Success rate: 33%
Recommendations ($): 42%  Funding rate: 36%
Discussion and Questions

The EOI Form is available online: