

The Fundamental Science Review: Where Are We At?

This is [Evidence for Democracy](#)'s second review of the status of the Fundamental Science Review recommendations, carried out by Umair A Baqi, Mairin Deith, Eashan Halbe, Kim Pho, and Farah Qaiser. Of the 35 recommendations, we found that:



Chapter 1: Panel Mandate, Scope of Review, and Principles

Recommendation	Status	Details
1.1 Consistent with the recommendation by the Advisory Council on Economic Growth, the Government of Canada should undertake a wide-ranging and multi-departmental review of innovation-related programming, including both direct and indirect supports for business research and development.	COMPLETE	A whole-of-government review of business innovation programs was announced in Budget 2018, and completed across 20 federal departments and agencies. Based on this review, Budget 2018 announced the streamlining of 92 innovation programs into 35.

Chapter 4: Oversight, Advice and Governance: Overdue Course Corrections

Recommendation	Status	Details
<p>4.1 The Government of Canada, by an Act of Parliament, should create a new National Advisory Council on Research and Innovation (NACRI) to provide broad oversight of the federal research and innovation ecosystems.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>Instead of NACRI, a new “Council on Science and Innovation” (CSI) was announced. In January 2019, there was a call for applications for a CSI Chairperson and members.</p> <p>There have been no public details since 2019 on the mandate, council membership or whether CSI is functional, though a Council on Science and Innovation Secretariat (CSIS) does currently exist within ISED.</p> <p>(Note: Recommendations 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 5.1, 5.8 and 7.2 are partly or fully dependent on NACRI’s involvement.)</p>
<p>4.2 The Science, Technology and Innovation Council should be wound down as NACRI is established.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>The Science, Technology and Innovation Council (STIC) is no longer operating, but NACRI (or CSI) has yet to be established.</p>
<p>4.3 NACRI should have 12 to 15 members, appointed through Orders in Council, comprising distinguished scientists and scholars from a range of disciplines as well as seasoned innovators with strong leadership and public service records from the business realm and civil society Domestic members should be drawn from across Canada and reflect the nation’s diversity and regions.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>Although the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation (CSI) body is still pending, the initial call for applications indicated that this body would consist of 11 members from the scientific and research community, the private sector, and civil society.</p>
<p>4.4 An external member should hold the Chair of NACRI with the CSA serving as Vice Chair NACRI should be supported by a dedicated secretariat working within the larger expert team supporting the CSA.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>Although the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation (CSI) body is still pending, the initial call for applications solicited an external Chairperson. There was no mention of a Vice Chair, but the Chief Science Advisor was listed as an ex-officio member.</p>
<p>4.5 The Privy Council Office, working with departmental officials and the newly appointed CSA, should examine mechanisms to</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>It is unclear whether a formal examination of mechanisms took place. There are currently different mechanisms to</p>

<p>achieve improved whole-of-government coordination and collaboration for intramural research and evidence-based policy-making.</p>		<p>coordinate intramural research and collaboration, including a Deputy Minister Science Committee, the Canada Research Coordinating Committee, and a growing network of departmental science advisors (DSAs), convened by the Office of the Chief Science Advisor. To date, there are seven DSAs across the federal government.</p>
<p>4.6 As a council of senior volunteers with a broad mandate of national importance, NACRI should have a publicly acknowledged working connection to the Prime Minister/PMO, parallel to that established for the CSA NACRI should report to and interact most directly with both the Minister of Science and the Minister responsible for Innovation and Economic Development It should also have open channels of communication with the Minister of Health and other ministers of key departments involved in intramural and extramural research.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>Although the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation (CSI) body is still pending, the initial call for applications indicated that this body would include three ex-officio members: the Chief Science Advisor, ISED Deputy Minister, and Deputy Minister of Health.</p>
<p>4.7 A Special Standing Committee on Major Research Facilities should be convened by the CSA and report regularly to NACRI The committee would advise NACRI and the Government of Canada on coordination and oversight for the life cycle of federally supported NRFs.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>A Special Standing Committee on Major Research Facilities has not been convened.</p> <p>However, in 2018, the Prime Minister asked the Chief Science Advisor (CSA) to “provide advice on a strategic national approach for (major) research facilities.” Following (inter)national consultations, the CSA recommended that “the government adopt a portfolio approach to its major research facilities, with a central steward to handle oversight and long-range planning of its investments” and to conduct “cyclical five-year reviews of each facility...using independent experts to determine future plans and ensure the continued excellence and relevance of these facilities.”</p>
<p>4.8 Ongoing interactions and annual in-person meetings should be established to strengthen collaborative research relationships among federal, provincial, and territorial departments with major intramural or extramural research commitments The CSA, with advice from NACRI, should take the lead in promoting a shared agenda on matters of national</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>We recognize that this recommendation falls under the Chief Science Advisor’s mandate, i.e. “promot[ing] a positive and productive dialogue between federal scientists and academia, both in Canada and abroad.” There have been ongoing interactions among federal, provincial and territorial departments, but nevertheless, it is unclear whether substantial progress has been made to strengthen research</p>

<p>concern, such as human resource planning to strengthen research and innovation across Canada.</p>		<p>relationships.</p>
<p>4.9 The Government of Canada should propose and initiate planning for a First Ministers' Conference on Research Excellence in 2017 The conference would celebrate and cement a shared commitment to global leadership in science and scholarly inquiry as part of Canada's sesquicentennial celebrations.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>There has been no First Ministers' Conference on Research Excellence in 2017, or since then.</p>
<p>4.10 The Ministers of Science and Health should mandate the formation of a formal coordinating board for CFI, CIHR, SSHRC, and NSERC, chaired by the CSA The membership of the new Four Agency Coordinating Board would include the four agency heads, departmental officials, and external experts. Reporting to the Ministers of Science and Health, the Coordinating Board would expeditiously determine and implement avenues for harmonization, collaboration, and coordination of programs, peer review procedures, and administration.</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p>	<p>In 2018, the Canada Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) was convened "to achieve greater harmonization, integration and coordination of research-related programs and policies and to address issues of common concern to the granting agencies and the CFI."</p> <p>It consists of agency heads (NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR, CFI) and departmental officials (the Deputy Minister of Health Canada, and Deputy Minister of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada). The President of the National Research Council of Canada is also a member of the CRCC.</p> <p>The CRCC is not chaired by the CSA. Instead, the role rotates on an annual basis among one of the presidents of the three federal granting agencies.</p>
<p>4.11 The Government of Canada should undertake a comprehensive review to modernize and, where possible, harmonize the legislation for the four agencies that support extramural research The review would clarify accountabilities and selection processes for agency governing bodies and presidents, promote good governance and exemplary peer review practices, and give priority to inter-agency collaboration and coordination.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>While there are some ongoing efforts to promote inter-agency collaboration and coordination (e.g., the CRCC), the legislation of the four agencies has not yet been harmonized, to the best of our knowledge.</p>

Chapter 5: Allocation and Adjudication: Shared Challenges and Recommended Solutions

Recommendation	Status	Details
<p>5.1 NACRI should be asked to review the current allocation of funding across the granting councils. It should recommend changes that would allow the Government of Canada to maximize the ability of researchers across disciplines to carry out world-leading research. Particular attention should be paid to evidence that ongoing program changes have adversely affected the funding opportunities for scholars in the social sciences and humanities.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation (CSI) body is still pending. It is unclear whether a formal review of the current allocation of funding across granting councils has taken place.</p> <p>There has been limited progress to address the flagged issues (e.g., new funding allocations to the Tri-Agency, see recommendation 6.1).</p>
<p>5.2 The Government of Canada should direct the new Four Agency Coordinating Board to develop and harmonize funding strategies across the agencies, using a lifecycle approach that balances the needs and prospects of researchers at different stages of their careers.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>The new Canada Research Coordinating Committee's (CRCC) work plan for 2019-20 included the objective to "review funding programs to identify gaps and linkages and to align opportunities for researchers at all stages of their careers." In addition, the tri-agency grants management solution (TGMS) initiative is currently in progress to harmonize and modernize the tri-agency grants management. The last public update (2020) indicates that initial consultations are complete, and that testing of "proof of concept" solutions will now take place.</p> <p>The Canada Graduate Scholarship (CGS) is one example of a program that has been harmonized across the tri-agency. However, almost all other funding strategies remain outstanding when it comes to harmonization.</p>
<p>5.3 The new Four Agency Coordinating Board should create a mechanism for harmonization as well as continuous oversight and improvement of peer review practices across the three councils and CFI.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>A Tri-Agency Interdisciplinary Peer Review Committee is being piloted for the SSHRC 2021-2022 Insight Grants, CIHR Fall 2021 Project Grant, and NSERC 2022 Discovery Horizons Grants funding opportunities.</p> <p>Additionally, improved peer review practices are being implemented in certain programs. For example, the CRCC established the New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRF). This included innovative merit review processes, such as proof-of-concept applications, pass-or-fail assessment, double-blind review, and a</p>

		sandpit for targeted calls.
<p>5.4 The Four Agency Coordinating Board should develop consistent and coordinated policies to achieve better equity and diversity outcomes in the allocation of research funding while sustaining excellence as the key decision-making criterion. This priority intersects efforts to improve peer review practices and requires a multipronged approach.</p>	IN PROGRESS	<p>Budget 2018 included commitments to collect improved demographic data on researchers, and implement programs that support improved EDI at post-secondary institutions.</p> <p>In March 2019, a pilot Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Institutional Capacity Building Grant program awarded \$5.3 million to small universities and colleges to help advance EDI. In September 2019, the Tri-Agency issued a Statement on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI). The Tri-Agency EDI Action Plan for 2018-2025 was also updated. This was followed by the launch of the Dimensions pilot by the tri-agency in September 2019. 17 post-secondary institutions are currently participating in the pilot.</p> <p>There are also various ongoing actions related to this recommendation. This includes the harmonized collection and analysis of self-identification data for research team members, and a harmonized EDI training plan for the four agencies. Similarly, research funds, such as the New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRF), have developed a Best Practices in Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Research guide for applicants.</p> <p>We recognize that this is a long-term file. While progress is ongoing, the success of these measures (i.e. better equity and diversity outcomes) will only become evident in the years to come.</p>
<p>5.5 The federal ministers responsible should consider hard equity targets and quotas where persistent and unacceptable disparities exist, and agencies and institutions are clearly not meeting reasonable objectives.</p>	IN PROGRESS	<p>In May 2017, the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program implemented an Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan, as recommended in the 15th year evaluation of the program. Institutions exceeded their equity targets for women, visible minorities, persons with disabilities and Indigenous peoples in December 2019. New, higher targets have been set for a 2029 deadline.</p> <p>Budget 2018 also required the granting councils to “publish an annual report for Canadians on progress in addressing challenges in the research system, including equity and diversity, and support for researchers at various career stages.” While certain aspects are reported, the annual report is left outstanding, to the best of our knowledge.</p>

<p>5.6 The four agencies should examine best practices in supporting early career researchers, augment their support of them consistently across disciplines, and track and report publicly on the outcomes.</p>	<p>COMPLETE*</p>	<p>In 2019, the Tri-Agency updated and harmonized its definition for early career researchers, including crediting all eligible leaves as twice the amount of time taken. The Tri-Agency also updated its ECR Action Plan to include two measurable objectives (including shared performance indicators): fair access to tri-agency research support, and equitable participation in the research ecosystem.</p> <p>The Tri-Agency has also committed to dedicating a portion of funding to ECR-led projects, and a common approach to report on ECR participation in investigator-initiated research programs. Balanced ECR funding was implemented in the 2019-20 NSERC's Discovery Grants and the New Frontiers and Research Fund.</p> <p>Past federal budgets have also made relevant commitments: 250 Tier 2 Canada Research Chairs to emerging researchers (2018), and a 12-month parental leave coverage for students and postdoctoral fellows who are funded directly or indirectly by tri-agency funds (2019). (See more in recommendation 7.1.)</p> <p>However, the pandemic has significantly impacted graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and early-career researchers. So while this recommendation is technically complete, the actions taken may fall short of better supporting this demographic, given the ongoing impacts of the pandemic.</p>
<p>5.7 The three granting councils should collaborate in developing a comprehensive strategic plan to promote and provide long-term support for Indigenous research, with the goal of enhancing research and training by and with Indigenous researchers and communities. The plan should be guided by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's recommendations on research as a key resource.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>The Canada Research Coordinating Committee's 2018-19 work plan included a commitment to "developing, in partnership with Indigenous communities, an interdisciplinary Indigenous research and research training model that contributes to reconciliation with First Nations, Métis and Inuit." This resulted in various forms of consultation, including regional roundtables, 110 position papers, and a National Dialogue event. In December 2019, the Tri-Agency released a strategic plan: <i>Setting New Directions to Support Indigenous Research and Research Training in Canada</i>.</p> <p>There were several investments in Budget 2019 to support Indigenous people's access to post-secondary education. As mentioned above (recommendation 5.5), there are CRC equity targets related to Indigenous peoples for academic institutions to achieve. However, progress on committing to long-term support for Indigenous research remains unclear.</p>

<p>5.8 NACRI should be mandated not only to review proposals to create new third-party delivery organizations, but also to assess ongoing activities of all existing third-party organizations that receive federal support. It should guide their formal periodic review processes and advise the Government of Canada on the continuation, modification, or termination of their contribution agreements.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation (CSI) body is still pending. However, Budget 2018 noted that “the government will consider a new approach to determine how to allocate federal funding to third-party research organizations, as advocated by Canada’s Fundamental Science Review.”</p> <p>It is unclear if a formal review did take place or not, but Budget 2019 announced a new Strategic Science Fund (SSF) beginning in 2022-23, which would use a “principles-based framework to make decisions about allocating federal funding to third party organizations.” The call for SSF applications is now open, and is being jointly administered by Health Canada, and Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.</p> <p>It remains to be seen what actions will be taken to assess ongoing activities of all existing third-party organizations that receive federal support.</p>
<p>5.9 When the intent is to support independent research, requirements for matching funds should be used sparingly and in a coordinated and targeted manner. In general, matching requirements should be limited to those situations where the co-funder derives a tangible benefit.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>It is unclear what progress has been made on this recommendation, though it remains as important as ever.</p>

Chapter 6: Funding The Research Ecosystem: Three Key Ingredients

Recommendation	Status	Details
<p>6.1 The Government of Canada should rapidly increase its investment in independent investigator-led research to redress the imbalance caused by differential investments favouring priority-driven research over the past decade.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>Budget 2018 committed to funding \$925 million over five years for the Tri-Agency, starting with \$115 million in 2018-19, and \$235 million per year ongoing. While this commitment was not specific to addressing the imbalance in investigator-led research, it met 57% of the original FSR recommendation (an increase of \$485 million in investigator-led direct project funding, phased in over four years, totaling \$1.2 billion).</p> <p>Budget 2021 also included a commitment of \$250 million over four years for the federal research granting councils to create a new tri-council biomedical research fund. It remains unclear how this funding will be utilized, and to what extent the imbalance between investigator-led and priority-led research will be addressed.</p>
<p>6.2 The Government of Canada should direct the Four Agency Coordinating Board to amend the terms of the NCE program so as to include the fostering of collaborative multi-centre strength in basic research in all disciplines.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>In December 2018, the Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE) program stopped accepting new applications, and was transferred to the New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRF). The NFRF largely supports interdisciplinary research, and has not significantly expanded options for researchers pursuing basic research.</p>
<p>6.3 The Government of Canada should direct the granting councils to undertake an interim evaluation of the CFREF program before the third wave of awards is made. The CSA and NACRI should be engaged in the design of the review. The results would guide a decision on whether to launch or defer</p>	<p>COMPLETE*</p>	<p>The Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS), housed within SSHRC, submitted an evaluation report for the Canada First Research Excellence Program (CFREF) in January 2021. The report states that “although it was too early in the program’s lifecycle to assess the longer-term expected results of investing at the institutional level, the program remains relevant, has largely met its immediate outcomes...and demonstrated progress toward some of its intermediate outcomes.” The report also notes questions about the sustainability of the transformational changes brought about by the CFREF.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the CSA was engaged in the review design. As mentioned above, NACRI does not exist, and the equivalent Council on Science and Innovation is still pending.</p>

<p>the program's third round, but not impede the fulfilment of existing commitments.</p>		<p>On August 5 2021, it was announced that the next CFREF competition will launch in fall 2021. The announcement stated that "modifications to the design and delivery will be made for the next competition." A Management Response and Action Plan was also shared (with target dates). It remains to be seen whether the report recommendations will be implemented in time.</p>
<p>6.4 The Government of Canada should mandate the Four Agency Coordinating Board to develop multi-agency strategies to support international research collaborations and modify existing funding programs so as to strengthen international partnerships.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>In January 2020, the CRCC released the <i>International Framework: Statement of Objectives and Principles</i> to serve as a reference that complements the international strategies of CRCC member agencies and applies when agencies have converging or intersecting international priorities.</p> <p>It is unclear to what extent existing funding programs have been modified to strengthen international partnerships.</p> <p>There are some new multi-agencies strategies to support international collaborations. For example, the Tri-Agency and four UK Research and Innovation councils launched the Canada-UK Artificial Intelligence initiative, and the New Frontiers in Research Fund hosted an international stream (the 2020 Horizon Global Platform Competition).</p>
<p>6.5 The Government of Canada should mandate the Four Agency Coordinating Board to develop strategies to encourage, facilitate, evaluate, and support multidisciplinary research.</p>	<p>COMPLETE*</p>	<p>Budget 2018 committed an additional \$275 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, and \$65 million per year ongoing, to create the New Frontiers in Research Fund (NFRF), which will "support research that is international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking and higher-risk." The NFRF is under the strategic direction of the CRCC, and is administered by the Tri-Agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (housed within SSHRC). The FSR had recommended that \$80 million of the increase for investigator-led research should be earmarked to this fund, phased in over four years.</p>
<p>6.6 The Government of Canada should mandate the granting councils to encourage and better support high-risk research with the potential for high impact.</p>	<p>COMPLETE*</p>	<p>The FSR also stated that "because demands on this fund would be intermittent and unpredictable, it could easily be structured alongside the international, multidisciplinary and/or [high-risk, high reward] research funds on a contingent basis." The NFRF follows this structure.</p> <p>Given that the NFRF is addressing multiple objectives, it remains to be seen how this program will be evaluated, and how effective it will be in encouraging and supporting multi-disciplinary and high-risk research.</p>

<p>6.7 The Government of Canada should mandate the granting councils to arrive at a joint mechanism to ensure that funds and rapid review mechanisms are available for response to fast-breaking issues.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>To the best of our knowledge, no such joint mechanism has been mandated or created yet.</p> <p>It should be noted that amid the pandemic, outside of normal mechanisms, the Government of Canada invested nearly \$27 million to fund research related to COVID-19, via the Tri-Agency, the New Frontiers in Research Fund, the International Development Research Centre, and Genome Canada. This could serve as a starting point to build a joint mechanism for future joint rapid review mechanisms for fast-breaking issues.</p>
<p>6.8 The Government of Canada should provide CFI with a stable annual budget scaled at minimum to its recent annual outlays.</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p>	<p>Budget 2018 committed \$763 million over five years to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), starting in 2018-19, with a proposal to establish permanent funding at \$462 million per year by 2023. This was followed up in Budget 2021, with a commitment of \$500 million over four years to support the bio-science capital and infrastructure needs of post-secondary institutions and research hospitals.</p>
<p>6.9 The Government of Canada should consolidate the organizations that provide digital research infrastructure, starting with a merger of Compute Canada and CANARIE. It should provide the new organization with long-term funding and a mandate to lead in developing a national DRI strategy.</p>	<p>COMPLETE*</p>	<p>Budget 2018 committed \$572.5 million to implement a Digital Research Infrastructure (DRI) Strategy.</p> <p>Compute Canada and CANARIE have not merged. ISED contributed \$137 million from 2020 to 2024 to fund CANARIE to deliver on three main objectives: network operations, technology innovation, and private sector innovation. The Canada Foundation for Innovation is funding Compute Canada (until March 31, 2022) to maintain researchers' access to advanced research computing and services, and for Compute Canada to provide strategic planning to position the national DRI system for future success.</p> <p>ISED has committed up to \$375 million of its five-year funding to establish a new national not-for-profit organization in 2019, titled the New Digital Research Infrastructure Organization (NDRIO). NDRIO is coordinating and funding activities in advanced research computing, research data management and research software components of the DRI strategy.</p> <p>Overall, while this recommendation is complete, a consolidation of the organizations that provide digital research infrastructure has not taken place.</p>
<p>6.10 The Government of Canada should mandate and fund CFI to increase its share of the matching ratio for national-</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p>	<p>In 2019, the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) made two changes to the Major Science Initiatives Fund: an increase of its share of funding from 40 percent to 60 percent of a facility's operating and maintenance costs for the subset of facilities identified as being of major scale, and to extend the funding cycle from five to six years.</p>

<p>scale major research facilities from 40 to 60 per cent.</p>		<p>The FSR had recommended that \$35 million per year be provided to change the sharing ratio for operating costs to 60:40. This recommendation was largely met as Budget 2018 allocated \$160 million to CFI's Major Science Initiatives Fund (i.e. \$32 million per year).</p>
<p>6.11 The Government of Canada should mandate and fund CFI to meet the special operating needs of individual researchers with small capital awards.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>Though new funding was provided to CFI in Budgets 2018 & 2021, it is unclear if this money will go towards small capital awards.</p> <p>The FSR had recommended that \$30 million per year be provided to increase the operating support available to recipients of small capital awards. The FSR also stated that the target level of operating support for small infrastructure should cover the equivalent of two years of operating support, and to be earmarked for individual research applicants as needed.</p>

Chapter 7: Funding The Research Ecosystem: Two More Elements and Cost Analyses

Recommendation	Status	Details
<p>7.1 The Government of Canada should direct the Four Agency Coordinating Board to oversee a tri-council process to reinvigorate and harmonize scholarship and fellowship programs, and rationalize and optimize the use of current awards to attract international talent.</p>	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>The Canada Graduate Scholarship - Doctoral (CGS-D) has been harmonized across the tri-agency. Almost all other funding strategies remain outstanding.</p> <p>Budget 2019 committed \$114 million over five years, starting in 2019–20, with \$26.5 million per year ongoing, to the Tri-Agency, to create 500 more master’s level scholarship awards annually and 167 more three-year doctoral scholarship awards annually through the CGS program. This falls slightly short of the FSR recommendation of \$140 million per year, over four years. In addition, any attempt to reinvigorate scholarship and fellowship programs must also account for the ongoing impacts of the pandemic on graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and early-career researchers.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether progress has been made to optimize the use of current awards to attract international talent.</p>
<p>7.2 The Government of Canada should renew the CRC program on a strategic basis in three stages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restore funding to 2012 levels, upon development of a plan by the granting councils and Chairs Secretariat to allocate the new Chairs asymmetrically in favour of Tier 2 Chairs, and increase the uptake of available funds through improved logistics in managing numbers and reduced delays in awarding Chairs; 2. Direct the granting councils to cap the number of renewals of Tier 1 Chairs and, in concert with universities and CFI, develop a plan to reinvigorate international recruitment and retention, for review by NACRI and approval by 	<p>IN PROGRESS</p>	<p>Budget 2018 committed \$210 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, with \$50 million per year ongoing, for the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program. The following changes were made to the CRC program: Tier 1 Chairs were limited to a single renewal (allowing for a maximum of two, seven-year terms), universities were allowed to convert chairs between Tier 1 and 2 (until Dec 2019), and there was a revision in the distribution of chair allocations across the Tri-Agency.</p> <p>In 2020, the Government of Canada reported that it has invested \$195 million to support 259 new and renewed CRCs. This was complemented by the Canada Foundation for Innovation, which provided \$14 million to 57 CRCs at 27 universities to support research infrastructure.</p>

<p>the government; and 3. On approval of that plan, adjust the value of the CRCs to account for their loss in value due to inflation since 2000.</p>		<p>The FSR had recommended that the CRC program be renewed at a cost of \$140 million per year, phased in over two years.</p> <p>It is unclear whether a plan to reinvigorate international recruitment and retention has been developed.</p>
<p>7.3 The Government of Canada should gradually increase funding to the RSF until the reimbursement rate is 40 per cent for all institutions with more than \$7 million per year of eligible funding. Current thresholds should be maintained to enable additional support for smaller institutions. As the size of the envelope of RSF-eligible operating grants grows, the funding of the RSF should be increased in lock-step to sustain the reimbursement rate of F&A costs on a trajectory towards this 40 per cent goal.</p>	<p>UNRESOLVED</p>	<p>While Budget 2018 included some funding to the Research Support Fund (RSF, \$231.3 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, with \$58.8 million per year ongoing), there was no change to the RSF rate in line with the FSR's recommendation. The FSR had recommended that funding be provided to move coverage of facilities and administration (F&A) costs from 21% to 40%.</p>