

THE FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCE REVIEW: WHERE ARE WE AT?

In 2017, the federal government commissioned a review of Canada's fundamental science and research ecosystem. The review, conducted by Dr. David Naylor and a panel of selected experts, made several key recommendations which aimed to improve the state of fundamental research in Canada.

In response to the review, many new investments in science and research have been made. But, how far have we come in addressing each of the Fundamental Science Review recommendations?

The following document takes a step-by-step approach, looking at each recommendation, what has been addressed, and what is still outstanding.

DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Streamlining of Innovation Programs

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- As recommended by the Advisory Council on Economic Growth, Budget 2017's Innovation and Skills Plan (page 78) announced a review of all business innovation programs to "make the services provided more responsive to client needs, more efficient and better able to promote business growth".
- The review took place across 20 federal departments and agencies, and was the first such review of all the innovation programs together.
- After the review, Budget 2018 (page 101) announced a streamlining of innovation programs into a suite of programs based on four principles that is easy to navigate and will respond to the challenges and opportunities facing Canadian businesses today and into the future. Total overall funding for innovation programming will increase, but the reform will see a reduction in the total number of business innovation programs by up to two-thirds -- a streamlining of innovation programs from 92 to 35.

National Advisory Council on Research and Innovation (NACRI)

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 4.2

The Science, Technology and Innovation Council should be wound down as NACRI is established.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- In January 2019, the government announced the creation of a new [Council on Science and Innovation](#) to replace the S&T Innovation Council (STIC).
- CSI is described as “an independent advisory body mandated to provide the Ministers with expert advice on policy issues related to science and innovation” who will “support the Government of Canada’s efforts to strengthen the science and research ecosystem and stimulate innovation across the country’s economy.”
- Unlike STIC, CSI advice will be made public, unless requested by a Minister.
- The CSI will be mandated to: “(1) provide evidence-based analysis and policy advice to the Ministers on complex issues that require background research and consultations/engagement with experts, stakeholders and/or civil society; (2) provide a “sounding board” for the Ministers on short-term and/or urgent issues; and, (3) publicly report on science and innovation issues of importance to the Government of Canada and to Canadian citizens”.
- Although the CSI has not been staffed, members will include a Chairperson and 11 members from the scientific and research community, the private sector, and civil society. The ex-officio Vice-Chair will be the Chief Science Advisor, and the Deputy Ministers of ISED and Health will serve as ex-officio members. Ministers will have the discretion to add additional ex-officio appointments as needed/appropriate.
- At this point, CSI has been announced, but has not been formally created or staffed, nor is the mandate fully clarified. It will be important to monitor progress on CSI moving forward.

Evidence-Informed Decision-Making**Recommendation 4.5**

The Privy Council Office, working with departmental officials and the newly appointed CSA, should examine mechanisms to achieve improved whole-of-government coordination and collaboration for intramural research and evidence-based policy-making.

Status: MOSTLY OUTSTANDING

- There have been some measures to address this though mostly indirectly. For example:
 - **DMSC:** The government recently reviewed and re-imagined the mandate of the former Deputy Minister Science & Technology Committee into the new “Deputy Minister Science Committee (DMSC)”. The committee “Supports the Government’s overall science agenda by overseeing, promoting and encouraging the collective management of federal intramural science with visible leadership and accountability. It aims to strengthen the capacity of the government to lead scientific action by undertaking science and in an integrated and coordinated way where mandates are aligned.”
 - **The Chief Science Advisor:** The new CSA, Dr. Mona Nemer, proposes new solutions for evidence-informed decision-making in her new [annual report](#), such as implementation of Departmental Science Advisors (DSAs) to support her role across the government. DSAs have already been implemented in a number of departments, including the Canada Space Agency and the National Research Council, and one is forthcoming at Environment and Climate Change Canada.

- However, to our knowledge, no formal examination of these mechanisms has been conducted by the Privy Council Office and/or CSA

Major Research Facilities**Recommendation 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 MRFs.

Status: ONGOING?

- Although there has been no formal announcement or action taken yet, we have heard that an announcement on this recommendation may come soon.

Coordination on science and research between federal, provincial and territorial governments**Recommendation 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 concern, such as human resource planning to strengthen research and innovation across Canada.

Recommendation 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.

Status: MOSTLY OUTSTANDING

- Regarding intramural-extramural coordination, as a part of her mandate, the new Chief Science Advisor “promotes a positive and productive dialogue between federal scientists and academia, both in Canada and abroad”. Thus the CSA herself is expected to improve connections between intramural and extramural science and research communities. However, there are still many barriers in coordination between these communities. This is outlined in the CSA’s first [annual report](#).
- There has been no First Minister’s Conference on Research Excellence held to this point.

Coordination between the federal granting councils

Recommendation 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.

Status: COMPLETED

- The [Canada Research Coordinating Committee](#) was formed in 2018 to “improve the coordination efforts of Canada’s granting agencies” including NSERC, CIHR, SSHRC and CFI. CRCC is mandated 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.
- CRCC membership includes the four agency heads, the Chief Science Advisor, and deputy heads from Health Canada, ISED and the National Research Council.

Recommendation 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.

Status: MOSTLY OUTSTANDING

- While the CRCC was created, and includes the senior leadership of the tri-councils, the legislation of the tri-councils has not been harmonized, to our knowledge.

Tri-council Funding

Increases in funding to the tri-councils

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Status: PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

- Budget 2018 made new investment of \$925 million over 5 years for fundamental research through the granting councils (page 88). Specifically:
 - \$354.7 million over five years (\$90.1 million per year ongoing) to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC)
 - \$354.7 million over five years (\$90.1 million per year ongoing) to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)
 - \$215.5 million over five years (\$54.8 million per year ongoing) to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).
- As well, Budget 2018 (page 88) aimed to enhance interdisciplinary research through an additional \$275 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, and \$65 million per year ongoing for a new tri-council fund to “support research that is international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking and higher-risk.” This new fund has now opened and is called the [“Frontiers in Research Fund”](#). However, there have been some [concerns among the community](#) about the submission process, and apprehension that approval rates will be low. There may be challenges moving forward.
- While these new funds are encouraging, the new tri-council investment is only roughly 60% of the original amount suggested by the Naylor report (\$1.2 Billion over 4 years to “core” open competition programs for fundamental research was recommended vs. \$690 Million over the first 4 years actually committed in Budget 2018). This is more explicitly outlined below.

Investments in Canadian Research in Investigator-Led Direct Project Funding (\$Millions)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total over first four years
Proposed in Naylor Report (exhibit 7.2)	135	270	405	405	1.2 Billion
Funded in Budget 2018 (NSERC)	44	59	71	90	264 Million
Funded in Budget 2018 (CIHR)	44	59	71	90	264 Million
Funded in Budget 2018 (SSHRC)	27	36	43	55	161 Million

Funded in Budget 2018 (total tri-council for fundamental research)	115	154	185	235	689 Million
Difference between proposed and actual funding	In the first four years, Budget 2018 investments in the tri-councils amounts to \$689 Million, which is 56.7% of the amount proposed by the Naylor report				

- As well, there were no significant steps taken to emphasize the challenges in the social sciences.

Harmonizing award amounts across the tri-councils

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Status: PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

- The Government has not yet harmonized funding strategies across the agencies. However, one of the priorities of the new CRCC is to “identify means to improve support for the next generation of scholars. This includes advancing harmonization efforts for scholarship programs across the granting councils and addressing issues affecting early-career researchers.”
- As well, CRCC, in their summer 2018 [consultation](#) addressed the following topics creating a new tri-agency fund for international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking, high-risk research; strengthening equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in Canadian research; and improving support for early career researchers (ECRs).

Equality, diversity and inclusivity in tri-council funding

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- CRCC conducted a public [consultation](#) in the summer of 2018. One of the consultation topics addressed “strengthening equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in Canadian research; and improving support for early career researchers (ECRs).”

- From this consultation, CRCC recommended a draft EDI action plan that had three strategic pillars: Fair access to research support; equitable participation and; data for evidence-informed decision making.

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- In May 2017, the Minister of Science announced her new “[Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan](#)” for the Canada Research Chair (CRC) program across all of the tri-agencies. This included new requirements for universities who hold at least 5 Chairs. The plan also requires universities to make their own EDI plans for hiring. Failing to comply could result in a withdrawal of funds. In addition, new changes to the CRC program were implemented, including:
 - Limiting Tier 1 Chairs to a single renewal, allowing chairholders to hold a maximum of two, seven-year terms
 - Allowing universities additional flexibility to convert chairs between Tier 1 and Tier 2 and across disciplines until December 2019, to promote greater uptake of diverse researchers into these prestigious positions; and
 - Revising the distribution of regular chair allocations across the federal research granting councils to promote research excellence in the natural sciences and engineering, health sciences, and social sciences and humanities.
- EDI Canadian Science was one of the key subjects of a [consultation](#) held by the CRCC in Summer 2018. Following the consultation, CRCC drafted an [EDI action plan](#) which has three pillars: fair access to research support; equitable participation and; data for evidence-informed decision-making.
- The government is holding consultations on a [made-in-Canada draft Athena-SWAN charter](#) designed “to encourage and recognize commitments made by post-secondary institutions towards advancing equity, diversity and inclusion in the research community”.
- Broadly, The Government of Canada recently renewed its commitment to Gender Based Analysis Plus, an analytical process used to assess how diverse groups of women, men and non-binary people may experience policies, programs and initiatives.
- Budget 2018 made several new commitments to monitoring EDI in academia including:
 - \$6 million over five years (\$0.5 million ongoing) for surveys to collect improved data on researchers, and \$15 million over five years to implement programs that support improved equality and diversity in academia at post-secondary institutions. (p.89)
 - Starting in 2018, the granting councils will be required to publish an annual report on their progress in addressing challenges in the research system, including equity and diversity, and support for researchers at various career stages. (p.254) This was made one of the priorities of the CRCC.

Early-career researchers

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- Budget 2018 (p.89) made new commitments to support ECRs including new investment of \$210 million over five years, starting in 2018–19, with \$50 million per year ongoing, for the Canada Research Chairs Program. As outlined in the budget, this investment aimed “to better support early-career researchers, while increasing diversity among nominated researchers, including increasing the number of women who are nominated for Canada Research Chairs. This funding will provide the flexibility to improve the program to meet researcher priorities, and could result in, for example, 250 additional Chairs for early-career researchers by 2020–21, and a sizeable increase in funding provided to early-career researchers.”
- As well, Budget 2018 (p.89) proposed “\$6 million over five years (\$0.5 million ongoing) for surveys to collect improved data on researchers, and \$15 million over five years to implement programs that support improved equality and diversity in academia at post-secondary institutions.” This includes ECRs.
- One of the priorities of the CRCC is to “identify means to improve support for the next generation of scholars”. In their [consultation report](#), they make several recommendations for policy changes regarding ECRs
- It will be important to monitor these initiatives to ensure they provide the needed changes for ECRs.

**Indigenous Research
Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- When CRCC was formed in 2017, one of its five priorities was to “support [SSHRC's leadership](#), working in collaboration with the other granting agencies, the CFI and Indigenous communities, in responding to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s call for the establishment of a national research program that will advance understanding of reconciliation.” As a result, the council “[prioritized the need for a national dialogue to co-develop, with First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities, an interdisciplinary, Indigenous research and research training model that contributes to reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.](#)”
- Budget 2018 (p.144) responded to this by providing SSHRC with “\$3.8 million in 2018–19 to develop a strategic plan that identifies new ways of doing research with Indigenous communities, including strategies to grow the capacity of Indigenous communities to conduct research and partner with the broader research community.”
- As well, Budget 2019 (p.48) provided new opportunities for Indigenous students to access and succeed in post-secondary education.

**Scholarships and Fellowships
Recommendation 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.

Status: PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

- Budget 2019 (p.48) provided “\$114 million over five years, starting in 2019–20, with \$26.5 million per year ongoing, to the federal granting councils—the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—to create 500 more master’s level scholarship awards annually and 167 more three-year doctoral scholarship awards annually through the Canada Graduate Scholarship program.”
- However, this amount is still significantly less than the recommendation in the Naylor report (\$140 million for scholarships and fellowships over four years) and does not include funding for postdoctoral fellows.
- As well, the government has not yet taken action on harmonizing scholarship and fellowship amounts across the tri-councils, which would equalize opportunities for trainees across all disciplines.
- It is also recommended that the government consider removal of restrictions on international portability of scholarships so Canadian students can be supported in studying abroad, and return home with new and international skills.

Third-Party Research Organizations

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- Budget 2018 (p.94) announced 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”. In order to “...improve the adaptability and effectiveness of federal research funding, the Government will communicate in the coming year new competitive processes for research institutes and organizations.”
- Following this, Budget 2019 (p.123) announced a new “Strategic Science Fund” beginning in 2022-23. This new fund, accompanied with a principle-based framework will be used to fund third-party research organizations, make funding decisions and consistently reviewing third-party research organizations in a more coordinated, evidence-based way.

Matching Funds

Recommendation 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.

Status: NOT ADDRESSED

- At this point, this recommendation is still outstanding

National Centres of Excellence**Recommendation 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.

Status: NOT ADDRESSED

- As of December 2018, the NCE program has been [ended](#) and no new applications will be taken
- Funding for NCE has been transferred to the [New Frontiers in Research Fund](#) which has now launched. This fund was designed to help support international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking, high-risk research.
- Naylor's original recommendations included lessening knowledge translation requirements of NCE, expanding options for researchers with basic research goals, creating new, smaller NCEs and removing the requirement for corporate structure for NCEs based entirely of academic researchers. It is unclear whether the New Frontiers program will address these recommendations.

Canada First Research Excellence Fund**Recommendation 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 the program's third round, but not impede the fulfilment of existing commitments.

Status: NOT ADDRESSED

- At this point, this recommendation is still outstanding

International, Interdisciplinary and Fast-Breaking Research**Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 6.5

The Government of Canada should mandate the Four Agency Coordinating Board to develop strategies to encourage, facilitate, evaluate, and support multidisciplinary research.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- One of CRCC's 5 [priorities](#) is to "strengthen Canada's capacity to engage in a rapidly evolving global research landscape. To this end, the CRCC will work to improve agency policies and programs in support of international, multidisciplinary, risky and rapid-response research."
- Following the CRCC consultation, Budget 2018 announced \$275 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, and \$65 million per year ongoing for a new tri-council fund to support research that is international, interdisciplinary, fast-breaking and higher-risk. This research fund will be administered by SSHRC.
- This new fund has launched: the "[Frontiers in Research Fund](#)". However, as discussed, the fund has been met with some challenges.

Canada Foundation for Innovation**Recommendation 6.8**

The Government of Canada should provide CFI with a stable annual budget scaled at minimum to its recent annual outlays.

Status: COMPLETED

- Budget 2018 (p.91) committed \$763 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, with proposal to establish permanent funding for the Canadian Foundation for Innovation at \$462 million per year by 2023.
- This included "\$160 million for increased support to Canada's nationally important research facilities through the Foundation's Major Science Initiatives Fund. The Government also proposes to establish permanent funding at an ongoing level of \$462 million per year by 2023–24 for research tools and infrastructure supported through the Canada Foundation for Innovation.
- The investment was publicly announced on March 13th, 2019.

Recommendation 6.10

The Government of Canada should mandate and fund CFI to increase its share of the matching ratio for national-scale major research facilities from 40 to 60 per cent.

Status: OUTSTANDING

- At this point, this recommendation is still outstanding

Recommendation 6.11

The Government of Canada should mandate and fund CFI to meet the special operating needs of individual researchers with small capital awards.

Status: MOSTLY OUTSTANDING

- Though new funding was provided to CFI, it is unclear if this money will go towards small capital awards

Digital Research Infrastructure**Recommendation 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.

Status: ONGOING

- Budget 2018 (p. 92) committed “\$572.5 million over five years, with \$52 million per year ongoing, to implement a Digital Research Infrastructure Strategy that will deliver more open and equitable access to advanced computing and big data resources to researchers across Canada. The Minister of Science will work with interested stakeholders, including provinces, territories and universities, to develop the strategy, including how to incorporate the roles currently played by the Canada Foundation for Innovation, Compute Canada and CANARIE, to provide for more streamlined access for Canadian researchers.”

Canada Research Chairs**Recommendation 7.2**

The Government of Canada should renew the CRC program on a strategic basis in three stages: 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 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.

Status: PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

- Budget 2018 (p. 89) committed “\$210 million over five years, with \$50 million per year ongoing, for a potential of 250 additional CRCs for early-career researchers by 2020–21.
- As well, the following changes were made to the CRC program:
 - Limiting Tier 1 Chairs to a single renewal, allowing chairholders to hold a maximum of two, seven-year terms
 - Allowing universities additional flexibility to convert chairs between Tier 1 and Tier 2 and across disciplines until December 2019, to promote greater uptake of diverse researchers into these prestigious positions; and

- Revising the distribution of regular chair allocations across the federal research granting councils to promote research excellence in the natural sciences and engineering, health sciences, and social sciences and humanities.
- Although the changes to the CRC program are notable, they do not meet the full expansion and renovation recommended in the Fundamental Science Review.

Research Support Fund (RSF)

Recommendation 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.

Status: PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

- While Budget 2018 included some Research Support Fund funding (p. 90; \$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 the report's recommendation.