Opening remarks (Adrian Mota)
- CCV scheduled maintenance & CIHR website will be down in later in December; ResearchNet should still be accessible.
- CIHR President search remains underway; interviews are in progress with a short-list. Anticipate a second round of interviews. This search is lead by the Privy Council (not CIHR). They anticipate an announcement in late Winter (January?).
- Peer Review Committee survey underway; mandates & peer review process; Encourage entire research community to give feedback and input. Here is site:
  Project Grant Fall 2017 - Health Research Community Survey on Peer Review Committees
  https://na1se.voxco.com/SE/?st=W5fbGhUKCRI%2fXDBUQKuPZvyo0klH05E8Xcm0Cggd5QU%3d&lang=en
- (David) Canada’s Fundamental Science Review led to report on Investing in Canada’s Future (aka Naylor Report, April 2017) with 35 recommendations to focus on system-wide coordination; coordination among federal granting agencies & CFI, and reinvestment in research ecosystem; Government responded (Aug 2017) outlining initial actions including creating a new governing structure: Canada Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) with deputy heads of government agencies/depts.
  - Membership is announced including presidents of granting councils, senior government officials (including Simon Kennedy); Invitations for Subject Matter Experts will be sent; Open letter was sent by Ministers of Science to outline initial priorities (international & interdisciplinary research); Inaugural meeting is anticipated to take place before end of 2017.
  - Priorities include:
    - Strengthen Canada’s capacity to engage in a rapidly evolving global research landscape;
    - Advance efforts in key emerging areas;
    - Strengthen equity and diversity in research;
    - Increase the capacity of Indigenous communities to conduct research and partners with the broader research community;
    - Improve support for the next generation of scholars.
  - Dr. Mona Nemer was appointed Chief Science Advisor; who reports directly to Prime Minister & Minister of Science; One of her roles include ensuring that federal scientists are free to speak about their work.
  - CIHR intends to have an active role on the CRCC; Identified opportunity for CIHR to provide expert advice directly to Chief Science Advisor. Alana Yuill is Chief of Staff to CIHR’s President who can help facilitate work between CIHR & CRCC.
  - Q – Are there any updates about the Minister of Health and her letter of support? Adrian – Minister seemed very engaged during a recent visit to better understand how research can inform practical issues in health.

Project Competition update (Kelly Taylor)
- Review process nearly complete (51 out of 65); process is going well.
- Extremely positive feedback emerging: 2 SOs; 3 Reviewers; Multidisciplinary applications handled well so far; Mandates seem to be largely satisfactory (a few exceptions; feedback from survey is important)
- Committees meet over 5 weeks (Nov 14 to Dec 14); a total of 65 committee meetings.
- Anticipate notice of decision on January 23rd.

Notes are informal means of communication only. Notes do not replace any official communication from CIHR. Content outlined was stated as suitable for public release. (No embargoed/confidential information included, as per CIHR UD agreement.)
- Q – Is it possible to have the Notice of Decision released early, when the next competition deadline is short? Kelly – Thank you for this suggestion; will take this back to the team. Timeline was explained….. will see what can be done to expedite the timeline. Adrian – In the past, we did use a Notice of Offer (?) without reviews to give people a sense if they will still need to apply to next competition. They will look into this in the future.
- Q – Some committees were too large. Adrian – Thank you, we will take this into account with balance of necessary expertise.
- Q – What is conflict of interest regarding being from same institution? Kelly – No, being from same institution / university does not mean there is necessarily a conflict of interest.
- Q – Kudos to CIHR for new review structure and pulling this off. Fantastic work. (Echoed by many UD’s)
- Q – Where should concerns about peer review be sent? Adrian – Send to general email address and they will ensure email gets to correct person.
- Q – My panel was not diverse in terms of members or institutions. What is plan for “rejuvenation”? Kelly – For now, they hope to have some stability for next committee; but will work with College and feedback to begin to address composition for the next competitions. Adrian – There are also issues related to diversity in terms of sex, gender, expertise, institutions that they aim to balance as well. This is on their radar.

Foundation Competition update (Kelly Taylor? Unsure – NOT Dale Dempsey)
- Decisions have been finalized and will be released today for Stage 1. Many thanks to reviewers.
- Budget was released this morning - $100M (as opposed to $125M, which was approved by Governing Council; directly linked to application pressure that was lower for Foundation; funds will be transferred to Project, which had higher application pressure)
- Full summary of results will be posted tomorrow (Friday, December 8)
- 303 applications for Stage 1; 187 are invited to Stage 2. CIHR is committee to gender equity; this has been met (proportion is equivalent to application). Applicants invited to Stage 2 will also receive information about baseline budget.
- Changes to review process for remainder of this competition are not feasible. The process is under review by the Project Review Committee (Terry Schmidt?). Considering: size of program; eligibility criteria; exit strategy; mid- & senior- career researchers. Will continue to work on decisions going forward and will inform scientific community.
- Q – Online discussion leaves much to be desired. Adrian – Thank you for comment. Will be sure committee is aware of this issue going forward.
- Q – Why is there reduction in application pressure to Foundation? Adrian – We are looking into this. We believe that some reason is because there was a call to cancel program and other issues related to how to exit.
- Q – Did you need to adjust the proportions due to gender equity? Kelly – Yes; the number moving forward was adjusted to reflect this equity. There were 28% women.
- Q – It seems like a large number to bring forward given the funding amount? Adrian – Yes, and some of this is due to logistics given the ranking model that is used in the Foundation scheme.
- Foundation Grant Program Review Committee: http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/50647.html
- Q – Have you considered transforming those who hold a Foundation grant into a Project grant so they can apply to the next competition? Kelly – Yes, this has been considered, along with a number of options being discussed by the committee. There are a number of decisions we are working through.
College of Reviewers (Stephanie Robertson & Allison)
- Will soon share announcement from Paul Kubes and Jane Rylet.
- Under 4000 members after first 2 phases; will begin next phase of enrollment in late January. UDs will be copied on correspondence to institutions with names of current members and proposed members.
- Will soon consult with UDs about toolkits, by way of surveys, to consider the use of simulations in training for peer reviewers, outside of the actual process (train the trainer); hope is to expand reach and teach about the process; this also has goal of helping to facilitate grant writing as well. Plan to pilot this process, and then modify the tools accordingly.
- Q – When will college be “live”? Stephanie – College is live as of now. We can come back with more information; 2/3 of project committee members were college members; working closely with Kelly’s teams to staff competitions and strategic programs; functional elements of college are in place. Allison – We are seeing great success; ~80% acceptance rate for college membership; working out kinks; still ramping up programs (observer program for ECIs; unconscious bias); will expand college reach soon.
- Q – How will institutions be selected for beta testing of toolkits? Stephanie/Allison – Will provide opportunity to let know if you are interested.
- Q – You indicated you would post name in searchable database for College of Reviewers. Allison – Yes, this is still underway. Need to be sure that members agree to be listed and sort out logistics to post 4000 names.
- Q – Will observer program continue? Allison – Yes. It is still in development with Observer2.0 program will look like. Suggestion to have observer shadow reviewer will be considered.
- Some committees have also raised concerns: Attachments (# pages); More info about budget by applicant; Increased streamlining had support; Budget caps, especially given caps. CIHR is aware of these emerging themes and thinking of next steps for these.

General Discussion
- Next UD meeting is January 11, 2018.