

## Evaluation Criteria – Equipment Fund

At NBIF, we do not conduct peer reviews and are therefore are not evaluating the application on its scientific merit, however, the expectation is that you are submitting an application that is scientifically sound, which can be demonstrated through Tri-council (or other organizations) reviews, earlier or other publications of your work in the given area, letters of support from industrial partners applying the innovation or other similar means.

It is assumed that applications are written in plain language (where possible), while addressing the evaluation criteria listed below:

1.	<p>Is the project as described innovative?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the project use an innovative process or program to solve a well-defined problem for New Brunswickers?</li> <li>b. Are you adapting an existing technology for a new purpose?</li> </ul>
2.	<p>Will the equipment support innovative projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the project use an innovative process or program to solve a well-defined problem for New Brunswickers?</li> <li>b. Are you adapting an existing technology for a new purpose?</li> </ul>
3.	<p>Is there potential socioeconomic impact (direct or indirect) for NB as a result of this work and is the pathway to impact well delineated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is there a potential for economic spin off from this work?</li> <li>b. Is commercialization anticipated at a later stage in this project?</li> <li>c. Are there potential indirect socio-economic impacts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Will the results of the work be leveraged to form policy, inform government decisions or best practices, inform more efficient use of public funds or contribute to a knowledge base that can be leveraged by the non-for-profit sector and public at large?</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Is knowledge mobilization/translation planning in place for the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Have sufficient efforts have been made to explain the plans for the knowledge generated from the use of the equipment so that it is communicated beyond the scientific community?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

4.	<p>Have the principal investigator and their collaborators demonstrated capacity to execute the project – in terms of the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Infrastructure and Equipment (lab space and capacity, industrial partnerships).</li> <li>b. Personnel (both directly in the PI’s team and the collaborators engaged, be they primary researchers, post-docs or students).</li> <li>c. Support from the PIs institution (course release, direct funding, support for students, letters of support).</li> <li>c. The principal investigator and their collaborators in the project have good standing within their specific field of study.</li> </ul>
5.	<p>Is the equipment requested intended for use that is demonstrably different from capacity that already exists in the province?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There are uses that would enable further leverage for the equipment, such as non-academic applications or fee for service work.</li> <li>b. There are uses for the equipment beyond the scope of the current project.</li> </ul>

