

1. I believe that more financial support needs to be provided to the commercialization side of new technology. This would help companies bridge the gap between the R&D, and difficult, time consuming job of finding new markets and customers (commercialization). In my experience the engineers and scientists develop new products, but the new products seldom or never find a commercial home, especially if the new products are outside of the current product portfolio of the company. Sales people are often measured on what they sell and a new product is often more difficult to sell than an existing one, so they don't spend the time to sell it that is required. Marketing is often seen as "overhead" and medium to smaller companies often have no dedicated marketing department. If the initial marketing and sales functions could be funded in some way, it would be useful.
2. Figure 2 makes sense.
3. I am not sure as I have never attempted to get risk capital. The companies I have worked for have funded R&D internally.
4. I believe Canadian firms should conduct their own R&D. The key factors that limit investment is the risk adverse nature and short sightedness of many Canadian companies. R&D is risky and most often the projects do not produce anything commercially successful. This is hard for accountants, which control many of the budgets in companies, to accept. Many Canadian companies are not prepared to spend money on long term projects, but are willing to spend it on improving and cost reducing existing products and processes, which are less risky and I think they are quite good at.
5. In my experience most collaboration between Canadian Universities and businesses are not successful. The reasons are many, but primarily it often comes down to "how you are measured and rewarded" University professors are awarded project money based on new creative research and often it has no know application to a commercial product. The professor does not get any more money or recognition if the R&D results in a commercial product and it is very difficult to commercialize from a lab idea to a commercial product. Companies are measured on bottom line profits and if the joint research is not applicable and commercialized quickly the project will not be funded. Also many universities are meant to produce new graduates and while this is necessary, a new graduate in a post graduate degree, wants to get their degree completed quickly and often graduates or finds a job before the project is completed, causing the project to lose focus and often not be picked up by a new student. Another point is the intellectual property. It must belong to the company or there is little incentive or value in developing it and not owning it. Canadian companies feel they fund universities through taxes and thus have already paid for the R and D and now in joint project, they are funding it again and still have no ownership. Why do universities need to receive money from the technology they develop? They are not profit centered or measured on the income they generate. They should get more funding for more research if their R&D is commercialized, otherwise they should join a private company that must make a profit to survive.
6. I don't see a role for the government to become the first customer. This just leads to bad products being developed and forced onto the government agencies.
7. I believe Canada is producing enough technical talent. Unfortunately there is no direct relationship between a post graduate degree and the ability to commercialize a product, so often PhD's are viewed as too technical and not commercially focused, and this is often the case. How do you develop entrepreneurial technical people? Those are the ones that are necessary.
8. We do employ students and find them useful for short term simple projects, but it is difficult to train them for complex jobs or projects since that normally takes several years to develop. A financial incentive for hiring a new graduate student at any level may be a good idea.
9. We use SRED and IRAP and both are good programs. We need to have the accounts realize that a new engineer is actually costing less than the gross salary, once these programs are accounted for.
10. The current SRED system is seen as a bonus after the end of the year, not an incentive. I am not sure why. I like the SRED system and don't see a need to change it, except to

some how allow the commercialization of the new technology to be included as mentioned in #1.

11. I think the paperwork is reasonable. It is still important to ensure records are kept and that R&D is done properly.
12. Not sure.
13. I think the incentives for R&D are fine, it is the ability to exploit them into commercial products that is the main problem.
14. Need to fund the commercialization. Need to link universities and actual professors to a project and use the company project as the university research project. The money for universities is so large and the return is very low. The people that measure this return are the ones getting the money or giving the money and thus skew the data, whether intentionally or not.