Q: I looked for sample grants but I didn't think there were for this call specifically... can you confirm? Thanks!

A: There are sample grants for the past two NFRF Explorations rounds. The link to the sample grants will be sent around with the slides.

Q: So, no CV attachments and no other attachments like support letters, except what NFRF specifies (e.g., references)?

A: Correct, the only attachments are: research proposal, references, budget, and the team biographical section. No appendices, letter of support, or CV.

Q: I think EDI should not be anonymous too?

A: The EDI section can say "UBC" and your faculty and department, but that is it. You cannot identify yourself or members of your team.

Q: If we say, let's say we collaborate with a programer at IBM, is this an identifying information?

A: This info would go into the team biographical section, not the proposal or EDI. This speaks to feasibility.

Q: In the proposal, often we have to cite our own previous work upon which the proposed work is built. Is this not allowed?

A: You are allowed to say 'past work has shown it is possible to do x, y, z'. You cannot say 'My past work has shown this is possible' or 'based on our work…'. Suggestions are to use language like "previous work has shown" rather than "our previous work".

Q: Are headers allowed in attachments? Don't want to get disqualified for violating formatting..

A: Yes, headers are allowed in attachments. We recommend using capital letters as sub-headings for the sections that are text boxes.

Q: I find it difficult to keep track of what is identifying information that reveals your name and what is "identifying information" that reveals your demographic. Can you provide any tips?

A: Avoid both, except in the team bio section. Do not name yourself or your team in any of the sections except in the team bio. You can name institutions, faculty, department in the EDI and team bio sections. Within the team bio section, also do not specify demographic info unless it is very relevant to the feasibility of the research, and you have consent from the team member you are identifying.

Q: Sorry I meant headers as in headers/footers, which would be technically outside the page margins (not section headings)

A: From https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/exploration/2019/instructions_attachment-instructions_piece_jointe-eng.aspx):

- In multi-page attachments, pages must be numbered sequentially.
- The application identification number (i.e., NFRFx-xxxx-xxxxx) must appear at the top of each page of the attachment.

- No personally identifying information should be included in the headers and/or footers (e.g., name, PIN, institution, etc.).
- The name of the document must appear at the top (e.g., Literature References).

Q: Do you suggest to include one standalone sub-section on feasibility in the proposal?

A: Yes, we suggest using subheadings pertaining to the review criteria.

Q: Do we know what you need all the matrix to get funded? Like all exceptional?

A: Between ‘very good’ and ‘exceptional’.

Q: It seems that the difference between a co-PI and a co-applicant is mostly in name only. Am I missing something?

A: More responsibility and more work input for the co-PI is expected.

Q: Hi, at this point, are we allowed to edit the field of research/discipline?

A: Checking on this and will get back to you directly

Q: Do both the external and interdisciplinary reviewers use the exceptional, … scale? Of just the 5 interdisciplinary reviewers?

A: they both score to the same matrix, although the final score comes from the internal committee plus the external reviews

Q: If the two disciplines never work together, but both fall under NSERC, will that be a fail? Say Agronomy and Chemistry?

A: This would require a justification as to how this is a novel interdisciplinary project.

For Exploration, the two required disciplines CAN fall within the same Tri-Council agency as long as they meet NFRF's stringent interdisciplinary requirements

Q: Wont the non-experts defer to the experts on the multidisciplinary panel regarding feasibility? How could they (strongly) disagree?

A: Most likely but be wary of acronyms, make sure others on your team can follow your methodology Bear in mind that you only get 4 pages, so you cannot go into granular detail anyway. It just needs to be understood that your workplan is feasible in the two-year time span.

Q: If the panel see PI’s names from team bio section, they can easily find out PI’s demographic info from photos / bio by googling PI’s names. But still we are not allowed to reveal PI’s demographic info in the EDI section? Just to clarify.

A: Yes, you’re right. You are still not allowed to reveal it unless it is directly related to the research. And you cannot reveal the PI’s demographic info in the EDI section.

Q: can/should we discuss the diversity composition in our current research groups for this section? (anonymously)

A: The “most identifying” information you can include is percentages, but even then be cautious. Demographic information can be linked to an individual if it is relevant to the research (e.g., research with Indigenous Peoples).

Q: Is there a risk in highlighting my team's current diversity (using %s instead of #s) if it just turned out this way without any concrete strategies on my/my team's part to increase diversity?

A: We recommend avoiding this entirely, unless there is something specifically related to your proposed research.

Q: I’m confused by this part. What if the research has no EDI. If it’s not relevant to the research plan how to include it?

A: This is an important section to start early because it is difficult to write convincingly. If your research team is already diverse, that’s great. If your research team is not diverse, perhaps that is because your field is not diverse and you have a limited pool of people to hire. The point is that you are committed to enhancing EDI within your research team. Specify the barriers that need to be overcome, if your field is not diverse. Barriers related to your institution, your field, and your department. What tools are available to you in order to increase or enhance EDI? We recommend using the Analysis of context section to lay out the negatives (barriers/challenges) and describe where you are now. The next sections (best practices, etc.) is where you outline your plan for addressing and overcoming these challenges.

Q: Can we say the Co-PI is the chair of some EDI related committe at UBC faculty of X, Depth of X??

A: You can say “a team member is a chair…”. You can note the faculty and dept. You can note that you have an EDI champion, but again, best not to identify anyone by name.

Q: For these points, can we say the PI did this and the Co-PI did that or we have to say a member of team?

A: You can say ‘concerns will be addressed to the NPI through this process…’

Q: Is it allowed to say PIs are from “Y” minority groups (without mentioning PI names)?

A: No, you cannot. This is too close to identifying information. You cannot say this about any member of the team.

Q: How about in Bio? Can we say we have a member from indigenous research community?

A: Yes, if it relevant to the research project and feasibility. But make sure that you have that person’s consent to mention this.

Q: can we mention the name of a supporting company in our proposal? Without identifying individuals

A: This should go in the team bio section but we will double-check on this and will follow-up.

Q: Directing one of the previous answers, “You can note that “X% of our team identifies as part of Y designated group”” can this kind of statement be mentioned in team bio, but not in EDI?

A: This can be included in the Team Bio if directly related to the research (feasibility).