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News and Updates
$1.1 billion dollars

11,300 professors

30,500 post-secondary students and post-doctoral fellows

3,000 Canadian companies

“Making Canada a country of discoverers and innovators for the benefit of all Canadians”
Budget 2015: The Highlights

• In 2014, $15 million per year to NSERC went to Discovery Grants, Post-Doctoral Fellowships and Research Tools and Instruments.

• 2015 Budget:
  ▪ $15 million per year to NSERC for collaborations between researchers and companies (starting 2016-17)
  ▪ Industrial Postgraduate Scholarships Program will be wound down
Discover / Innovate /
We invest in scientific discovery and talent for the benefit of Canada – science and engineering at the frontier of knowledge.
We ensure businesses are the first to know – use discoveries to accelerate R&D.

Featured News
Governor general announces Canada's top natural sciences and engineering researchers for 2015
February 17, 2015
Celebrated research includes groundbreaking chemical theories, quantum computers that think like humans, and new production of medical isotopes.

Latest News
Minister Holder says Government will increase investment to create jobs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics
March 18, 2015
Minister Holder announces new Open Access Policy for research
February 27, 2015
Search for the next Vice-President of Research Partnerships
February 11, 2015
Government of Canada supports over 70 science and engineering research teams
February 10, 2015
New NSERC funding for Arctic observing and research for sustainability
March 24, 2015
NSERC announces increase in postdoctoral fellowship offers for 2015
February 4, 2015

Features
Celebrate research excellence NSERC award winners shine
Strategic plan consultations A Vision of NSERC in 2020
Dr. B. Mario Pinto Connect with our President
NSERC Dashboard Where we invest and why
Discovery Grants Budget Allocation

- Preparing to launch a review of the budget allocation methodology
- **Goal**: ensure the program remains effective, accountable and that funds are used optimally
- Opportunity to introduce new factors to allocate funds among the 12 Evaluation Groups
- Discipline comparisons and allocations to be informed by quantitative indicators and expert judgment
Phase-out of Team Grants

- Starting with the 2016 competition, Team Grant applications no longer accepted through the Discovery Grants Program
- All new applications must be for individual Discovery Grants
- Existing Team Grants will continue until completion
Discovery Development Grants

• Promote a diversified base of high-quality research in small universities
• Foster a stimulating environment for research training in small universities
• $10K/year for 2 years
Paid Parental Leave

- Increased from 4 months to 6 months
- Starting April 1, 2015
- For graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
- Applies to scholarships and fellowships as well as those paid from supervisor grant
NSERC’s Mandate

• ...to promote and assist research in the natural sciences and engineering, other than the health sciences... (NSERC Act 1978)

• Clarification of NSERC guidelines
  – Updates to tri-agency document: “Selecting the Appropriate Federal Granting Agency”
  – Creation of NSERC-specific guidelines document
  – Staff validation of updated Subject Matter Eligibility tools
Open Access

Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications

• Researchers must make articles freely available online within 12 months of publication
• Applies to all grants awarded May 1, 2015 and onward
• How to comply:
  – Deposit peer-reviewed manuscript in a repository; and/or
  – Submit manuscript to journal that offers open access within 12 months
• For more information: Tri-Agency Policy FAQs and Toolbox
  or contact: openaccess@nserc-crsng.gc.ca
Discovery Grants Program and Research Tools and Instruments

2015 Results
2015 Competition Statistics Discovery Grants (DG) available at:
http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Professors-Professeurs/DiscoveryGrants-SubventionsDecouverte/Index_eng.asp
Discovery Grant: Total Funding, Success Rates, Number of Awards and Average Award


- Scale applies to Total Funding
- Scale applies to Avg grant and Success Rate (S/R)
- Scale applies to # Awards and Total Funding

Legend:
- Avg (x$1K)
- S/R (%)
- Total (x$100K)
- # Awards
### Discovery Grants Overall Results – 2015 Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Average Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Researchers (ECR)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$26,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Researchers (ER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewing their grant (ER-R)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>$35,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Holding a Grant (ER-NHG)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$26,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes Discovery and Subatomic Physics (Individual and Team) Grants, but excludes the Subatomic Physics Projects.
2. Includes returning established unfunded applicants and experienced researchers submitting a first application.
### Mechanical Engineering (EG1512)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Career Researchers</th>
<th>Established Researchers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>Not Holding a Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ awarded</strong></td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>$2,676,000</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success rate</strong></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Grant</strong></td>
<td>$23,034</td>
<td>$29,407</td>
<td>$24,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-official results
Success Rate\(^1\) by Category of Individual Applicants – 2009-2015 Competitions

Includes Discovery Grant Individual only
Research Tools and Instruments

- **New**: RTI applications to use the Research Portal and CCV for the 2016 competition

- Quota is now 700. Minimum of 2 per institution

- Funding level for 2015 increased
### Research Tools and Instruments - Overall Results

- Smaller national competition with quota of applications per university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>$25M</td>
<td>$19.5M</td>
<td>$25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Appl.</strong></td>
<td>666</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Funded</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Rate</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Rate</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Research Tools and Instruments - EG 1512 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Tools &amp; Instruments (Category 1)</th>
<th>1512 applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applications</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Rate</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$2,578,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discovery Accelerator Supplements

- DAS provides resources to researchers who:
  - Have highly original and innovative research programs
  - Show strong potential to become international leaders within their field

- $120,000 - typically over three years
- Up to 125 Supplements per year
- Each EG will receive a quota of DAS nominations to recommend
- EG members nominate candidates. Executive Committee makes the final recommendation to NSERC
# Discovery Accelerator Supplements 2015 Competition Results

## Evaluation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Group</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genes, Cells and Molecules (1501)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Systems and Functions (1502)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution and Ecology (1503)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (1504)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (1505)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences (1506)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (1507)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics (1508)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil, Industrial and Systems Engineering (1509)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering (1510)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Chemical Engineering (1511)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (1512)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subatomic Physics (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Pie Chart

- 47% 12 years or less
- 33% between 12-20 years
- 20% 20 years or more
Discovery Grants (DG) Program
Overview

“Delivering on NSERC’s commitment to excellence”
Objectives

- To promote and maintain a diversified base of high-quality research capability in the natural sciences and engineering (NSE) in Canadian universities.
- To foster research excellence.
- To provide a stimulating environment for research training.
# Two-Step Review Process

## Merit assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence of researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to training of HQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Funding recommendation

- A (L, N, H)
- B (L, N, H)
- C (L, N, H)
- D (L, N, H)
- N
- O
- P
Discovery Grant Program
The Conference Model

- Several sessions occur in parallel streams.

- Members are assigned to various sections/applications on the basis of the match between their expertise and application subject matter.
  - Members may participate in reviews in more than one EG.

- Flexibility allows applications at the interface between Evaluation Groups to be reviewed by a combination of members with pertinent expertise from relevant groups.

- Evaluation structure consists of 12 Evaluation Groups (EGs)
Evaluation Groups

- Genes, Cells and Molecules (1501)
- Biological Systems and Functions (1502)
- Evolution and Ecology (1503)
- Chemistry (1504)
- Physics (1505)
- Geosciences (1506)
- Computer Science (1507)
- Mathematics and Statistics (1508)
- Civil, Industrial and Systems Engineering (1509)
- Electrical and Computer Engineering (1510)
- Materials and Chemical Engineering (1511)
- Mechanical Engineering (1512)
How does the Conference Model Work?

- Inside an EG, applications are assessed within Sections.

- Reviewers are drawn from the EG’s membership as a function of the members’ expertise and the need to ensure balanced reviews.

- Members from different EGs could participate in the review of any application, if required to ensure a comprehensive review. Referred to as Joint Reviews.
  - Primary EG: leads the review (“home” of application).
  - Secondary EG(s): provides expert reviewer(s).
  - Reviewer(s) from secondary EG(s): among the five reviewers assessing the application (full assessment, participation in deliberations, and vote).
Implementation of the Conference Model and the Rating Indicators

Reader

Commercial Excellence: Outstanding
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Outstanding
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COR Factor: N

Merit
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Outstanding
Outstanding
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Conflicts?

First Internal

Reader

Program Officer

Chair
Life Cycle of a Discovery Grant Application

**August 1**
Submission of Notification of Intent to Apply with CCV

**September to October**
Initial assignment to EG and contacting of external reviewers

**November 1**
Submission of grant application with CCV

**Mid-November**
Applications sent out to external reviewers

**Early December**
Evaluation Group members receive applications

**February**
Grants competition

**March to April**
Announcement of results
DISCOVERY GRANTS PROGRAM

HOW TO APPLY?
Eligibility to Apply

To be eligible, you must:

- hold, or have a firm offer of, an academic appointment at a Canadian institution (minimum three-year term position) and take up the position no later than September 1 of the year of the award
- be in a position that requires independent research and allows supervision of highly qualified personnel (HQP)
- work full-time in an eligible Canadian institution (if your primary position is outside of Canada)

Requirements can be found on NSERC website
Eligibility of Subject Matter

- Discovery Grants Program supports
  - Research programs in the natural sciences and engineering (NSE); and
  - Interdisciplinary research that is predominantly in the NSE
    - Significance, impact, advancement of knowledge or practical applications in NSE

- The same proposal cannot be submitted to two federal granting agencies

- Eligibility guidelines on NSERC’s Web site and www.science.gc.ca

- Applications deemed more appropriate for another agency will be rejected
Before the Review

- Applicant
- Suggested EG
- Chair
- Member

Decision on Joint Review

- Application
- Possible JR EGs
- Applicant Suggested EG

Keywords

- Proposed Research Topics
  - 1504 Chemistry / CH4 Atmospheric and Environmental Chemistry
  - 1506 Geosciences / GS12 Biogeochemistry
  - 1504 Chemistry / CH16 Chemistry of biological systems
  - 1502 Biological Systems and Functions / 15802 Food Science
  - 1504 Chemistry / CH15 Analytical chemistry

- Language of the Application (required)
  - English
  - French

- Suggested Evaluation Group (required)
  - 1504 Chemistry

- Possible JR EGs
  - Contaminated areas, Soil
Evaluation of Discovery Grant Applications

Dr. Gregory Kopp, Western University Member – Mechanical Engineering EG
Evaluation Criteria

- Scientific or Engineering Excellence of the Researcher(s)
- Merit of the Proposal
- Training of Highly Qualified Personnel (HQP)
Scientific or Engineering Excellence of the Researcher

- Knowledge, expertise and experience.
- Contributions to, and impact on, proposed and other areas of research.
  - Focus on Natural Sciences and Engineering
- Assessment based on the quality and impact of contributions.
- Assessment based on achievements demonstrated over past six years. “Most significant contributions” section of resume may include earlier work if they still have a significant impact (e.g., exploitation of patents).
Scientific or Engineering Excellence of the Researcher: Tips

- Describe up to five most significant research contributions (found in the application) and highlight quality & impact
- List all types of research contributions (from 2009-2015)
- Explain your role in collaborative research activities
- List all sources of support
- Give other evidence of impact
- Explain delays in research activity (See Peer Review Manual, Section 6, for details)
Scientific or Engineering Excellence of the Researcher

Location of Information

- In CCV
  - “Contributions” section (publications, books, patents, etc.).
  - “Recognitions” section (honors, prizes and awards, etc.).
  - “Activities” section (international collaborations, event organization, editorial activities, assessment and review activities, knowledge and technology transfers, etc.).
  - “Memberships” section (service on committees).

- In Application
  - “Most Significant Contributions” section (discusses most significant contributions).
  - “Additional Information on Contributions” section (discusses choice of venues, order of authors, etc.).
Merit of the Proposal

- Originality and innovation.
- Significance and expected contributions to research; potential for impact.
  - Must describe a program of research that will advance knowledge in the Natural Sciences and Engineering.
- Clarity and scope of objectives.
- Clarity and appropriateness of methodology.
- Feasibility of program.
- Extent to which the proposal addresses all relevant issues
- Appropriateness of budget.
  - Relationship to other sources of funds must be clearly explained.
Merit of the Proposal: Tips

- Write summary in plain language
- Keep in mind that two audiences read your application: expert and non-expert
- Provide a progress report on related research
- Position the research within the field and state-of-the-art
- Clearly articulate short- and long-term objectives
- Provide a detailed methodology and realistic budget
- Consider comments/recommendations you may have received for previous applications
Merit of the Proposal – Tips: Overlap

- Discuss relationships to other research support
  - For each grant currently held or applied for, clearly provide: the main objective, a brief outline of the methodology, budget details, and details on the support of HQP
  - Must include summary and budget pages for CIHR and SSHRC grants currently held or applied for
  - Should include summary and budget information for other grants with budget overlap
Merit of the Proposal
Conceptual Overlap

- Conceptual overlap occurs when the ideas in the proposal are, or appear to be, the same ideas that are supported by other sources (applicant’s other projects/programs).

- Complementary parts of an applicant’s research program can be supported by different sources.

- The onus is on the applicant to differentiate between the research program covered by the Discovery grant proposal and other research programs/projects supported by other sources.

- Funds requested from Discovery grants must support a program of research in the Natural Sciences and Engineering.

- Saying “there is no overlap” is not sufficient.
Tips from Evaluation Group Members

Do…

– Be original and creative, but also show you have the expertise to carry out the program
– Highlight transformative research
– Have long term vision and short term plan
– Integrate HQP into the proposal

Don’t…

– Propose an unfeasible number of objectives
– Propose a project or a series of disconnected projects
– Use a lot of jargon and acronyms
– Be vague when describing methodology
– Only reference your own publications
Merit of the Proposal
Location of Information

- In **Application**
  - Proposal (dedicated 5-page section).
  - List of References (dedicated 2-page section).
  - Budget Justification (dedicated 2-page section).
  - Relationship to Other Sources of Support – Explanation (dedicated 2-page section).

- In **CCV**
  - “Research Funding History” section to assess possible conceptual or budgetary overlaps.

- **Standalone attachment** (when applicable)
  - Relationship to Other Sources of Support – Attachments (Summary and budget section of applications to other agencies).
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Describe and list:

- Quality and impact of contributions to training during the last six years (2009–2015)
- Proposed plan for future training of HQP in the NSE
- Enhancement of training arising from a collaborative or interdisciplinary environment (where applicable)

Read the Policy and Guidelines on the Assessment of Contributions to Research and Training (PRM)
Contributions to the Training of HQP - Tips

Past Contributions to Training:

- Use an asterisk to identify students who are co-authors on the listed contributions
- Explain your role in co-supervision activities
- Explain any delays that might have affected your ability to train HQP
- Describe nature of HQP studies
  - HQP ranges from undergraduate theses and summer projects to postdoctoral levels
Contributions to the Training of HQP - Tips

Training Plan

- Describe the nature of the training (e.g., length, specific projects) in which HQP will be involved, the HQP’s contributions and pertinence to the research program proposed
- Discuss the training philosophy and the expected outcomes
- Clearly define your role in any collaborative research and planned joint HQP training
- Do not select “Academic Advisor”
Tips from Evaluation Group Members

- **Do…**
  - Describe your involvement and interaction with HQP
  - Describe the nature (PhD, master’s, undergraduate), length of time (summer project vs. thesis) and type of training (course-related or thesis)
  - Fully describe the nature of co-supervision
  - Include present position for past HQP
  - Include all levels of HQP, including undergraduates
  - Make sure projects are appropriate for level of HQP proposed

- **Don’t…**
  - Just list numbers
  - Have name withheld on all entries
  - Have a blanket statement, be specific
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Location of Information

Plan for Training

- In **Application** - one dedicated page.

  - This page is to be used by applicant to present the training plan to be undertaken as part of the proposed research activities.

  - Among other things, the plan should provide details on activities in which trainees will be involved, skills and knowledge trainees would learn, the relevance of training activities for the level of trainees involved (undergraduate, Master’s, etc.), and the expected impact.
Contributions to the Training of HQP

Location of Information

**Record** of Training

- In **CCV**
  - “Supervisory Activities”
  - “Contributions” section: Co-authors who are trained HQP are to be identified by an asterisk (*).

- In **Application**
  - Section “Past Contributions to HQP Training” in application
Cost of Research

- Not used by all Evaluation Groups

- Relative cost of research of the proposed research program as compared to the norms for a given discipline / field of research.
  - High, Normal, Low.
  - It is expected that most applications will be deemed to have a normal Cost of Research relative to the discipline.

- A budget that is large simply because of the program’s size, while the cost of the activities is similar to the norm in the discipline / field of research, does not translate into a High cost of research.
Cost of Research
Location of Information

- In **Application**
  - Proposal (dedicated 5-page section).
  - Budget Justification (dedicated 2-page section).
  - Relationship to Other Sources of Support – Explanation (dedicated 2-page section).
## Discovery Grants Indicators

(See Peer Review Manual)

### 6.13. DISCOVERY GRANTS MERIT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellence of the Researcher</th>
<th>Acknowledged as a leader who has continued to make, over the last six years, influential accomplishments at the highest level of quality, impact and/or importance to a broad community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit of the Proposal</td>
<td>Proposed research program is clearly presented, is extremely original and innovative and is likely to have impact by leading to groundbreaking advances in the area and/or leading to a technology or policy that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term vision and short-term objectives are clearly defined. The methodology is clearly described and appropriate. The budget clearly demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of HQP</td>
<td>Training record is at the highest level, with HQP contributing to top quality research. Most HQP move on to positions that require highly desired skills, obtained through training received. Research plans for trainees are appropriate and clearly defined. HQP success highly likely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exceptional

- The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be far superior in quality, impact and/or importance.

### Outstanding

- The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of superior quality, impact and/or importance.

### Very Strong

- The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be solid in their quality, impact and/or importance.

### Strong

- The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be of reasonable quality, impact and/or importance.

### Moderate

- The accomplishments presented in the application were deemed to be below an acceptable level of quality, impact and/or importance.

### Insufficient

- Proposed research program is presented lacks clarity, and/or is of limited originality and innovation. Objectives are not clearly described and/or likely not attainable. Methodology is not clearly described and/or appropriate. The budget does not clearly demonstrate how the research activities to be supported are distinct from and complement those funded by other sources.

---

1 The Discovery Grants Merit Indicators should be used in conjunction with the Peer Review Manual (Chapter 6) which outlines how reviewers arrive at a rating.

### Cost of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority of justified expenses represent costs higher than the norm for the research area.</td>
<td>Majority of justified expenses are within the norm for the research area.</td>
<td>Majority of justified expenses are lower than the norm for the research area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Possible examples include: Cost of training of HQP, Equipment, intensive research and/or high users fees, particularly expensive or frequent consumables, Travel (for collaborations, field work, access to facilities, conferences, ...)*
FINAL ADVICE:
Discovery Grant Applications

- Ask colleagues and/or your RGO for comments on your application
- Read other successful proposals
- Consult the Peer Review Manual section 6
- Plan ahead and check institution deadlines
  - Give yourself time: CCV
Application Process for Discovery Grants

- Notification of Intent to Apply (NOI) and full application must be submitted through NSERC’s new Research Portal.

- Applicants must complete and submit NSERC’s version of the Canadian Common CV (CCV) at the NOI and application stages.

- Notification of Intent to Apply (NOI) must be submitted to NSERC by the deadline date of August 1, 8:00 pm Eastern.

- If an NOI is not submitted by the deadline, it is not possible to submit a full application.
Application Process for Discovery Grants

- Instructions are available on NSERC’s Web site.
- Applicants are encouraged to carefully read the instructions on how to complete the NOI and NSERC CCV.
- Applicants are encouraged to complete their CCV as soon as possible as it can be time consuming to populate its fields the first time.
Resource Materials

- Consult the *Peer Review Manual, Section Six (6)* in conjunction with the Merit Indicators
- Consult Resource Videos:
  http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Professors-Professeurs/Videos-Videos/Index_eng.asp
  - Submitting a DG through the Research Portal
  - Tip to help applicants write a better proposal (interviews with EG members)
  - Demystifying the DG review process
- Webinars on the Research Portal and How to apply (NOI and Full Application stages)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSERC Contacts</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSERC Staff</td>
<td>First Name.Last <a href="mailto:Name@nserc-crsng.gc.ca">Name@nserc-crsng.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines, acknowledgement of applications and results</td>
<td>Your university RGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your account, Grants in Aid of Research Statement of Account (Form 300)</td>
<td>Your university Business Officer (BO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSERC Web site</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca">www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discovery Grants Program (including eligibility) | E-mail: resgrant@nserc-crsng.gc.ca
| Tel.: 613-995-5829                      |                                                          |
| Use of Grant Funds                     | E-mail: awdad@nserc-crsng.gc.ca                         |
| On-line Services Helpdesk              | E-mail: webapp@nserc-crsng.gc.ca                        |
Questions?
Thank you

www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca