Supporting Document: Description of the open and transparent process

All institutions submitting an application in Stage 3 are required to submit a narrative describing the processes to award funding in accordance with the program's established principles, including a description of the open and transparent process for allocating funds and the criteria used to select the supported projects. **Each affiliate included in the application is also required to post an open call to researchers.**

Description of the Open and Transparent Process	Not Present (0)	Present but Insufficient (1)	Present with Notable Deficiencies (2)	Acceptable (3)
1.1 The institution and each of its affiliates posted on their public website an open call to their research community that invites applications from research leads	No evidence The institution did not post an open call on their public website, or the document is missing.	Evidence = URL of the post The institution posted an open call to their research community on their public website, but it would be difficult for a research lead to find it or know that they can apply for funding.	Evidence = URL of the post The institution posted an open call to their research community on their public website in an accessible location, but the institution did not advertise the posting.	Evidence = URL of the post + advertisement e.g., banner, news item, etc. The institution posted an open call to their research community on their public website and advertised the posting. It is easy to find and includes an invitation to research leads to submit applications.
 1.2 The institution communicated the details of the call (e.g., by email) including: eligibility criteria application information evaluation criteria used to allocate the funding. 	The institution did not communicate details of the call, or the document is missing.	The institution communicated details of the call, but the communication is missing TWO of the following: eligibility criteria, application information, and evaluation criteria.	The institution communicated details of the call, but it's missing ONE of the following: eligibility criteria, application information, or evaluation criteria.	The institution communicated details of the call including eligibility criteria, application information, and evaluation criteria.

1.3 The institution's evaluation criteria do not create barriers to access for individuals from equity-seeking groups	The institution's evaluation criteria may create barriers to access, or the information is missing.	The institution states that their evaluation criteria do not create barriers to access, but does not specify how.	The institution states that their evaluation criteria do not create barriers to access for individuals from equity-seeking groups and supports this claim with evidence.	The institution states that their evaluation criteria do not create barriers for individuals to access equity-seeking groups. The institution supports this claim with evidence and provides details on active measures they have implemented to ensure funding is accessible to these groups.
1.4 The institution considered their support for individuals who have been personally impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic	The institution did not consider their support for individuals who have been personally impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.	The institution states that they considered support for individuals personally impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic but does not provide specifics.	The institution states that they invited researchers to self-identify as having been personally impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and states that the information was taken into account in their considerations.	The institution provides a detailed and specific account of how the research of individuals who self-identify as having been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic was considered for funding at a rate equal to or higher than other research projects.
Overall Assessment: The document demonstrates that the institution implemented an open and transparent process for the internal allocation of Stage 3 funds to their researchers				The supporting document must score a minimum of 9/12 with at least 1 point per criteria for the application to proceed.

Supporting Document 2: Justification for eligible costs beyond the notional allocation

This document is only submitted by institutions requesting funding beyond the notional allocation and should contain justification of the amount of Stage 3 funding beyond the initial notional amount, that the institution is requesting for additional research projects, including those from affiliated institutions (if applicable). The funding amount justified in this document must match the additional funding amount requested in Convergence.

In the application itself, the institution will have already specified the number of additional research projects for which the institution is requesting Stage 3 funding beyond the initial notional amount, separated into the three categories of eligible costs.

Justification for eligible costs beyond the notional allocation	Not Present (0)	Present but Insufficient (1)	Present with Notable Deficiencies (2)	Acceptable (3)
2.1 The document specifies why the institution requires funding beyond the notional allocation. (max. 400 words)	The document is missing or does not contain this information.	The document states non- specifically that the institution requires funding beyond the notional allocation.	The document describes the institution's extraordinary need for funding beyond the notional allocation, but does not provide evidence.	The document includes a narrative and evidence that the institution was more severely impacted than average.
2.2. The document provides data in support of additional funding requested	The document is missing or does not contain this information.	The document repeats the information already entered into the Convergence application about the number of projects to be funded and whether they are categorized as maintenance, ramp-up or both.	The document evidences that the institution received an inordinate number of applications for funding as a result of their open call, but does not provide a detailed assessment of the projects to be funded by the notional	The document gives a thorough account of the number applications received as a result of their open call, the number of projects to be funded by the notional allocation, and the number of projects that could be funded by the additional funding requested. The document specifies whether those projects are to be funded for maintenance, ramp-up or both. The amount of funding requested as a result of the open call does in fact <i>exceed</i> what might have been

2.3 The document specifies the amount of additional funding earmarked for equity-seeking groups, researchers personally affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, and early career researchers	The document is missing or does not contain this information.	The document states non- specifically that some additional funding is earmarked for equity-seeking groups, early career researchers, and researchers affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.	allocation vs. the projects to be funded in addition. The document provides an account of how much of the additional funding is earmarked for researchers of equity-seeking groups, researchers personally affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, and early career researchers, but the account is in some way	anticipated in the calculation of the institution's notional allocation. The document provides a thorough account of how much of the additional funding requested is earmarked for researchers of equity-seeking groups, researchers personally affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, and early career researchers.
			deficient.	
Overall Evaluation: The document is sufficient to demonstrate that the eligible funds requested beyond the notional allocation are justified.				The supporting document must score a minimum of 7/9 with at least 1 point per criteria for the application to proceed.

Supporting Document: Signature from Financial Authority

The document includes the signature of the institute's representative (**as well as the signatures of all affiliate representatives, if applicable**) and must also attest that funding will be distributed, according to the actual incurred costs, by the authorized financial authority (e.g., a VP of Finance) of the applicant, and by the authorized financial authority of each affiliate, as applicable.

There is no scoring grid for this supporting document. It is either complete or incomplete. The application will not proceed if absent or incomplete.