

Non-disclosure and Conflict of Interests

Confidentiality and Non-disclosure Agreement for Resource Allocation Expert Reviewers

Expert Reviewer

By signing this agreement, you are accepting to abide by the Compute Canada Reviewer Confidentiality and Non-disclosure policy outlined below.

Any documents or information acquired during the review process must be treated as strictly confidential. This information must not be used for any purpose beyond that for which it was originally intended. Comments made by committee/panel members during the review meetings will also be regarded as confidential. All reports and scores that contribute to the decision-making process and provide a basis for the allocation of resources through any Compute Canada Resource Allocation Competition will not be discussed outside of the Resource Allocation Competition.

The undersigned agrees to treat as strictly confidential all information received by Compute Canada for the purposes of the Resource Allocation evaluation process and all unpublished material from the documents submitted by Compute Canada and its authorized contractors, together with all deliberations, comments, and recommendations of the Expert Review Committee.

Compute Canada Conflict of Interest Policy

Committee members who are directly or indirectly associated with the applications must disclose their interest and follow the guidelines adopted by Compute Canada regarding conflicts of interest. Members who stand to gain or lose financially, either in their personal capacity or by virtue of being an officer of any legal entity affected by a decision of the Compute Canada Federation, must disclose their interest.

These guidelines cannot foresee all possible situations and Compute Canada must rely on the judgment of the committee members. Indeed, it is the responsibility of members to declare any conflict of interest. Examples of conflict of interest include:

Expert Reviewers are in **direct conflict** if they:

- submitted an application that will be reviewed in the committee they are serving (in other words, they are in conflict with their own application);
- are from the same university department as the applicant(s);
- have been a research supervisor or graduate student of the applicant(s) within the past five (5) years;
- have collaborated or published with the applicant(s) within the past two (2) years or have plans to collaborate or publish in the immediate future;

- are providing direct or indirect support for the application;
- are a relative or close friend, or have a personal relationship with the applicants;
- have had scientific or personal differences with the applicant that have been expressed publicly;
- are in a position to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the application (e.g., hold stock in the company of an industry partner or a competitor), or for some other reason feel that they cannot provide an objective review of the application.

Committee members are in **indirect conflict** if they:

- are from the same immediate institution* or company as the applicant *and* interact with the applicant in the course of their duties at the institution or company;
- have other reasons not to review an application.

**A reviewer is not in conflict with an application if they are from the same institution as the applicant(s) but do not know or interact with them.*

Review committee members are asked to inform Compute Canada Staff of potential conflict(s) of interest as early as possible.

At the beginning of a session, the Chair will read the list of identified conflicts and ask each member in turn to declare any other relationship to a proposal (positive or negative). If the Chair believes a member should not participate in the review of a given application, that member will withdraw from the discussion. Difficult cases should be brought to Compute Canada Staff who have the responsibility to rule.

All committee members must read and agree to abide by this conflict of interest policy prior to viewing any application information.