

1. Interdisciplinary research with a primarily mathematical core is being threatened

Mathematicians are being pushed into other evaluation groups where the money is significantly better. This will have a long term effect of changing the researcher's priorities as they adapt to the new evaluation group's measures. For example, someone doing computational math will have a mix of scientific products including articles, but also including software contributions and prestigious conference proceedings. These are undervalued in mathematics, and the scientist is pushed clearly to computer science. To maintain credibility in computer science, they must make computer science achievements, and this will ultimately reduce the mathematics in their work!

2. Places like BIRS are wonderful.... if you can go! They have little or no capacity for teleconferencing and the travelling excludes people that can't travel for either family reasons, or because they only have a tiny NSERC grant (from which they also must pay their graduate students) or none at all. Once you are beyond 5 years from your PhD, and in a university position, it can be difficult to get travel funding. Furthermore, emphasizing the institutes puts money towards more expensive things, like lovely buildings in a mountain parks, fancy catered affairs, and an additional layer of professional administration. We see now that this is coming directly out of the pockets of smaller scale researchers; they do not co-exist.

3. Funding for small local events is cost effective. That said, I have found that the availability of small (\$1000) grants for local workshops to be a very useful. Small scale events, whose emphasis is sharing research, and launching and continuing collaborations can be very cost effective. PIMS does this, and if the proposal is well-founded they are easy to obtain, even in the absence of an "important" main speaker. This definitely addresses several of the points raised just above.

4. Make a national archive of our work. Canada might consider setting up a national pre-print server like CNRS in France has in order to ensure it has long term access to the mathematics that we have paid for. It seems shameful to me that in this electronic age for-profit journals bleed our libraries with expensive subscription costs while they have far fewer costs than even a few years ago. Why do we accept that so much university money goes to a few very profitable companies?

5. Don't force new mothers to keep an army of students just to maintain their funding! Finally, if NSERC is serious about making HQP a third of our evaluation, it needs to make it very clear the expectations, and criteria of evaluation. I believe that the current system unfairly punishes responsible supervisors who do not take on students when they are about to go on extended leave (eg. maternity or parental leave); It creates a built-in deduction against parents who take leave to which they are legally entitled. Such an evaluation should be possible, but there needs to be more thought involved. While we are at it, can NSERC be at least as generous as SHIRC and CIHR in with its rules on bringing your own childcare with you when

you need it?

If NSERC is interested in seeing more women at the upper end of the research scale they cannot abandon us the moment we have a baby and divert some of our energies to our kiddies!