



Australian Research Data Commons

# Request for Proposal

## Platforms Program Open Call 2020

v1.4, 27 August 2020

**RFP closing date and time:** 18 September 2020, 5pm AEST

**Closing date and time for questions:** 11 September 2020, 5pm AEST

**Announcement of Successful Proposals:** 29 October 2020

**Project Commencement:** January 2021

### Revision history

Version	Date	Revision	Made by
v1.0	10 June 2020	First release	Kerry Levett
v1.1	12 June 2020	2.5 - corrected investment amount to \$1M <i>in total</i>	Kerry Levett
v1.2	14 July 2020	Minor formatting edits to Appendix 2	Kerry Levett
v1.3	6 August 2020	2.6 - amended value of "significant amount of the person's time" to 0.2FTE (from 25%). Added assessment guidance to Proposal questions in Appendix 2	Kerry Levett
v1.4	27 August 2020	Appendix 2 - fixed links to bookmarks, and fixed formulae in Budget & Milestone template	Kerry Levett

<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
ARDC	2
Platforms Program Vision	2
Delivering this Vision	2
<b>Open call details</b>	<b>3</b>
Scope	3
In scope	3
Out of scope	3
Eligibility	4
Proposal selection criteria	4
Proposal evaluation and selection	4
ARDC investment & support	5
Co-investment	5
Proposal enquiries	5
Submitting a Proposal	5
<b>Project requirements</b>	<b>6</b>
Enabling FAIR	6
Project reporting schedule	6
<b>Proposal terms</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix 1 - Indicative EOI questions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Response to RFP - Indicative Proposal questions</b>	<b>10</b>
Proposal questions	10

# 1. Background

## 1.1 ARDC

The Australian Research Data Commons (ARDC) was formed by the Federal Government in July 2018 through the merger of three existing National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS) infrastructure capabilities (the Australian National Data Service (ANDS), National eResearch Collaboration Tools and Resources (Nectar) and Research Data Services (RDS)).

The ARDC is a transformational initiative that enables Australian research community and industry access to nationally significant, leading edge data intensive e-Infrastructure, platforms, skills and collections of high-quality data.

In partnerships with organisations, the ARDC leads facilitations that work towards a coherent research environment to enable researchers to find, access, contribute to and effectively use services to maximise research quality and impact.

## 1.2 Platforms Program Vision

The ARDC Vision for Platforms (which extends beyond the current ARDC investment period) has two elements.

The first is technical: a growing portfolio of research-oriented platforms and services that connect and provide access to a range of resources (data, storage, compute, tools) of relevance to researchers. An explicit goal of the Platforms Program is to increase the number of researchers with access to platforms, both in terms of absolute number and in terms of diversity of disciplines.

The second is social: a growing community of Platforms developers/managers who derive value from sharing good practice, continually learning, and alignment with national infrastructure initiatives. Such a community would also mitigate risk in the development and deployment of platforms.

## 1.3 Delivering this Vision

Delivering this vision will require a coordinated program of activity across multiple years: technical investment, community building, and practice enhancement.

The first Platforms Open Call demonstrated the value of an approach that started with an open lightweight EOI, encouraged collaborations to come together, and issued a more formal request for proposals. The 2020 Platforms Open Call will use the same approach, refined by what was learned in 2019. In particular, ARDC will take a more active role in bringing together potential collaboration partners and facilitating conversations. In particular, we encourage collaborations between those projects where ARDC invested in 2019 and those requesting investment in 2020.

At the same time, the ARDC will seek to bring together those who are building eResearch platforms, both those with ARDC investments and others, to build a community of eResearch platforms developers and managers. This group will be facilitated, not led, by the ARDC and will be used to help identify opportunities for greater national coordination and service delivery.

Lastly, ARDC will seek to encourage eResearch platforms to adopt software best practices and eResearch best practices through webinars, guidelines and sharing good examples.

## 2. Open call details

### 2.1 Scope

For the purposes of this call we define a Platform as a set of online services, often with associated integration and/or orchestration functions, as well as connections to specific data resources, that are intended to enable researchers to carry out some of their research activities.

Platforms are often designed to meet the needs of particular communities. Examples of eResearch platforms are the first round of [Platforms projects](#), and the [Data-Enhanced Virtual Laboratories](#), a previous ARDC program.

The broad scope for this call is Platform solutions (or elements thereof) that enable researchers to collect or generate data, analyse those data, and produce outputs that can be made Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR). We are particularly looking for transformative platforms that will enable radical changes in the way research is conducted, or dramatically increase the speed in which research is done.

Please note, this open call is funded under the Software and Platforms Theme and therefore the focus of Proposals has to be on the Platform, rather than on data-focussed activities (e.g. an activity to bring together new data which could then be accessed by a platform). ARDC's [National Data Assets](#) initiative includes a series of data-focussed open calls.

#### 2.1.1 In scope

- Adoption of an existing platform used by one research community and implementation by a new or expanded community in Australia
- Adaptation of an existing platform to a new community in a different area of research (with associated work on additional integrations to data sources and tools)
- Support for adoption of a relatively generic platform solution
- Re-engineering of an existing solution to make it more sustainable (i.e. adoption of shared services, move to microservices architecture)
- Instantiation and operation of specific services/micro-services that could be integrated into platforms

#### 2.1.2 Out of scope

- Development of a new platform from scratch
- Purchase of a Commercial Off the Shelf Solution (COTS)

## 2.2 Eligibility

ARDC will need to contract with a legal entity with a current ABN.

Proposals will be accepted from Project Leads from higher education institutions (specifically [Higher Education Support Act 2003 Table A providers](#)); the following Commonwealth publicly funded research agencies: AIATSIS, AIMS, ANSTO, CSIRO, DSTG, GA, BoM; state-based eResearch service providers (Intersect, QCIF, TPAC, and VicNode), Medical Research Institutes, and NCRIS Facilities. Note that ARDC will need to contract with a legal entity.

## 2.3 Proposal selection criteria

1. An EOI was submitted for the proposed project in the Platforms 2020 open call.
2. The proposal includes at least three different organisations (including the lead organisation) who will actively contribute to the project delivery.
3. The intended user community is represented in the project.
4. The platform supports a transformation to: enable new kinds of research; or answer research questions that couldn't previously be answered.
5. The platform will accelerate research (i.e. decreases the time taken to do a type of research or answer a research question).
6. The project has a feasible sustainability model.
7. The proposer's ability to deliver the project is clearly demonstrated.
8. The project provides good value for money (comparable to similar projects).
9. High co-investment from project partners is achieved.

## 2.4 Proposal evaluation and selection

Proposals will be evaluated by a selection panel to be appointed by the ARDC (composed of ARDC and external members), and scored according to the Selection Criteria.

The decision to invest in proposals will not just be based on the results of the evaluation process. The ARDC is looking to fund a balanced portfolio of projects, and this will be a factor in the final decisions. The final decision to award funding to Proposals rests with the ARDC Chief Executive Officer.

## 2.5 ARDC investment & support

ARDC is investing \$10M in total for the 2020 Open Call. Proposals can apply for up to \$1M in total, for project durations up to two and a half years. Please note: at this stage there are no plans for an Open Call in 2021.

In addition to ARDC monetary investment, successful Platforms projects are eligible to receive access to ARDC-funded Cloud Compute and Storage resources during the lifetime of the project.

## 2.6 Co-investment

ARDC recognises that the COVID-19 situation has placed financial constraints on many organisations, which are restricting the funds available for infrastructure projects. To assist in the continued development of e-research infrastructure, 1:1 matching co-investment will not be mandatory for this Platforms Open Call. However, the level of co-investment will form part of the Proposal evaluation criteria.

Co-investment must be in an auditable form (in accordance with reporting and accountability requirements as specified by the Commonwealth Department of Education) and can be cash (from project partners or other grants), investment from other NCRIS Projects, or effort/labour. NOTE: if contributing effort/labour, work on the project must be a significant amount of the person's time, i.e. 0.2FTE or more).

## 2.7 Proposal enquiries

Proposing organisations are encouraged to seek clarification if the RFP document is unclear or they identify issues not covered by the provided documentation. Questions can be submitted via the [ask a question](#) form.

Questions and corresponding responses will be deidentified and published in the [frequently asked questions](#).

The closing date for questions is 5pm AEST 11 September 2020.

## 2.8 Submitting a Proposal

Proposals must be submitted using the online form that will be available from [Platforms Open Call 2020](#).

Submissions open on 1 September and close at 5pm AEST on 18 September 2020.

Please note: an Expression of Interest (EOI) must have been submitted for the proposed project in this Platforms Open Call for a Proposal to be accepted. The EOI opens on 7 July and closes at 5pm AEST on 24 July 2020.

## 3. Project requirements

### 3.1 Enabling FAIR

The ARDC encourages the adoption of the [FAIR principles](#) as a valuable way of making research outputs more reusable, both for humans and machines. As an NCRIS facility ARDC is required to make the research outputs it enables FAIR (see the [NCRIS principles](#)). For Platforms, this refers to the platform itself as well as research outputs produced by the platform. Before the RFP phase, ARDC will provide guidance and support to projects on how platforms can produce FAIR (or FAIR-ready) data, and these expectations will form part of the project requirements and reporting.

### 3.2 Project reporting schedule

Report	Details	Due date
Progress report #1	Details of progress against agreed deliverables, enabling FAIR, and project impact.	6 months from Commencement date
Progress report #2	Details of progress against agreed deliverables, enabling FAIR, and project impact.	12 months from Commencement date
Annual acquitted financial statement #1	Details of expenditure of ARDC funds and signed by the subcontractor's representative.	12 months from Commencement date
Progress report #3	Details of progress against agreed deliverables, enabling FAIR, and project impact.	18 months from Commencement date
Progress report #4	Details of progress against agreed deliverables, enabling FAIR, and project impact.	24 months from Commencement date
Annual acquitted financial statement #2	Details of expenditure of ARDC funds and signed by the subcontractor's representative.	24 months from Commencement date
Final project report	Details of progress against agreed deliverables, enabling FAIR, and project impact.	On completion
Acquitted financial statement	Details of expenditure of ARDC funds and signed by the subcontractor's representative.	On completion

## 4. Proposal terms

1. The Proposer must inform the ARDC promptly in writing of any material change to any of the information contained in their submitted Proposal, and of any material change in circumstance that may affect the truth, completeness or accuracy of any of the information provided in, or in connection with the Proposal.
2. The Proposer acknowledges and agrees that:
  - 2.1 to the maximum extent permitted by law, neither the ARDC nor its employees, advisers or agents will in any way be liable to any person or entity for any cost, expense, loss, claim or damage arising out of or in connection with this RFP;
  - 2.2 they have not relied on any express or implied warranty or representation made by or on behalf of the ARDC other than as expressly contained in this RFP or an addendum to this RFP;
  - 2.3 they have not received improper assistance from any staff member of the ARDC;
  - 2.4 they have not colluded with other organisations to inflate cost estimates
3. The Proposer acknowledges that the ARDC may alter this RFP, including its specifications / requirements, structure and timing, at any time and for any reason
4. The Proposer understands that proposals will be treated as confidential by ARDC and that ARDC will not disclose Proposal contents and Proposal information, except:
  - 4.1 as required by law (including, for the avoidance of doubt, as required under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (Vic) (FOI Act);
  - 4.2 for the purpose of investigations by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission or other government authorities having relevant jurisdiction;
  - 4.3 to external consultants and advisers of ARDC engaged to assist with the Proposal Selection Process;
  - 4.4 to the Department of Education, Skills and Employment, at its request and if required, to enable transparency and accountability; and/or
  - 4.5 general information from Proposers required to be disclosed by government policy and as part of the RFP approval process.



## Appendix 1 - Indicative EOI questions

The following section is intended to provide guidance as to the questions that will be asked in the online EOI form that will be made available on the ARDC website once the EOI period opens (<https://ardc.edu.au/collaborations/strategic-activities/platforms/platforms-open-call-2020/>). It is not anticipated at this point that the form will vary from this indicative template, but the ARDC reserves the right to make enhancements to the form before the EOI period opens. If you wish to be notified of any such changes, please [register your interest](#).

<p><b>1. EOI title</b> Provide a title of no more than 75 characters (approximately 10 words) *</p>
<p><b>2. Project lead</b> - contact details *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Title, First Name, Last Name, Job Title, Organisation, Group/Dept, Alternative Affiliation (optional), Alternative Job Title (optional), State, Email, Phone Number, ORCID (optional).</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Collaborators</b> *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- List collaborators who are involved in developing this EOI.</li> <li>- Title, First Name, Last Name, Job Title, Organisation, Group/Department, Alternative Affiliation (optional), Alternative Job Title (optional), State, Email, ORCID (optional).</li> <li>- <i>“Organisation” is the person’s employing organisation</i></li> <li>- <i>Please enter only <b>one</b> answer per entry field (i.e. do not list multiple groups or organisations in the same box)</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4. EOI summary</b> *</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide a summary of no more than 1500 characters (approximately 200 words) focusing on the <b>aims, significance (or context), expected outcomes, and expected benefits</b> of this project.</li> <li>- Write your EOI Summary simply, clearly and in plain English.</li> <li>- Avoid the use of acronyms and jargon.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. National-scale Research Infrastructure</b> * (1000 characters)</p> <p>The <a href="#">2016 Roadmap</a> identified a number of key research areas that would benefit from the development of national research infrastructure. This listing was not exhaustive, but implicit in this identification is that many research needs can be met by commercially available or institutional level solutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Describe why National-scale Research Infrastructure is required as a solution to the research problem or need you seek to address, and explain why this cannot be met by commercially available or institutional level solutions.</li> </ul>

6. **Key deliverables** \* (1000 characters per deliverable, up to five deliverables)

- Developing a successful, sustainable platform requires a mix of technical and social solutions. Technical elements can be an entire existing platform solution (like HubZero or OSF), components of a platform (such as data stores, analysis tools, microservices), or integrations between components, services, or data sources. Social elements include governance frameworks, community building approaches, or training methodologies and materials.
- Briefly describe the key deliverables of the project, noting:
  - the purpose of the deliverable
  - the technical or social elements that will be used for this deliverable
  - the relationship between the project elements

**Example deliverable:**

**Deliverable 2 Cloud-native tools for working with sample data**

A cloud-native data capture and analysis environment which will enable interacting at scale with multiple data types, essential for national-scale applications. This will consist of:

- API-enabled data discovery, access and download (in any standard format) to enable VDI users to access remote data and process it on local or cloud compute (adapted from ExampleCloud).
- “Code-snippets” to provide easy multi-code access to datasets in common languages (Python, R) (adapted from ExampleCloud)
- MicroServices for turn-key pipelines for common tasks
- Leverage CloudStor for raw data sharing and transfer
- Implement analysis tools built by Uni A and Industry Partner B

The data and metadata standards agreed upon in *Deliverable 1 - Community-agreed Data Standards* will inform this work.

7. **What is the anticipated total investment envelope (\$K) requested from ARDC? \***

- 125-199   
  200-299   
  300-399   
  400-499   
  500-599  
 600-699   
  700-799   
  800-899   
  900-999

8. **Proposed length of project** (beginning Jan 2021) \*

- 1 year   
  2 years   
  2.5 years (finishing June 2023)

9. **Any other information you wish to provide** (750 characters)

# Appendix 2 - Response to RFP - Indicative Proposal questions and assessment guidance

The following section is intended to provide guidance as to the questions that will be asked in the online form that will be made available on the ARDC website once the RFP period opens (<https://ardc.edu.au/collaborations/strategic-activities/platforms/platforms-open-call-2020>). It also includes the relevant selection criteria and assessment guidance. It is not anticipated at this point that the form will vary from this indicative template, but the ARDC reserves the right to make enhancements to the form before the RFP period opens. Those who submitted an EOI will be advised of any changes to this Proposal form via email.

Platforms Proposal questions, with associated selection criterion and assessment guidance	
1. <b>Proposal title *</b> Provide a title of no more than <b>75 characters</b> (approximately 10 words)	
2. <b>Proposal short title *</b> This can be an acronym or 2-3 word title used to refer to the project ( <b>25 characters</b> )	
3. <b>Proposal summary *</b> Provide a written Proposal summary of no more than <b>2000 characters</b> (approximately 260 words) focusing on the <b>aims, significance (or context), and expected outputs</b> of this Project. Write your Proposal Summary simply, clearly and in plain English. If your proposal is successful, the Proposal Summary will be used to give the general community an understanding of your project.  - <i>Avoid the use of acronyms, jargon and quotation marks.</i>	
4. <b>Expected benefit and impacts</b> of this proposal * ( <b>750 characters</b> ) - <i>Avoid the use of acronyms, jargon and quotation marks.</i>	
5. <b>EOI(s) *</b> List ID(s) of EOI(s) that led directly to this proposal	
<b>Criterion 1:</b> An EOI was submitted for the proposed project in the Platforms 2020 open call	<b>Assessment guidance:</b> The proposal relates to at least one EOI.

## 6. Proposal lead \*

### a. contact details

Title, First Name, Last Name, Job Title, [Organisation](#), Group/Dept, Alternative Affiliation (optional), Alternative Job Title (optional), State, Email, Phone Number, ORCID (optional), Project Role [choose all that apply].

- Project roles can be: DevOps, Project Manager, Training and/or development of user support materials, Communications, Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Board, Scientific/Subject Expert Advisory Board, Key user, Provision of advice only.

- *List only **one** affiliation/job title per field*

## 7. Collaborators \*

List collaborators who will be actively involved in the project. *\*List only **one** person/affiliation/job title per field\**

- First Name, Last Name, Email, Project Role
- All listed collaborators will be emailed a link to a form ([example](#)) which they **must** submit by 25 September to be counted as a collaborator on the assessment of this proposal. The form will ask for:
  - Title, First Name, Last Name, Job Title, [Organisation](#), Group/Dept, Alternative Affiliation (optional), Alternative Job Title (optional), State, Email, Phone Number, ORCID (optional), Project Role.
  - If they are a [Key User](#), it will ask what FoR codes (2 to 6 digit) they work under, and for up to three brief (**1000 character max**) case studies of what the platform will enable for their research.

- *List only **one** person/affiliation/job title per field*

- *“Organisation” is the person’s employing organisation. “Organisation” is defined as the highest-level Organisation that is relevant to a person (e.g. if you are from the Melbourne Institute hosted by University of Melbourne, you would list University of Melbourne as your Organisation, and the Melbourne Institute as your Alternate Affiliation). Therefore, if the institutes are hosted by/based at the same University, they do not count as separate Organisations for the purposes of assessing selection criterion #2. This also applies to CSIRO divisions, ARC Centres of Excellence, etc.*

- *‘Key Users’ are involved in shaping the platform functionality. They may be those that are already using the existing platform or service, or those that the platform is being developed to meet the needs of. They are committed to using the platform once developed.*

**Criterion 2:** The proposal includes at least three different [organisations](#) (including the lead organisation) who will actively contribute to the project delivery.

**Assessment guidance:** The proposal includes at least three different [organisations](#) who will actively contribute to the project delivery (i.e. they hold a role in the project other than “provision of advice only”).

## 8. Target research community

- Briefly describe the community/ies from which the core (or initial) user base of this Platform will be drawn \* (750 characters)
- How big is the initial user base? \* (200 characters)
- How many users of the platform are expected (for existing services, provide numbers of current users, and expected users at end of project). \* (200 characters)
- What is the total size of the potential Australian user base? \* (200 characters)

**Criterion 3:** The intended user community is represented in the project.

**Assessment guidance:** How is the intended user community (as described in Q8) represented in the project (as demonstrated by the Project Roles filled by Collaborators in Q7)?

**No score:** there is no evidence that the user community is represented or involved in the project.

**Satisfactory:** the user community has no direct representation in the project but users have been consulted (e.g. users were consulted in previous requirements gathering); or meaningful community consultation is planned once the project is underway.

**Excellent:** the user community is represented by key users who are part of the project team, contributing to project delivery, and/or serving on the steering, technical or scientific advisory boards.

## 9. Research Transformation

Will the platform support a transformation in the *type* of research that can be done? That is, will it enable new kinds of research, or answer research questions that couldn't previously be answered?

- Yes/No \* (radio buttons)
- If Yes, please provide **up to** three short use cases that best describe the transformation. (1500 characters each)
  - Describe:
  - The Challenge/Problem/Research question
  - The Data
  - The Solution (e.g. platform functionality)
  - The Transformation

Use Case #1

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: (pick list)

### **Example Use Case:**

**Challenge:** *How do integrated transport and land use policies and planning decisions impact on traveller behaviour, choices and future demand?"*

**Data:** *Transport datasets that are notoriously large, heterogeneous and hosted by multiple cross-jurisdictional agencies. For example, travel demand data which consists of millions of trips each day in different states; infrastructure supply data which consists of millions of road segments throughout Australia; and traffic flow data which consists of millions of vehicle and people movements each day.*

**Solution:** *Integrate the datasets and provide access through a single portal. Merging of datasets across sources will reduce bias in transport datasets, fill gaps in*

the data, improve the quality of data being input into models and thus the reliability of the modelling outputs. The Platform will provide users with a simple interface to select data, apply verified models, and visualise the outputs.

**Transformation:** This will enable complex transport and planning questions to be answered, in a form that can easily be translated into policy decisions.

Use Case #2

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: (pick list)

Use Case #3

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: (pick list)

**Criterion 4:** The platform supports a transformation to enable new kinds of research, or answer research questions that couldn't previously be answered.

**Assessment guidance:** An “adequate demonstration of transformation” would be: the existing state is clearly explained and contrasted with the proposed change in research practices; and the value of that change is clearly expressed.

**No score:** there is little or no evidence that the proposed platform will enable new kinds of research; or enable the answering of research questions that couldn't previously be answered

**Satisfactory:** the proposal adequately demonstrates that the platform will enable moderate improvements in research practices beyond what is currently possible.

**Excellent:** the proposal adequately demonstrates that the platform will enable radical improvements in research practices beyond what is currently possible.

**10. Research Acceleration**

Will the platform support a transformation in the *speed* at which research can be done? That is, will it decrease the time taken to do a type of research or answer a research question?

- a. Yes/No \* (radio buttons)
- b. If Yes, please provide **up to** three short use cases that best describe how it will accelerate research. (1500 characters each)
  - Describe:
  - The Challenge/Problem/Research question

- *The Data*
- *The Solution (e.g. platform functionality)*
- *The Transformation*

Use Case #1

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: \* (pick list)

Use Case #2

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: (pick list)

Use Case #3

- Relevant FoR(s): (pick list, max 2 FoRs)
- Target NRI: (pick list)

**Criterion 5:** The Platform will accelerate research (i.e. decrease the time taken to do a type of research or answer a research question).

**Assessment guidance:** An “adequate demonstration of acceleration” would be: the existing state is clearly explained and contrasted with the proposed change in research practices; and the value of that change is clearly expressed.

**No score:** there is little or no evidence that the proposed platform will decrease the time required to perform tasks related to research

**Satisfactory:** the proposal adequately demonstrates that the platform will moderately decrease the time required to perform tasks related to research

**Excellent:** the proposal adequately demonstrates that the platform will significantly decrease the time required to perform tasks related to research

11. **Building the Platform.** Developing a successful, sustainable platform requires a mix of technical and social solutions. Technical elements can be an entire existing platform solution (like HubZero or OSF), components of a platform (such as data stores, analysis tools, or microservices), or integrations between components, services, or data sources. Social elements include governance frameworks, community building approaches, or training methodologies and materials.

Outline how you will develop the technical and social solutions that make up your proposed platform, by describing the key deliverables of the project, noting:

- the purpose of the deliverable
- any existing technical or social elements that will be utilised
- the relationship between project components
- who is responsible for delivery, and
- the effort involved in delivery.

Key deliverable 1 \* (1500 characters)

*Example key deliverable:*

#### **Data analysis environment**

A cloud-native data capture and analysis environment which will enable interacting at scale with multiple data types, essential for national-scale applications. This will consist of:

- API-enabled data discovery, access and download (in any standard format) to enable virtual desktop users to access remote data and process it on local or cloud compute (adapted from ExampleCloud).
- “Code-snippets” to provide easy multi-code access to datasets in common languages (Python, R) (adapted from ExampleCloud)
- MicroServices for turn-key pipelines for the following common tasks ...
- Leverage CloudStor for raw data sharing and transfer
- Host analysis tools: XYZannotator built by Uni A, which allows ... 3D CalcTool from Industry Partner B provides ...

The data and metadata standards agreed upon in *Key Deliverable 2 - Community-agreed Data Standards* will inform this work.

Uni A will be responsible for adapting ExampleCloud, and implementing MicroServices and tools. Expected effort is 16 person-months.



Key deliverable 2 (1500 characters)

Key deliverable 3 (1500 characters)

Key deliverable 4 (1500 characters)

Key deliverable 5 (1500 characters)

This question contributes towards the evaluation of **Criterion 7: The proposer's ability to deliver the project is clearly demonstrated**

**Assessment guidance:** There should be a clear, logical breakdown of deliverables. Are the deliverables clear (i.e. unambiguous), appropriate (i.e. aligned with project goals), and achievable?

**No score:** deliverables are unclear, inappropriate, or not granular enough

**Satisfactory:** deliverables are clearly articulated, sufficiently aligned with project goals, and are *likely* achievable in the given timeframe.

**Excellent:** deliverables are clearly articulated, closely aligned with project goals, and are *highly likely* to be achievable in the given timeframe.

## 12. Dependencies \*

List any dependencies between your proposal and other existing or potential projects (including those submitted in this Platforms Open Call). What is your contingency approach if these other projects are not funded or struggle to meet their deliverables? (1200 characters)

**This question is not assessed.** However, this section allows you to address any apparent dependencies, and we may use this information when considering the final portfolio of projects.

### 13. Sustainability \*

Describe the sustainability model for the operation and maintenance of the Platform beyond the end of the project:

- a. Is there a community or organisation committed to the use and maintenance of the service provided by the platform? Or a clear path to commercialisation? \* (1200 characters)

---

- b. Projects that endure beyond a funding window often have a community of committed individuals who help to build a welcoming environment for new or interested potential users, actively fostering a growing base of users. How do you plan to grow the user base (beyond the initial core users) during and/or after the project?  
- *For example, by developing new use cases and expanding the functionality, and/or by active promotion of the platform and training new users.* \* (1200 characters)

---

- c. Key data assets should remain *usefully* accessible even if the platform ceases to operate (i.e. they are in formats that can be easily used, with enough metadata to be discoverable and reusable). How will any key data assets be preserved and made accessible should the platform cease to operate? \* (1200 characters)

---

- d. Anything else you'd like to add (1200 characters)

**Criterion 6:** The project has a feasible sustainability model

**Assessment guidance:** A sustainability model has many potential facets. Hence this criterion is assessed across three questions covering aspects that are equally important (13a. organisational commitment, 13b. active user community, and 13c. continued access to data assets); and any other ideas that you have to sustain the platform that does not include further ARDC investment or grant funding (13d).

**No score:** little consideration has been given to key elements of a sustainable platform. The platform seems unlikely to continue at the end of the ARDC investment period, outside of applying for additional investment.

**Satisfactory:** consideration has been given to the answers to 13a-c, or a novel aspect described in 13d, demonstrating an adequate plan to continue operation of the platform at the end of the ARDC investment period.

**Excellent:** considerable thought has gone into sustaining the platform beyond the ARDC investment period. The answers to the questions 13a-c make a compelling case that the platform will be able to continue at the end of the ARDC investment period; and/or a compelling alternate pathway to sustainability is laid out in question 13d.

#### 14. Governance and Project Management \*

Describe the governance and project management structures for the proposed project. (2200 characters)

This question contributes towards the evaluation of **Criterion 7: The proposer's ability to deliver the project is clearly demonstrated**

**Assessment guidance:** Projects should have a governance structure that includes at least a steering committee and a core project work group/team. ARDC will be represented on the steering committee, and ARDC staff may be available to sit on project or other groups to provide advice. It may also be appropriate to have one or more of the following: a technical advisory group; an expert advisory group; a standards group; or a business advisory group, etc. Individual members of groups may be nominated in advance from across the project partners, or determined during project implementation.

Project management involves developing the project plan, communicating with internal and external stakeholders, ensuring the deliverables and milestones are met, reporting to the steering committee and ARDC, and monitoring project risks and issues. The person responsible for project management must have the time and capacity to perform these functions, so the role is generally assigned to a dedicated project manager, rather than being undertaken by the Chief investigator or Project Lead.

**No score:** the governance and project management structures are not described, vague, and/or inappropriate.  
**Satisfactory:** a project governance group is proposed, but either not enough detail is given, or membership is not appropriate.

**Excellent:** a project governance group (e.g. a steering committee, project control board, etc) is proposed with membership comprising appropriate representatives from the partners. Additional groups (such as technical and/or scientific advisory groups) are proposed for large, complex projects. The role and responsibility of each group is outlined and is appropriate.

**Assessment guidance:** Does the proposal lead have the time and capacity to deliver the project?

**No score:** The proposer has not adequately demonstrated that they have the capacity to devote the proposed effort to the project

**Minimal:** there are concerns that the lead has too many competing commitments to devote the proposed effort to the project

**Satisfactory:** the lead has time to devote the proposed effort to the project

## 15. Budget & Deliverable breakdown \*

Using the [template](#), provide:

- a. a breakdown of the deliverables. This needs to be more detailed than the key deliverables outlined in Q11. Milestones may be added to suit the needs of the project.

This question contributes towards the evaluation of

**Criterion 7: The proposer's ability to deliver the project is clearly demonstrated**

**Assessment guidance:** There should be a clear, logical breakdown of deliverables. Are the deliverables clear (i.e. unambiguous), appropriate (i.e. aligned with project goals), and achievable?

**No score:** deliverables are unclear, inappropriate, or not granular enough

**Satisfactory:** deliverables are clearly articulated, sufficiently aligned with project goals, and are *likely* achievable in the given timeframe.

**Excellent:** deliverables are clearly articulated, closely aligned with project goals, and are *highly likely* to be achievable in the given timeframe.

- b. a breakdown of the project budget, over the length of project. Include proposed roles and organisation; where actual individuals have not been allocated to the project, use a role name and Full Time Equivalents (FTE). Each individual or FTE role is to be included as a separate line item.

- *If project collaborators have been listed as having a project delivery role, they must be included in the budget table*
- *Activities should be assigned to appropriate level personnel*
- *Effort proposed should be appropriate*

(Allowed to upload ONE file that contains Deliverable Breakdown and Budget)

**Criterion 8: The project provides good value for money (comparable to similar projects)**

**Assessment guidance:** Does the project provide good value for money in the context of comparable projects and given the size of the project?

**No score:** The Budget is not well described in enough detail to perform the evaluation, or does not meet the criteria for "Satisfactory".

**Satisfactory:** The proposed project provides good value for money in the context of comparable projects and given the size of the project; activities are assigned to appropriate level personnel; and effort proposed is appropriate. Additionally, project collaborators who are listed in Q7 as having a project delivery role are included in the budget table with the same role.

**16. Investment**

- a. What is the investment requested from ARDC per year? \* *(Only provide numbers for each calendar year that the project will run, leave blank otherwise)*
  - i. 2021 (12 months)
  - ii. 2022 (12 months)
  - iii. 2023 (6 months)
  
- b. What is the total amount of co-investment from partners? \*

**Criterion 9: High co-investment from project partners is achieved**

**Assessment guidance:** This criterion will not be used to rank applications, but it may be considered when making a final decision.

**17. Diagram or graphic**

You may provide ONE diagram or graphic that assists in describing the project to the reviewers. For example, a high-level system architecture diagram, a diagram describing the data flows, or a visual project breakdown, etc.

*(Allowed to upload ONE file (expect PDF or JPEG, PNG, etc))*

\* indicates required question