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# RFP

## RFP Contact Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP Proposals ONLY** | [proposals-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:proposals-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au) |
| **RFP Questions ONLY** | [questions-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:questions-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au) |
| **General Queries**  **Questions relating to the RFP**  **should ONLY be delivered via the**  **appropriate email addresses above.** | The NeCTAR Directorate  Room 3.11, Level 3  Doug McDonell Building  The University of Melbourne, Vic 3010  Contact: (03) 8344 1277 |

## RFP Timeline

The full timeline is published and maintained on the NeCTAR website at (http://www.nectar.org.au)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Request For Proposal issued | 20th September 2011 |
| Close for queries regarding proposal preparation | 5 business days before the Closing Time |
| Responses to be received by (Closing Time) | 04:00pm AEST 02nd November 2011 |

## RFP Checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Have you registered online at http://www.nectar.org.au? |  |
| 1. Have you read and understood Part A? |  |
| 1. Have you read and understood the relevant project Part B documentation? |  |
| 1. Have you read and understood Part C? |  |
| 1. Have you completed all sections of Part D? |  |
| * Section 2 Contact Information |  |
| * Section 3 Compliance Statement and Departures |  |
| * Section 4 Fields of Research (as appropriate) |  |
| * Section 5 Response, noting the selection criteria in Section 6 |  |
| * Section 7 Milestones and Deliverables |  |
| 1. Have you asked any questions you needed to, and received sufficient answers? |  |
| 1. Have you returned the pack, Part D, to [proposals-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:proposals-rfp-nectar@unimelb.edu.au)? |  |

## Submission Instructions

Proposals shall be submitted:

* electronically (as per Section 1.1);
* in English;
* in a legible font and size (suggested minimum 10pt);
* in text-searchable PDF; and
* a 10 Megabyte (including attachments) limit.

On Closing Time, the University of Melbourne Tender Board will issue all submissions to NeCTAR for review.

Proposals must be received no later than Closing Time specified in the Timeline or they will be treated as a Late Submission as described below.

NeCTAR reserves the right to change the Closing Time for any reason, in which event written notice of the change will be provided.

## Late Submission

Proposals lodged after the Closing Time or lodged at a location or in a manner that is contrary to that specified in this RFP will be disqualified from the selection process and will be ineligible for consideration, except where the Proposer can clearly demonstrate, to the reasonable satisfaction of NeCTAR, that late lodgement of the Proposal:

1. resulted from the mishandling of the Proposal by NeCTAR; or
2. was hindered by a major incident and the integrity of the selection process will not be compromised by accepting a Proposal after the Closing Time.

The determination of NeCTAR as to the actual time that a Proposal is lodged is final. Subject to paragraphs (a) and (b) above, all Proposals lodged after the Closing Time will be recorded by NeCTAR, and will only be opened for the purposes of identifying a business name and address of the Proposer. NeCTAR will inform a Proposer whose Proposal was lodged after the Closing Time of its ineligibility for consideration. All such Proposals will be returned at the conclusion of the Selection Process.

# Contact Details of the Proposer

## Proposer Contacts

The Contact Details of the Proposer are to be detailed in section 2.1.1 below.

Please add the details of any anticipated participating organisations in section 2.1.2. Add extra lines as required.

### Proposer

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organisation Name |  |
| Contact Name |  |
| Position |  |
| Business Address |  |
| Postal Address |  |
| Telephone |  |
| Facsimile |  |
| Mobile Phone |  |
| E-mail |  |

### Participating Organisations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Organisation / Group Name | Location | Role |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Compliance Statement

## Proposed Sub-Contract Compliance

**Are there any Departures from the Contract (Part C) Terms and Conditions?**

**No** There are no departures from the terms and conditions (i.e. Full Compliance)

**Yes** There are departures from the terms and conditions

Detail the departures in Section 3.4 of this document.

The proposing organisation warrants that except for the departures listed in Section 3.4, the response is in full compliance with the Contract terms and conditions and no further contractual issues will be entered in to.

Signature of authorised person making the statement Name and role (printed) Date

## RFP Compliance

**Are there any Departures from the RFP Terms and Conditions (Part A)?**

**No** There are no departures from the terms and conditions (i.e. Full Compliance)

**Yes** There are departures from the terms and conditions (i.e. Does not Fully Comply)

Detail the departures in Section 3.4 of this document.

The proposing organisation warrants that except for the departures listed in Section 3.4, the response is in full compliance with the RFP terms and conditions.

Signature of authorised person making the statement Name and role (printed) Date

## Conflict of Interest

**Are there any known or potential conflicts of interest responding to the RFP and its Terms and Conditions or in delivering the proposed works?**

**No** There are no conflicts of interest

**Yes** Describe the conflicts in Section 3.5 of this document.

Do you commit to inform the University of Melbourne of any future conflicts or potential conflicts as they arise?

**Yes**

Signature of authorised person making the statement Name and role (printed) Date

## Statement of Departures

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clause or Reference** | **Nature of Compliance** | **Proposed wording of amendment** |
| **Proposed Sub-Contract** |  |  |  |
| **RFP Terms and Conditions** |  |  |  |

## Conflict of Interest

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The Nature of the Conflict** | **Implications of the Conflict** | **How the Conflict is to be managed?** |
|  |  |  |

# Fields of Research

For RC and NSP proposals, this section is optional. RT and VL proposals must complete this section. Select up to five disciplines using either the two or four digit codes, or a mixture of both, and allocate a percentage score or weight against how closely the Proposal is aligned to a particular community discipline or Field Of Research. The FOR codes are available at: <http://www.arc.gov.au/applicants/codes.htm>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DISCIPLINE/FOR Code | Weight (percent) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 0% |

# Response Template

Complete the following table, ensuring a response to all headings and statements are provided. Attach this as a separate document to your proposal. Not all elements apply to every program (RT, VL, RC, NSP), please indicate “not applicable” as appropriate.

Any additional material or brochures can be added as attachments to the Proposal. The page counts are an indicative guideline for responses.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Title** | **Items to Address** | **Suggested Page Count** |
| **SUMMARY** | | | |
| **1** | **Program and Proposal Title** | * *Which program is this proposal addressing? (RT, VL, RC, NSP).* * *Provide a short title for the proposal to use as a reference in communications.*   Cloud-based Bioinformatics Tools  This proposal is addressing the eResearch Tools program. | 0.1 |
| **2** | **Executive Summary** | *Summarise the context that leads to this project and briefly outline the vision for the outcomes.*  Data is the primary asset of biomedical researchers, and the engine for both discovery and translational medical research. As the volume and sensitivity of research data increases, due to technologies such as whole genome scanning and high throughput sequencing, so too does the requirement for access to application software for integrating and interrogating the different types of research data. Researchers often need to be able to execute complicated queries and conduct analysis across multiple data types, such as phenotypic, genotypic, pedigree and biospecimen data.  The Ark project was established within the Centre for Genetic Epidemiology & Biostatistics at the University of Western Australia in late 2009 to develop an open-source platform to support Australian and International biomedical researchers. The objective of The Ark project is to provide a suite of secure, integrated web-based applications that incorporate the majority of the functionality required to conduct a complex study or clinical trial.  The project has now delivered a Java-based solution that delivers the following capabilities:   1. Create and a configure a study; 2. Define users and manage their roles and access permissions 3. Define and manage a research participant pool; 4. Define and manage the collection of phenotypic research data; 5. Dynamically generate Electronic Data Capture (EDC) forms for collecting most types of research data; 6. Manage physical biospecimens and the associated data (LIMS); and 7. Generate reports.   This functionality has now been released as Version 1.0 and is being used in production. The project team is currently focussed on supporting Version 1.0 and completing the first version of the following functionality:   * A flexible data extraction tool to extract data for analysis using software applications like SAS, SPSS or Stata; * Additional reporting functionality to support cross-module reports.   Additional capabilities that have been identified as necessary to support the medical research community include:   1. A contact management and pedigree management module; 2. A genotypic data management module. Note that we have developed a prototype in conjunction with researchers and developers from the OBiBa project at McGill University in Montreal; 3. Two and three dimensional pedigree visualisation and exploration software. Note that we have developed a prototype for a 3 dimensional pedigree visualisation tool that may be used as the basis for this module; 4. Integrated invoicing and billing capabilities; 5. Registry Management functionality; and 6. Additional web services to support integration with other systems and web sites.   The software has been designed and developed in accordance with the following guiding principles:   * The software should be web-based; * The software should be as user-configurable as feasible through a graphical user interface; * One instance of the software should securely support multiple research studies and multiple users; * The software must be highly secure; and * The software modules should be well integrated.   We are not aware of any equivalent open source software applications available nationally or internationally and we are unaware of any viable alternatives for researchers that do not have the required funding or expertise to purchase commercial solutions or develop their own solutions. Smaller studies are often able to operate using simple tools, such as Microsoft Access or Microsoft Excel, but there is no doubt that the research being undertaken by these studies is being compromised by the lack of suitable informatics support. | 1 |
| **3** | **Research Community Profile** | *Provide a profile of the research community that is sponsoring the proposal; include the aims of the community, geographic spread or location and membership size.* | 1 |
| **4** | **Development Organisation Profile** | *Provide details of the organisations that will contribute to the development of the proposed infrastructure; include information about their capacity and capabilities, their track record and relevant experience in this role, their approach to quality standards, support and warranty mechanisms, etc. Include any supporting statements from Research Users. Where specific projects are mentioned, indicate specifically the aspects which support your track record or experience.*  The Centre for Genetic Epidemiology & Biostatistics at the University of Western Australia…….  The Centre for MEGA Epidemiology at the University of Melbourne….  The OBiBa Project at McGill University in Montreal, Canada……  St John of God Hospital……..  Australian Twin Registry…….  Western Australian Institute for Medical Research……..  Clinical Oncological Society of Australia……….  Sun City Medical Services……  New South Wales Cancer Council…….  Australian Breast Cancer Foundation……… | 2 |
| **5** | **Operational Organisation Profile** | *Provide details of the organisations that will contribute to the development of the proposed infrastructure once they have been commissioned; include information about their capacity and capabilities, their track record and relevant experience in this role, their approach to quality standards, support and warranty mechanisms, etc. Include any supporting statements from Research Users.*  *Where specific projects are mentioned, indicate specifically the aspects which support your track record or experience.* | 2 |
| **6** | **Other Participants** | *Name any other institutions or groups that will need to be involved in the project planning and execution and their roles.*  *Patrick Rose*  *Cancer Council of New South Wales*  *National Breast Cancer Foundation* | 0.5 |
| **7** | **Key Personnel** | *State any key individuals that are required for specific project activities and their availability.*  *Provide names, organisational locations, and their expected roles.*  *For example; Project Managers, designers, technical experts.*   * Paul White, University of Western Australia, Project Manager * Christopher Ellis, University of Western Australia, Technical Architect * Adrian Bickerstaffe, Melbourne University, Software Developer * Professor Eric Moses, Centre for Genetic Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Western Australia, ?? * Professor John Hopper, Melbourne University, ?? * Dr Nik Zeps, Western Australian Research Tissue Network, St John of God Hospital, ?? | 0.5 |
| **8** | **Infrastructure** | *Describe the proposed infrastructure to be developed. Provide supporting documentation, specifications etc as required.*  *Need to detail the functionality to be developed on top of The Ark.*  *The proposed infrastructure will* | 2 |
| **RESEARCH COMMUNITY NEEDS & BENEFITS** | | | |
| **9** | **Target Research Community** | *Identify the research communities and the expected number of users.* | 0.5 |
| **10** | **Needs and Impact** | *Describe the needs of the research community. Describe the impact on current research practices and any opportunities the new infrastructure will provide to those communities.*  *List the benefits to be derived from the delivered infrastructure, describe them in quantifiable terms where possible.*  *Outline how the impacts and benefits will be tracked, managed and measured.* | 2 |
| **11** | **Broader adoption** | *State which additional communities, resource providers or organisations would also be expected to benefit from the use of the new infrastructure and services should the project succeed.* | 0.5 |
| **12** | **Value adding** | *Identify the components of the project that are adding value to existing research infrastructure investment. For example; building new services on top of and using existing research infrastructure.*  *Describe the alignment with national research infrastructure and eResearch infrastructure priorities. See* [*http://www.innovation.gov.au/Science/ResearchInfrastructure/Pages/default.aspx*](http://www.innovation.gov.au/Science/ResearchInfrastructure/Pages/default.aspx)*.*  *Note how this project will engage with, and leverage off, the other national infrastructure programs such as ANDS, AAF, NCI, and RDSI, as well as any other NCRIS Capability Platforms.*  *Identify components that could be used by other research communities and organisations to resolve their problem. For example; a part of the workflow that could be used by other domains and research communities.* | 1 |
| **PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | | | |
| **13** | **Governance** | *State who is accountable for assessing project performance, what process will they apply.*  *Describe the authority structure over resources in the proposed project.*  *List all members of the Project Governance Body.*  *Describe the organisation’s Project Management methodology, scaled as appropriate for the proposed sub-project, and the maturity of its use within the organisation.*  *Describe the key processes and templates used internally by the organisation for governance and project management.* | 1 |
| **14** | **Project Scale** | *Identify the overall scale expected in the project, total effort, amount of funding required, amount of co-investment proposed and nominate any other participants that have indicated a willingness to participate through providing resources and what they are.* | 0.5 |
| **15** | **Project Approach** | *Detail how the required services will be developed and delivered. Outline the different stages of activity.* | 1 |
| **16** | **Key Deliverables and Acceptance Criteria** | *Define the key project deliverables.*  *Deliverables include the services, infrastructure and functionality specified above for development by the sub-project as well as any required project management artefacts.*  *Show the Acceptance Criteria against each deliverable. These will be further elaborated during project delivery when Commissioning Tests are prepared.*  *Define the Acceptance Criteria specific to Commissioning.* | 1 |
| **17** | **Quality Control** | *Identify the personnel, processes and any special resources that will be required for Quality Control, Acceptance and Commissioning Testing activities on the proposed project.*  *State who is responsible for the completion of each deliverable.*  *State who is accountable, within the sub-contracted organisation, for the acceptance of each deliverable.*  *In contrast to “what we will test” described earlier, this is a “how we test” description.* | 1 |
| **18** | **Risk and Issue Management** | *Define the key risks to the successful delivery of the proposed project.*  *Define any open issues that need resolving before the proposed project can start delivery.*  *Detail any key questions that will affect the operation of the proposed project pending a decision.*  *Define how the major risks and issues to the proposed project will be managed.* | 1 |
| **LEVERAGING** | | | |
| **19** | **Standardisation and Interoperability** | *Describe the global technology development or standardisation work that will be adopted, adapted or extended within the project and any risk reduction or additional value available by collaboration with similar activities occurring elsewhere in the world.*  *Identify any local or emerging standards that will incorporated by the project.*  *Mention OBiBa*  *NBCF collaboration* | 0.5 |
| **FINANCIAL** | | | |
| **20** | **Budget Breakdown** | *Provide a proposal breakdown of the project budget by the milestones, which are described as an attachment to the Proposal in the format described below.*  *Include proposed staffing levels; where actual individuals have not been allocated to the sub-project, use a role name and Full Time Equivalents (FTE) to show the number and value of budgeted staff that will be working on the sub-project at that milestone. For example; Software Designer by 2 or two Software Designers working full time on the sub-project. Each individual or FTE role is to be included as a separate line item.*  *Break down the budget into EIF (NeCTAR) funding or co-investment funding.* | 1 |
| **SERVICES AND SUPPORT** | | | |
| **21** | **Service Levels** | *Specify the service level that will be offered for each service in relation to the levels discussed in the relevant Part B document.* | 0.5 |
| **22** | **Operations and User Support** | *Detail the proposed operator of each service, what support will be provided to users and by whom.* | 1 |
| **23** | **Sustainability** | *Describe how the project infrastructure will be made sustainable following the completion of the project and becoming operational, when EIF funds cannot be used. Include information on the proposed business/financial model and the timeframes to which they apply.* | 0.5 |
| **24** | **IP, Licensing and Access** | *State if any software licenses will be used for software developed by the proposed project, or other software used for the services to be delivered by the proposed project.*  *State if software developed by the project will be made available under an open-source license.*  *State if other Intellectual Property (IP) or licensing restrictions are relevant to the services that will be delivered.*  *State if there are any restrictions on access to the services that will be delivered.*  All software development will be undertaken under the GPLv3 open source software license. The GNU General Public license is a copyleft license for general use, which means that derived works can only be distributed under the same license terms. Under this philosophy, the GPL grants the recipients of a computer program the rights of the free software definition and uses copyleft to ensure the freedoms are preserved, even when the work is changed or added to.  There will be no other Intellectual Property or licensing restrictions relevant to the services that will be delivered.  There will be no restrictions on access to the services that will be delivered.  Software licenses used for software development will include:   * Macintosh Operating System * Windows Operating System * Centos Linux Operating System (Local & NeCTAR Research Cloud) * Navicat Data Modelling Tool * MySQL Database (open source license) * Atlassian Jira issue tracking and project management (open source license) * Atlassian Confluence wiki (open source license) * Subversion source code management * Drupal web content management * Limesurvey * Hudson Continuous Integration * Microsoft Project * LDAP * AAF Authentication Services * RDSI NoDe and DaSh??? For data sharing * Other tools? | 0.5 |
| **25** | **Communications and Engagement** | *Describe the means by which customer satisfaction with the proposed project’s planning, requirements gathering, scoping decisions, progress, quality and outputs will be measured.*  An Agile software development approach will be used for the project. Software will be developed in short iterations, typically 4 weeks. Each iteration will involve a team working through a full software development cycle including planning, requirements analysis, design, coding, unit testing, and acceptance testing. At the end of each iteration a working product will be demonstrated to stakeholders. This will minimise overall risk and allow the project to adapt to changes quickly. This approach will provide the project customers the opportunity to provide timely feedback that can rapidly be integrated into the software development process. | 0.5 |
| **26** | **Constraints and Dependencies** | *Define and explicitly quantify any schedule, expenditure, resource, scalability, performance, and quality constraints or limitations on the project and its deliverables.*  *State the dependencies with external parties, including other NeCTAR projects, which have been identified in planning the proposed project.* | 0.5 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **For National Servers Program and Research Cloud proposals Only** | | | |
| **27** | **Datacentre** | *Provide information about the datacentre hosting the infrastructure and the existing capacity for the projected equipment. Define what emergency and redundant power is available State if it is cooling redundant, and with sufficient capacity. Define what fire systems are used. State your stated service levels for your datacentre.* | 0.5 |
| **28** | **Network** | *Provide information about the network facilities available to the infrastructure. Define the typical network capacity available to servers in your datacentre. State any known bottlenecks (eg in the network core). State your connection to AARNET. Define any other wide area network links that you have that could be useful to this project. State if you configure critical network equipment in a redundant manner. State if you have stated service levels for your network.* | 0.5 |
| **29** | **Operations** | *Provide information about your ICT operations practices that would apply to this project. State if you have maintenance windows, or procedures for handling infrastructure downtimes. State what monitoring facilities are used. State your typical hours of operation.* | 1 |
| **30** | **Governance and Participation** | *Indicate your commitment to participating in the RC/NSP Governance framework as outlined in the relevant Part B, working cooperatively with the Lead Node and the NeCTAR governance groups to achieve a nationally coherent infrastructure* | 0.5 |

# Selection Criteria

The following table outlines the criteria that will be used to assess proposals, based on the responses to Section 5 above. They are provided here only for the information of respondents and to ensure that responses consider the key elements being sought.

## Criteria for Virtual Laboratory and eResearch Tools Proposals

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Weight (%)** | **Criteria** |
| **Research Community** | **20%** |  |
| Research community to benefit is well-defined (by location, institutions, size), nationally significant and the proposal is well supported by the research community | | |
| The needs of the research community to be addressed by the proposal are well defined and significant | | |
| Researcher participation in the proposal is well defined, significant and national or international in scale, supporting outreach, uptake, testing and evaluation of the project infrastructure | | |
| The proposal is aligned to national research priorities | | |
| The proposal is aligned with, and contributes to implementation of, national research infrastructure and eResearch priorities | | |
| **Research Impact** | **30%** |  |
| The benefits to be delivered to the identified research community are well described, achievable, significant and measurable | | |
| The process for tracking and measuring the benefits is defined and achievable | | |
| **Virtual Laboratories:** | | |
| The proposal integrates significant infrastructure and research capabilities on a national scale to deliver a transformative impact for the research community identified in the proposal:   * Improving access to instruments, data, compute and other research infrastructure * Enables new research practices through research workflows * Address emerging research challenges * Support cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary research workflows through the provision of integrated collaborative ICT infrastructure * Connect significant infrastructure capabilities to support discipline and problem oriented research workflows: e.g. remote laboratory access, computation, research data repositories, workflow tools and sensor networks * Provide an exemplar to research communities of the benefits of integrating significant research support capabilities into a rich online collaborative environment. | | |
| **eResearch Tools:** | | |
| The proposal delivers software infrastructure which improves existing tools to:   * Enhance support for research collaboration * Improve remote access to underlying research facilities and infrastructure * Enhance support for research workflows, including cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary workflows, and/or * Enable the connection of research data sets and repositories with research tools and workflows. | | |
| Potential benefits from re-use across research disciplines are well described, realisable and significant | | |
| **Implementation** | **30%** |  |
| An appropriate Governance structure has been defined for the Project   * A Governance body appropriate to the project has been defined * Authority structure over resources in the project has been described * Key personnel (if required) and their roles have been clearly defined | | |
| The infrastructure to be created by the proposal is well-described, achievable and will deliver the research impacts described.   * The scope is realistic and outcomes are achievable * Project Management is well-described and appropriate to the proposal scale * Key risks have been identified and are manageable * Issues that require solving have been identified * Dependencies with third parties have been listed | | |
| Capability and track record in development and operation of eresearch infrastructure   * The contribution and track record of each organisation in the proposal to development and operation of the infrastructure is well-described and appropriate to the successful delivery of the proposal infrastructure | | |
| The proposal leverages or builds upon existing research infrastructure where appropriate:   * the NeCTAR Research Cloud and NSP for infrastructure hosting and computation * existing research and eresearch infrastructure (eg. RDSI, ANDS, NCI, Pawsey, Super Science, NCRIS Capabilities, State and Institutional infrastructure)   It is expected that proposals will utilise the AAF for common authentication services. Where it is not possible for the proposed infrastructure to utilise the AAF for authentication purposes, appropriate and reasonable justification has been provided. | | |
| **Financial and Co-investment** | **20%** |  |
| The project budget is well-described, matched to appropriate milestones and appropriate to the needs of the project | | |
| The identified co-investment achieves the target level, is appropriate to the needs of the project, and adequately covers the operational requirements of the proposal | | |
| The proposal identifies an appropriate model for delivering future sustainability of the infrastructure | | |
| Proposed expenditure of EIF funds is adequately described and conforms to the EIF funding guidelines (Mandatory) | | |
| The proposal conforms to the principles on Access and Pricing as described in Part B of the NeCTAR RFP (Mandatory) | | |

## Criteria for Research Cloud and National Server Program Proposals

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Weight (%)** | **Criteria** |
| **Research Community** | **10%** |  |
| Research community to benefit is well-defined (by location, institutions, size), nationally significant and the proposal is well supported by the research community | | |
| The needs of the research community to be addressed by the proposal are well defined and significant | | |
| Researcher participation in the proposal is well defined, significant and national or international in scale | | |
| The proposal is aligned to national research priorities | | |
| The proposal is aligned with, and contributes to implementation of, national research infrastructure and eResearch priorities | | |
| **Research Impact** | **20%** |  |
| The benefits to be delivered to the identified research community are well described, achievable, significant and measurable   * Process for tracking and measuring the benefits is defined and achievable | | |
| Potential benefits from re-use across research disciplines are well described, realisable and significant | | |
| **Implementation** | **40%** |  |
| An appropriate Governance structure has been defined for the Project   * Proposers commit to operate under the Governance arrangements for the RC and NSP as described in the NeCTAR Final Project Plan (Section 4.3) * Research Cloud node proposers commit to operate in accordance with the principles described in Section 4.3.1.3 of the NeCTAR Final Project Plan * Authority structure over resources in the project has been described * Key personnel (if required) and their roles have been clearly defined | | |
| The infrastructure to be created by the proposal is well-described, achievable and will deliver infrastructure in a timely manner.   * Project Management is well-described and appropriate to the proposal scale * Key risks have been identified and are manageable * Issues that require solving have been identified * Dependencies with third parties have been listed | | |
| Capability and track record in development and operation of signifcant ICT infrastructure for research users   * The contribution and track record of each organisation in the proposal to development and operation of the infrastructure is well-described and appropriate to the successful delivery of the proposal infrastructure | | |
| The proposal leverages or builds upon existing research infrastructure where appropriate:   * Co-location with proposed nodes of the RDSI Project * Co-location of proposed Research Cloud and NSP nodes to achieve cost reductions * Co-location with other significant eresearch infrastructure (eg. HPC, Repositories Instruments) | | |
| **Financial and Co-investment** | **30%** |  |
| The project budget is well-described, matched to appropriate milestones and appropriate to the needs of the project | | |
| The identified co-investment achieves the target level, is appropriate to the needs of the project, and adequately covers the operational requirements of the proposal | | |
| The proposal identifies an appropriate model for delivering future sustainability of the infrastructure | | |
| Proposed expenditure of EIF funds is adequately described and conforms to the EIF funding guidelines (Mandatory) | | |
| The proposal conforms to the principles on Access and Pricing as described in Part B of the NeCTAR RFP (Mandatory) | | |

# Milestone and Funding Milestone Template

## Funding Estimate

Please add the details of any anticipated participating organisations in the below table along with their anticipated Funding Allocation as a percentage of the Proposer’s Total Funding estimate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organisation / Group Name | Anticipated Distribution of EIF Funds (%) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Milestone Template

Complete the table overleaf with proposed milestones and the associated budgets and proposed funding amounts to be drawn down from NeCTAR. The submitted table must form an attachment to the Proposal and will be used to prepare the contract Schedules. Deliverables are to be described in as much detail as necessary to show that careful thought has been spent on planning. Example milestones shown may apply to a particular type of project, but are expected to be adapted to suit the needs of the project and NeCTAR Program.

**Note** – **Items in “Deliverables/Completed Activity” are mandatory.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Funding Milestone**  **Yes / blank** | **Milestone Title** | **Deliverables/Completed Activity** | **Target Milestone Date** | **NeCTAR (EIF) funds ($thousands)** | | | | **Co-investment**  **(budgeted contribution value) (‘000)** |
| **Requested**  **(‘000)** | **Planned Expenditure breakdown** | | |
| **Labour**  **(‘000)** | **Equipment**  **(‘000)** | **Other**  **(‘000)** |
| 1 | Yes | Sub-contract signed |  | 31 Jan 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | Project Initiation complete | *Communications plan prepared and sent to NeCTAR (Signed contract + two months).* | 31Mar 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Yes | Final Admin Closure | *Post-implementation Review (PIR) conducted and sent to NeCTAR.*  *Practical Completion Certificate accepted by NeCTAR.* | 30 Sep 2013 | 100  (last ten percent) |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  | Operations to June 2014 | *Service Levels met and reported to NeCTAR as defined.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |