|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Application Experiment title  |
| Proposal Template to CloudFlow Project Open Call1 (CloudFlow-1) |

Partner table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Partner no | Partner acronym | Partner name | PIC | Organization type | SME |
| 1 | Partner 1 |  | 12345678 | End user |  |
| 2 | Partner2 |  |  |  |  |
| … | … |  |  |  |  |
| N | Partner n |  |  |  |  |

Coordinator

Name:
Affiliation:
Phone:
E-mail:

Abstract *(5 lines)*

Keywords *(max. 5 keywords)*

Keyword 1, …, keyword 5

Table of Contents

[1 Industrial Relevance (max. 1 page) 4](#_Toc387232007)

[2 Design of Experiment (max. 1 page) 5](#_Toc387232010)

[3 Technical impact (Section 3 and 4 together max. 1 page) 6](#_Toc387232011)

[4 Business impact 6](#_Toc387232012)

[5 Innovation (max. 1 page) 7](#_Toc387232013)

[6 Exploitation (max. 1 page) 8](#_Toc387232014)

[7 Technical Approach (max. 1 page) 9](#_Toc387232015)

[8 Work plan (max. 2 pages including tables) 10](#_Toc387232016)

[9 Resources committed (max. 1 page) 12](#_Toc387232021)

[10 Consortium (max. 2 pages incl. max. ½ page per partner) 13](#_Toc387232022)

**Call information**

Identifier: CloudFlow-1

Call title: New application experiments for CloudFlow – 1st call

Project full name: Computational Cloud Services and Workflows for Agile Engineering

Project acronym: CloudFlow

Grant agreement number: 609100

Call deadline: 30. September 2014 17:00 h (CET)

# 1 Industrial Relevance (max. 1 page)

## 1.1 Description of the current (engineering and manufacturing) process

*Which task(s) is/are addressed? How do you solve it/them today?*

*What are the current limitations and their consequences?*

*Which data is involved? Which tools do you use?*

*Which compute resources are you using?*

*Which effort does it require?*

*How much time do you need today, approximately?*

## 1.2 Description of the envisaged process based on Cloud simulation

*What are the suggested improvements and potential benefits?*

# 2 Design of Experiment (max. 1 page)

*What are the driving questions for the experiment?*

*What do you want to know/prove?*

*How did you design the experiment to get evidence?*

*What are you performance indicators?*

*How do you want to measure them?*

*Answer and discuss the above questions for business (models) AND technical aspects.*

# 3 Technical impact (Section 3 and 4 together max. 1 page)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| End-users: | *What is the technical impact of the experiment as a whole on your application?* |
| ISVs: | *What is the technical impact of the experiment as a whole on your software?* |
| HPC center: | *What is the technical impact of the experiment as a whole on your infrastructure?* |
| R&D partner: | *What is the technical impact of the experiment as a whole on your technology?* |

*What do you think is the technical impact of your experiment on the CloudFlow infrastructure?*

# 4 Business impact

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| End-users / ISV / HPC center: | *What is the impact of the experiment as a whole on your business?* |

# 5 Innovation (max. 1 page)

*What are the innovative aspects of your application experiment?*

1. *enable end-users to access computational Cloud engineering services not yet used by them*
2. *allow to simulate more complex models for developing better product / for more reliably assessing compliance with requirements (design for X and simulation/optimization) – predictability of product behaviour*
3. *enable/support complex computational engineering services and workflows in the Cloud challenging the interoperability of data and tools*
4. *others*

*Please explain and discuss.*

# 6 Exploitation (max. 1 page)

*How the results are going to be exploited during and beyond the span of the project?*

*How are you going to continue the partnership of this experiment (after the end)?*

*How do you plan to scale up from the consortium to other partners, countries, etc.*

*How will the experiment result (incl. software) be available to CloudFlow after the end of your experiment?*

# 7 Technical Approach (max. 1 page)

*How you want to implement and run the experiment?*

*What are the building blocks of your solution?*

*How are they related and will they be integrated?*

*Which changes do you plan to do to them?*

# 8 Work plan (max. 2 pages including tables)

*Which steps do you want to take to realize them?*

## 8.1 Activities: Activity table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ActivityNo** | **Activity title** | **Lead parti-cipant no.** | **Person-months** | **Startmonth** | **Endmonth** |
| Act n | <title> | Pn | <nn> | Mi | Mk |
|  | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |

*NB: There is a mandatory activity to evaluate the experiment and corresponding services will be provided by the CloudFlow Competence Center.*

## 8.2 Milestones: milestone table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestone number** | **Milestone name** | **Activity(-ies) involved** | **Expected date** | **Comment** |
| MS EXn.1 | <name> | A1, A2, …, An | Mi | <text> |

## 8.3 Deliverables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Del. no.** | **Deliverable name** | **Activity no.** | **Nature[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Dissemination level**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **Delivery date** |
| D EXn.1 | <name> | A1, A2, …, An | R/P/D/ other | PU/PP/RE/CO | Mi |

*NB: In addition come obligations to CloudFlow, namely activity reporting (every three months), final experiment report and review contributions.*

## 8.4 Timeline: Gantt chart

*Example Gantt chart showing the CloudFlow work package that manages the OpenCall for experiments.*

**

**

**

# 9 Resources committed (max. 1 page)

*Please fill the table.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant number | Participant short name | Estimated eligible costs | Requested EC contri-bution(€) |
| Effort (PM) | Personnel costs (€) | Subcon-tracting(€) | Other direct costs(€) | Indirect costs(€) | Total costs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Explain clearly and justify your (types of) costs (other direct, subcontracting, etc.), e.g.*

* *use of HPC resources*
* *software,*
* *etc.*

*Note, additional costs for the CloudFlow Competence Center do not have to be considered here, since there is independent financing for existing CloudFlow partners of up to 40% (estimated, on average) of the requested contribution by an experiment.*

# 10 Consortium (max. 2 pages incl. max. ½ page per partner)

*Please describe the consortium as a whole*

*<here>*

*Please provide company profile, key personnel (per partner)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Partner name | *<description of company / organization>* |
| Link to webpage | *<web link>* |
| 1-2 key person(s)  | *Max. 5 lines* |

**Annex 1: Evaluation criteria and report form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation criterion Mark: | 1,2,3,4,5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Industrial relevance | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| 2. Design of Experiment | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 3. Impact, technical | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 4. Impact, business | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 5. Innovation | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 6. Exploitation | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 7. Soundness of technical approach | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 8. Quality of work plan | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 9. Effective and justified deployment of resources | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| 10. Appropriateness of the consortium for the experiment | 🞏🞏🞏🞏🞏 |
| Justification of score: |  |
|  |  |
| Sum: |  |

**Comments / instructions:**

0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. Reviewers leave the tick box empty and write a corresponding comment in the comment field.

1 Very Poor The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses;

2 Poor While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses;

3 Acceptable The proposal addresses the criterion, although significant improvements are possible;

4 Good The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are still possible;

5 Very Good The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Only integer numbers are possible.

**Rules for acceptance**

* Threshold is 30 out of 50
* At most 3 categories below 3 points
* In case of a tie of two or more proposals reaching the same numerical score and at the border of the funding resources, the CC can take the decision of which to fund and has to justify against the PO.
1. Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

 **R** = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

 **PU** = Public

 **PP** = Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services).

 **RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services).

 **CO** = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)