

Common errors in the Proposal and Computational Details submitted for A3P review:

1. Your name (or the names of your team members)
 - In titles/headers
2. Name of your institution/organisation/agency/university
 - In titles/headers
 - In captions for Figures and Tables
 - In the **Storage** section of Computational Details
 - Instead say something like
 - *"Archival data will be stored on home institution server."*
 - *"Surplus storage requirements will be met by partner facilities."*
 - *"...from our institution's managed data storage."*
 - Regarding licenses for software – *"Licence is available on University of Melbourne's* supercomputer."*
 - instead state
 - *"partner license is available"*
3. Project code
 - In titles/headers
 - In file name (this is not essential but is best practice to remove)
4. Year of PhD - the anonymised track record metric of **m-index** is being used to obscure CI career length
 - This could be used to calculate from m-index to h-index for a CI
5. Remove gendered pronouns (his/her)
 - Replace with 'their'
6. Previous allocation – do not include amount and/or usage statistics
 - Previous utilisation data will be provided by facilities in a normalised format
 - *"We have fully utilised our allocations in 2020 and produced a lot of data for climate systems."*
 - Consider instead using the '**Resources**' section of the application form (A3P NOT required) If you wish to provide more details on your 2020 use as justification for the 2021 request
 - '**Utilisation of Current Allocation**' and/or
 - '**Justification for Requested Amount**'
 - *"These reasonable requirements can also be reflected by our usage of allocations in 2020, which is given in the Progress Report."*
 - Do not include previous NCMAS allocation
 - Do not reference any previous NCMAS work – as this implies a previous/current NCMAS grant
 - This includes statements that refer to 'ongoing' support – as this implies current support
 - e.g. *"To guarantee success, ongoing NCMAS support is needed..."*
 - Remove 'ongoing'
 - Do not reference the '**Progress Report**' – as this implies current NCMAS allocation
 - The justification within the Computational Details should be things like a requirement for large scale parallel jobs, high throughput workflows, or data-intensive workflows using large data sets

7. References to named partners
 - Remove names of specific government/industry/university partners
 - Instead consider the type of partner and refer in a general non-identifiable way
 - It is acceptable to refer to *“experimental collaborating researchers at partner universities”* or similar.
 - *“This project supports existing frameworks of several existing nationally supported initiatives.”*
 - Remove these specific affiliations and refer to more general previous experience and current support from government initiatives/programs.
 - The **'Resources'** section of the form, including the **'Justification for Requested Amount'** (A3P not required) can be used to provide specific identifiable details of funding/support
 - Within the **'HPC Experience'** section you can also state the other projects that are the baseline for some of the work you propose to do (A3P not required)
 - Or, within the **'Funding'** section you can use the free text box to describe the specific (named) support of the project (A3P not required)
8. Please remove direct references to grant schemes/funding throughout the proposal
 - If you wish to specify support from a particular institution (e.g. BoM/CSIRO/GA/DoD), specific grant (e.g. ARC LP/ARC FT/ARC DP/NHRMC), or industry partnership (i.e. company names), you can do so in the **'Additional Funding'** text box in the **'Funding'** section of the Application Form (A3P not required).
 - Try instead to refer to 'national grants', 'industry partnerships', 'government initiatives/programs'
9. Computational Details - Remove specific details of team/funding/previous NCMAS or partner allocation
 - Detailing the resource estimates required for your job in a way that complies with A3P in the Computational Details is a good option as this means that all Stage 1/anonymous views of your application will see a thorough explanation of your request.
 - You can use the **'Justification for Requested Amount'** under **'Resources'** to simply state *“refer to the Computational Details”*.
 - However, if there is a justification you would like to provide that references an identifiable aspect of your project/team, the **'Resources'** section provides for this option.
 - This would be the place to highlight specific increased funding or change to circumstance (A3P not required).
 - Remove reference to previous allocation amount
 - Justification for increase can be provided in the **'Justification for Requested Amount'** part of the **'Resources'** section of the application form (A3P style NOT required)

10. Team size will be provided in the anonymised track record metrics – so the details of this should not be expressed in the Proposal and Computational Details
- Be careful of statements like *“This project will involve six PhD students and two RAs who will benefit from working in this cooperative team environment, with qualified and zealous researchers with interdisciplinary proficiency. The proposed projects will provide excellent opportunities for at least four Honours students.”*
 - Justification for resource amount, including a specific increase, can be provided in the **‘Justification for Requested Amount’** part of the **‘Resources’** section of the application form (A3P style NOT required)
 - This would be the place to include the specific staff available to support the resource request - including if new staff are starting in 2021
 - In sections of Computational Details, rather than referencing the *growth* in the group – could you just state that it is because of the size of your group?
 - *“We have a large group, and so our storage needs are accommodated under standard storage allocations.”*
11. Self-referencing
- Be careful of identification through naming another group
 - *“To date, we are aware of only one other similar project (Smith et al 2019)...”* implies that you are not Smith et al, which could be identifiable
 - Remove this sentence, or reword to something like
 - *“With this project we aim to contribute to the field of super laser projection, following the work of Smith et al (2019).”*
 - Referencing a preliminary/accepted paper implies some inside knowledge of the stage of publication
 - This also implies that you are the author of the paper
 - *“We have recently demonstrated the feasibility of our proposed combination of super lasers and quantum lenses*, (11) with a speed-up of nearly 4 orders of magnitude possible in the process.”*
 - Should be replaced with something like
 - *“A recent study has demonstrated the feasibility of the same combination of super lasers and quantum lenses* that we propose (11), with a speed-up...”*
 - *“Here, we will extend our earlier work on polarity interference with copper* [10] to investigate multiple metals, either simultaneously or sequentially.”*
 - Should be reworded to something like
 - *“We plan to extend the work on copper polarity interference* [10] to investigate...”*
12. Scalability testing on Gadi/Magnus/FlashLite/MASSIVE
- Scalability data on NCMAS facilities is fine
 - There are many ways you could have tested this e.g. start-up grant/NCMAS/partner share - so it is not immediately identifiable or associated with specific access.
 - Reference to specific facility in lack of use – implies personal experience
 - *“Scalability on MASSIVE: I haven’t accessed MASSIVE so far, so won’t be able to provide a scaling report for running jobs on MASSIVE.”*
 - Reword to something like *“No scaling report available for MASSIVE”*