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Models the IT Working Group considered

- **Fully centralised**
  - Evidence portfolios and research output sent to and stored by DEST

- **Decentralised**
  - EPs and research output stored at universities

- **Semi-centralised**
  - Evidence portfolios sent to DEST with research output held in institutional repositories
Semi-centralised model

- Institutions prepare institutional submission and evidence portfolios and send to DEST. EPs will include links to research outputs.
- Assessors log into an RQF MIS to be presented with a list of research outputs to assess.
- Assessor clicks on the links to access institutional repositories to assess research outputs.
- Plus managing panels, assessors, ‘scoring’, reporting, funding ...
Semi-centralised model
The Technology

• Institutional submission and evidence portfolios sent to DEST (via XML **web services**?)
• Research output made available via institutional **repositories**
• Access, **authentication** and Access Federation
• **Web application** - RQF IMS interface for panels, assessors and institutions
Issues

- Still some details to sort out
- Usability
- Timeframe
- Technology
  - Different repositories
  - Different platforms
  - Access methods
  - Bandwidth and big things
  - Foreign objects (non-traditional)
How and When

• Working with you
• Site visits and surveys
• Proof of concept(s) – progressively
• Technical architecture and specification – June/July
• Pilot - December
Questions
(to add to the list!)