

Application review form

FIRI 2024

FIRI 2024 Membership in international research infrastructures

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review the applications

The aim of this call is to assess whether it would be beneficial for Finland to become a state member of international research infrastructures.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for section 1 (Operation of international research infrastructure and national operations), section 2 (Wide and versatile impact) and section 3 (Sustainable financial plan. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 4 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.

Use a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved
2 (poor)	Contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Operation of international research infrastructure and national operations

1.1 International research infrastructure

Subrating (1–6)

Are the services and service modes offered internationally clearly described at an appropriate level?

Please review the following aspects:

- Does the international RI strengthen the existing national and international RI landscape?
- Is the ownership, know-how and organisational structure of the international research infrastructure operations at an appropriate level?



- How the international research infrastructure considers aspects related to digitalisation and data.
- See [action plan](#) (section 1.1)

1.2 Finnish activities related to international research infrastructure Subrating (1–6)

Are the services and service modes offered nationally clearly described at an appropriate level?

Please review the following aspects:

- Does the international research infrastructure have a clearly defined user community in Finland and does/do the Finnish coordinator(s) have a plan for how to widen it? Please explain.
- Could the membership increase the international attractiveness and competitiveness of Finland's research, development and innovation (RDI) system? Please explain.
- How the international research infrastructure considers aspects related to digitalisation and data.
- See [action plan](#) (section 1.2)

2 Wide and versatile impact

2.1 Would membership bring added value to the wide and versatile impact of RDI actions in Finland? Sub-rating (1–6)

Please review the following aspects:

- Would membership in the international research infrastructure have an impact on the research, development and innovation ecosystem (incl. international networks)?
- Is impact discussed with the stakeholders and monitored sufficiently?
- See [action plan](#). (section 2.1)

2.2 Green transition (no numerical rating)

Has the green transition been considered appropriately in the operation of the international research infrastructure? If it has not, please provide comments in the text box below.

- Yes
- No

2.3 Sustainable development (no numerical rating)

Have relevant sustainable development goals (other than the green transition) been considered appropriately in the operation of the international research infrastructure? If they have not, please provide comments in the text box below.



Research Council of Finland

Yes

No

- See [action plan](#) (section 2.2).

3 Sustainable financial plan

3.1 Are the plans for the international research infrastructure's long-term funding base sustainable and realistic in general? **Subrating (1–6)**

- See [action plan](#) (section 3).

4 Review panel's summary assessment

4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications **(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of application's main strengths, with justifications

- [To be completed only at the panel meeting](#)

4.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications **(no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of application's main weaknesses, with justifications

- [To be completed only at the panel meeting](#)

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

5 Overall rating

Rating (1–6)

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the subratings. For example, the application should not be penalised if it has a slight weakness in one evaluation item that is later



Research Council of Finland

strengthened in another item (e.g. lack of some expertise in a local team but compensated through international collaboration).

