Application review form

Finnish Flagship Programme interim evaluation 2021

Panel/Name of reviewer: Application number:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

The Academy of Finland's Flagship Programme is an instrument that supports high-quality research and increases the societal impact emerging from the research. The Finnish Flagships represent an effective mix of close cooperation with business and society, adaptability and a strong commitment from host organisations. In this call, host organisations of the Flagships selected in the first and second Flagship Programme calls are invited to submit funding applications for the second four-year Flagship term. The applications will serve as review material in the interim evaluation of the Flagships. The review material will also include interim reports provided to the Academy by the Flagships and results of a stakeholder survey that the Academy will organise in spring/summer 2021.

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following items.

- Blue text with bulleting refers to technical instructions for the online services (SARA).

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (poor). Where relevant, please consider both scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society.

6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty, innovation as well as impact with crucial relevance; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that extremely significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
5 (excellent)	Demonstrates novelty, innovation and impact with very high relevance – contains no significant elements to be improved; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that very significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely

4 (very good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved; has impact with high relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that significant support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
3 (good)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved; has impact with relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that some support to economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society is likely
2 (fair)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement; has low potential for impact in support of economic growth and/or innovation ecosystem(s) and society
1 (poor)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society during first two years of Flagship operation

1.1 Progress made, efficiency and effectiveness of activities during first two years of operation
Sub-rating (1–6)

Activities since project kick-off; advancement of project goals; validity of identified needs/changes from the point of view of achieving Flagship goals and added value generation; risks encountered and managed; etc.

- See **item 2** in the research and impact plan.
- See **Flagship progress report** available on the panel site in the online services.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

---

2 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society for remaining four-year funding period and beyond

---

2.1 Implementation plan for remaining funding period and beyond

Sub-rating (1–6)

Clarity and appropriateness of Flagship goals and how the plan builds on previous work; appropriateness of planned actions; risk management and mitigation; significance of expected outcomes by end of funding term; appropriateness of strategy beyond Flagship term and expected outcomes, etc.

- See **item 3** in the research and impact plan.

2.2 Responsible science   (no numerical rating)

Have the following aspects of responsible science been properly considered in the application? If not, please provide further comments.

- See **item 3.2** in the research and impact plan.
- The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting research integrity, responsible conduct of research and the principles and practice of equality and nondiscrimination and open science. See 'Instructions for reviewing' for further information.

2.2.1 Research ethics

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

2.2.2 Promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within project or in society at large

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

2.2.3 Open access to research publications

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

2.2.4 Data management and open access to data

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

2.2.5 Provide further comments if responsible science aspects have not been properly considered

- In addition, you are encouraged to comment on principles of sustainable development. However, these should not affect the review/rating of the application. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

3 Evolution of ecosystem and organisation of Flagship

3.1 Demonstration of innovative, dynamic ecosystem   Sub-rating (1–6)

Links of the proposed activities to host organisation's strategic choices and synergies; identified needs for changes and strategy for ecosystem development; appropriateness of allocated resources and their evolution for implementation of proposed activities; clarity of roles of different actors; demonstration of active collaborations with business sector and/or other sectors of society; appropriateness of planned actions for increasing appeal of research environment; etc.

- See **item 4** in the research and impact plan.
- See **resource table** appended to the application.
- See **Flagship progress report,** available on the panel site in the online services.
- See **summary of Flagship stakeholder survey,** available on the panel site in the online services.

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1 Progress made and added value of Flagship   (no numerical rating)

Progress made by Flagship as part of the ecosystem and added value of the Flagship, evolution of the ecosystem

4.2 Expected significant scientific impact and impact in support of economic growth and/or society   (no numerical rating)

Flagship's expected significant scientific impact and impact in support of economic growth and/or society

4.3 Main strengths and weaknesses   (no numerical rating)

Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as any additional comments.

- Please give an overall assessment for the application including lists of strengths and weaknesses as well as any additional comments.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

5 Overall rating	Rating (1–6)

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings. For example, the application should not be penalised if it has a slight weakness in one evaluation item that is later strengthened in another item (e.g. lack of some expertise in a local team but compensated through international collaboration).