Application review form

Joint mobility programmes with foreign funding agencies

September 2021 call

This form is used in the following calls:

**Mobility call for joint seminars with Japan or China**

**Mobility call for joint projects with India, China or Germany**

Based on the Academy of Finland’s agreements with Japan/JSPS, China/NSFC, China/CAS, China/CASS, India/DBT and Germany/DAAD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research council:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration country:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings.**

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 10 to 1:

- 10–8 = eligible for funding
- 7–4 = to be discussed
- 3–1 = ineligible for funding.

If one of the ratings (items I, II, III) falls below 4, the whole proposal must be rejected as ineligible for funding.

A bonus of 0.1 to 0.3 points can be awarded for proposals where particular additional outcomes can be expected from working together with the partner.
Rating

I) Project quality (rating I __)

Ia) Presentation of project (sub-rating __)
   - Clarity of project goals
   - Preliminary work
   - Work and time schedule

Ib) Scientific quality of project (sub-rating __)
   - Topicality and degree of innovation
   - Methodology
   - Appropriateness of question within the work and time schedule

II) Qualifications of research teams (rating II __)

IIa) Project-relevant competence of Finnish team (sub-rating __)
   - Publications
   - Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
   - Project-relevant research infrastructure

IIb) Project-relevant competence of foreign team (sub-rating __)
   - Publications
   - Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
   - Project-relevant research infrastructure

IIc) How do the two teams complement each other? (sub-rating __)
   - In terms of content, methodology and equipment
   - Previous joint scientific/research activities or publications
   - How meaningful is this cooperation for achieving the aspired goals?

III) Participation of early-career scientists and researchers (if relevant) or other relevant added value of cooperation (rating III __)
IIIa) Scientific importance of project for early-career scientists and researchers (sub-rating __)

IIIb) Project-appropriate ratio between number of participating early-career scientists and number of visits (sub-rating __)

IV) Aspired additional outcomes of cooperation (bonus points IV __)

IVA) Particular exploitability of results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal)
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

IVb) Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. junior-senior partnerships)
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

IVc) Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of cooperation
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

Overall assessment and rating

Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions

Strengths:
Weaknesses:
Comments:

Overall rating: Mean rating (items I–III) + bonus points (item IV) = ____________________