



Proof of Concept call

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

Application review form

Proof of Concept call 2023

Application number:

How to review Proof of Concept applications

The Academy of Finland Proof of Concept funding aims to promote versatile utilisation of research results produced by Academy-funded Centres of Excellence and Finnish Flagships. The funding promotes the commercialisation as well as other societal impact of research. The funding can be used for example to pilot or test research results in practise, or to create new models for business, public administration or the third sector. In the 2023 pilot call, funding may be applied by Centre of Excellence principal investigators and researchers authorised by the Academy's Finnish Flagships.

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following items. Write evaluative rather than descriptive comments.

- [Bullet text refers to technical instructions for the online services \(SARA\).](#)

Below is the rating scale for the draft review (before the panel meeting) and the final review (in the panel meeting). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Draft rating	Description	Final rating
6 (outstanding)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates outstanding innovativeness and utilization potential; Demonstrates a highly feasible and innovative interaction and impact plan; Promises crucial commercial and/or other societal impact 	6 (outstanding)
5 (excellent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates very significant innovativeness and utilization potential; Demonstrates a very feasible and innovative interaction and impact plan; Promises very high commercial and/or other societal impact 	5 (excellent)

4 (good)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved; Demonstrates good innovativeness and utilization potential; Promises commercial and/or other societal impact 	4 (good)
3 (fair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved; Demonstrates some innovativeness and utilization potential; Promises some commercial and/or other societal impact 	1-3 (fair to insufficient)
2 (poor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement; Promises very little commercial and/or other societal impact 	
1 (insufficient)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application 	

1 Impact and utilization potential and project's relevance to the Call

1.1 Impact and utilization potential and project's relevance to the Call Sub-rating (1-6)

- How does the project fit the objectives of the POC Call?
- How is the proposed promotion of research utilisation linked to the applicant's ongoing Flagship/Centre of Excellence project?
- Are the expected impact objectives commercially and/or societally significant?
 - See item 1 in the Interaction and impact plan.

2 Plan for promoting interaction and impact, and its resources

2.1. Quality, breadth, and significance of expected impact Sub-rating (1-6)

- Are the impact objectives innovative and well-presented, with clear short-term effects and targeted long-term impact described (e.g., progress and follow-up indicators)?



- Are the networks, collaborators, and potential user groups appropriate? How are they engaged with co-creation, co-design, or participative methods during different phases of the project?
 - See item 2 in the Interaction and impact plan.

2.2. Implementation of plan for interaction and impact

Sub-rating (1-6)

- Is the plan for interaction and impact innovative and feasible (schedule, goals, means, stakeholders, and implementation)?
- Is there an appropriate risk and mitigation plan?
 - See item 3 in the Interaction and impact plan.

2.3 Human resources, expertise, and collaborations

Sub-rating (1-6)

- Is the management and coordination of the project appropriate and high-quality?
- What are the competences of the team (incl. impact experts and external collaboration) in implementing the interaction plan and generating impact on society?
 - See item 3 in the Interaction and impact plan.
 - See CV(s) of applicant(s) in the application form.
 - See Most relevant publications and other key outputs in the application form.
 - See list of publications.
 - See Mobility in the application form.
 - See letter(s) of collaboration.

2.4 If applicable: Research consortium

(no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives

- See item 3 in the Interaction and impact plan.
- A consortium is a fixed-term body of subprojects under a joint project plan that it implements together with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation. Each consortium subproject applies for funding to implement the plan as part of the joint consortium application, but a consortium application is reviewed as a single research plan.



3 Responsible science

3.1 Responsible science

(no numerical rating)

Has the applicant considered all relevant aspects of responsible science properly in the application? Please provide further comments especially if there are shortcomings in any of the following aspects: research ethics; promotion of equality and non-discrimination within project or in society at large; open access to research publications; data management and open access to data; sustainable development.

- See item 3 in the Interaction and impact plan. Applicants are furthermore instructed to pay attention to questions of responsible science throughout the application.

4 Summary assessment of the project

Main strengths and weaknesses of project

(no numerical rating)

Summary assessment of the application including main strengths and weaknesses with justifications

4.1 Main strengths and their justifications:

4.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications:

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).

**Ranking based on the panel discussion (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)**

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] Proof of Concept applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked. The Proof of Concept 2023 applications addressed to the Subcommittee for Proof of Concept Funding were reviewed in 2 panels.