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Application review form: International research infrastructures where Finland is a member, call for invited applicants 2023

The objective of the call is to support Finland’s international research infrastructure memberships that offer Finnish scientific and business communities’ opportunities to access research infrastructure services that would not be possible to provide solely through national efforts. International research infrastructures also provide a platform for international research, development and innovation, which makes it possible to carry out cooperation and science diplomacy between different countries.

The final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 6 (outstanding). Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to the following items.

- Bullet text refers to technical instructions in the online services (SARA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (outstanding)</td>
<td>Demonstrates high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at international level; is a high-gain plan that may include risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (excellent)</td>
<td>Is excellent in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (good)</td>
<td>Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (fair)</td>
<td>Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (poor)</td>
<td>Contains flaws. Is in need of substantial modification or improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (very poor)</td>
<td>Severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Description of the international research infrastructure

1.1 Are the services and service modes offered nationally and internationally clearly described in an appropriate level?  
Sub-rating (1–6)

Is the ownership, know-how and organisational structure of the international research infrastructure operations appropriate in Finland? Does the international research infrastructure have a clearly defined user community in Finland and does the Finnish coordinator(s) have a plan for how to widen it? Please explain. Has the membership increased the international attractiveness and competitiveness of Finland's research, education, and innovation system (RDI)? Please explain.

- See item 1 Description of international research infrastructure and its functions in Finland in the action plan

The international membership provides research infrastructure services that cannot be provided at national level alone. The services of the international research infrastructure are openly accessible. The international research infrastructure has a sufficient user base in Finland. National activities related to international research infrastructure memberships are professionally coordinated and managed. The ownership and the actors’ roles, rights and obligations are clear. The coordinating body has sufficient expertise to make full use of the membership.

2 Wide and versatile impact

2.1 Does the membership bring added value to the wide and versatile impact of the research infrastructure operation?  
Sub-rating (1–6)

Please explain.

- See item 2 Wide and versatile impact in the action plan.

Membership brings added value to the wide and versatile impact of the research infrastructure in the research community, in national research infrastructure activities, in international research infrastructure cooperation and in society as a whole. There must be a long-term plan for how the international research infrastructure membership can be utilised in Finland.
3 Digitalisation and data

3.1 Does the research infrastructure aim to follow the FAIR principles in its data management?

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

- See item 3 Digitalisation and data in the action plan.
The international research infrastructure aims to adhere to the FAIR principles in its data management.
The international research infrastructure provides guidance and support for users in open access to research data.

4 Responsible science

4.1 Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly in the application?

Please provide further comments if responsible science aspects have not been properly considered.

4.1.1 Good scientific practice and governance, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within the project or in society at large, relevant sustainable development goals (other than the green transition)

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment

4.1.2 Green transition in the operation of the research infrastructure

☐ Yes

☐ No, please comment
• See item 4 Responsible science in the action plan.
  In its activities, the international research infrastructure must take into account research ethics, equality and nondiscrimination and the objectives of sustainable development, including the green transition.

5 Sustainable funding plan

5.1 Are the plans for the international research infrastructure’s long-term funding base sustainable and realistic in general?

Please explain.

• See item 5 Long-term financial planning in the action plan.
  The international research infrastructure must have a long-term funding plan for maintenance and development of services. The funding base of the research infrastructure must be stable.

6 Summary assessment

6.1 Main strengths and weaknesses, additional comments and suggestions (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. It is important to comment on both the strengths and the weaknesses of the application.

Strengths:
Weaknesses:
Comments:

6 Overall rating

• Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.