



Application review form

Joint mobility programmes with foreign funding agencies

September 2023 call

This review form is used in the following calls:

Funding for mobility cooperation with China, Taiwan or Germany

Referring to the Academy of Finland's agreements with China/NSFC, China/CAS, China/CASS, Taiwan/NSTC and Germany/DAAD.

Application number: _____

Applicant: _____

Instructions

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 1 to 10:

- 10–8 = eligible for funding
- 7–4 = to be discussed
- 3–1 = not eligible for funding.

If one of the ratings (1.1–1.3) falls below 4, the whole proposal must be rejected as it is not eligible 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.

Overall rating: Mean rating (items 1.1–1.3) + bonus points (item 1.4)



1. Rating

1.1 Project quality

1.1.1 Presentation of project (sub-rating __)

- Clarity of project goals
- Preliminary work
- Work and time schedule

1.1.2 Scientific quality of project (sub-rating __)

- Topicality and degree of innovation
- Methodology
- Appropriateness of question within the work and time schedule

1.2 Qualifications of research teams

1.2.1 Project-relevant competence of Finnish team (sub-rating __)

- Publications
- Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
- Project-relevant research infrastructure

1.2.2 Project-relevant competence of foreign team (sub-rating __)

- Publications
- Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
- Project-relevant research infrastructure

1.2.3 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?

1.3 Participation of early-career scientists and researchers (if relevant) or other relevant added value of cooperation

1.3.1 Scientific importance of project for early-career scientists and researchers. Project-appropriate ratio between number of participating early-career scientists and number of visits. Alternatively or additionally other relevant added value of cooperation (sub-rating __)



1.4 Aspired additional outcomes of cooperation

1.4.1 Particular exploitability of results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal)

Bonus 0.1 points

1.4.2 Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. junior-senior partnerships)

Bonus 0.1 points

1.4.3 Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of cooperation

Bonus 0.1 points

2. Overall assessment

Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

