



Programme: DAAD – ACADEMY OF FINLAND								
Referee:								
Proposal Number:								
Project Coordinator:								
■ New Project?	☐ Yes		No					
Previous funding with the same partner?	☐ Yes		No					
■ For follow-up proposals: Status Report:	☐ Yes		No					
Information on the Re	feree's Form							
Assessment Scale: Please use the whole range of the assessment scale. Please enterplease round off the Mean Values and the Overall Grade to one defeated.		whole	e number in the given column.					
If the grade falls <b>below 4 points</b> for one of the mean values (A,B,C), then the <b>whole</b> proposal must be rejected as <b>not eligible for funding</b> .								
A bonus of <b>0.1 to 0.3 points</b> can be awarded for proposals from which particular additional outcomes can be expected from working together with the partner.								
Text Fields: For free text comments and remarks – including on the individual sub points – please use the appropriate "Comments" space located beneath the Overall Grade.								
If you would like to recommend any conditions, for example, in resperticipation of young and early-stage scientists and researchers, Conditions".								
Thank you very much.								

## **Assessment**

Assessment Scale: Please write the grade (whole number) in the given column under consideration of the listed sub points.	Not eligible for funding			To be discussed				Eligible for funding		
A) Project Quality	1 2 3			4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Presentation of the project ▶										
■ Clarity of the project goals		•						•	•	
■ Preliminary work										
■ Work and time schedule										
2. Scientific quality of the project ▶										
<ul> <li>Topicality and degree of innovation</li> </ul>		•						•	•	
■ Methodology										
Appropriateness of the question within the context of										
the work and time schedule										
	Mean Value A:									

	Carry over Mean Value A:									
Assessment Scale: Please write the grade (whole number) in the given column under consideration of the listed subpoints. ▶	Not eligible for funding			To be discussed				Eligible for funding		
B) Qualifications of the Research Groups	1 2 3			4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Project-relevant competence of the Finnish ► group										
<ul><li>Publications</li></ul>										
<ul> <li>Thematic relevance of the project coordinators and project participants</li> </ul>										
Project-relevant infrastructure										
2. Project-relevant competence of the German► group										
<ul><li>Publications</li></ul>		•								
<ul> <li>Thematic relevance of the project coordinators and project participants</li> </ul>										
■ Project-relevant infrastructure										
3. How do the two groups complement ► each other?										
In terms of content, methodology, and equipment										
<ul> <li>Previous joint scientific/research activities or publications</li> </ul>										
How meaningful is this cooperation for achieving the aspired goals?										
			N	leai	n Va	alue	В:			

C) Participation by Young Scientists and Researchers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Scientific importance of the project of the ▶ young scientists and researchers										
		•								
<ol> <li>The project-appropriate ratio between ►     the number of participating young scientists     and the number of stays</li> </ol>										
			N	llea	n Va	alue	<b>C</b> :			
		Λ	/lear	า Va	lue	Α-	- C:			

	Carry over Mean Value A – C:
D) Aspired Additional Outcomes of the Cooperation	
<ul> <li>Particular exploitability of the results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal)</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. Junior-Senior partnerships)</li> </ul>	Maximum of 0.3 points:
<ul> <li>Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of the cooperation</li> </ul>	
	Total Grade:
Comments:	1
Comments.	
Financing:	
Are the proposed travel plans plausible? <b>ye Comments:</b>	s 🗌 No 🗌
Recommended conditions:	
ncoonmended conditions.	
Signature of the Deferee	
Signature of the Referee  Date Referee's name in block letters	