

Application review form
**SPECIAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL
COLLABORATION IN HIGH-
PERFORMANCE COMPUTING 2024**

Special funding for international
collaboration in high-performance computing
2024

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

**How to review applications for SPECIAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN
HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING 2024**

The funding granted under the present call will support international research collaboration in themes represented by the Finnish Flagships of the Research Council of Finland's Flagship Programme. The research shall focus on European cooperation in using EuroHPC's high-performance computing resources, or on cooperation in using the LUMI supercomputer with partners in the US states of Texas and/or Colorado, and/or researchers of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) of the US federal government, and/or research teams in the United Kingdom and/or Japan. The funding is not intended for coordination or planning of collaborations.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for section 1 (Quality of research) and section 2 (Implementation) and give an overall rating in section 4. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 3 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.

Use a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains some elements that should be improved
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved



Research Council of Finland

2 (poor)	Contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Project's relevance to the call

1.1 Project's relevance to the call

Sub-rating (1-6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

- See [research plan](#).
- See [5 Societal effects and impact](#) in the application form.

2 Quality of research

2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- scientific quality and significance of project's objectives and hypotheses
 - ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives, including possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines
 - (if applicable) scientific added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives
 - impact of research within academia
 - potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes including possible high-risk, high-gain research
 - project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices
- See [research plan](#).
 - A consortium application consists of two or more subprojects each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common research plan. The consortium implements a joint research plan together with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation.

2.2 Additional comments on aspects of societal effects and impact of the project, if relevant

(no numerical rating)

- Comments on societal effects and impact should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking. Instead, they will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.



3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility of research plan, including aspects of responsible science

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- feasibility of project, taking into account extent to which proposed research may include high risks
 - materials, research data and methods
 - working arrangements and management of research tasks
 - research environment including research infrastructures
 - identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan
 - consideration of research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination in society at large, and sustainable development within in the project
- See [research plan](#).

3.2 Expertise, human resources, and collaborations, including aspects of responsible science

Sub-rating (1-6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of applicant (and in case of consortium: all applicants) in terms of project implementation
 - complementary expertise of team, who are directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for proposed project
 - adequateness of human resources for project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project
 - contribution of both national and international research collaborators, who are engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
 - significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
- See [research plan](#).
- See [most relevant publications and other key outputs](#) in the application form.
- See [CV\(s\)](#) of the applicant(s) in the application form.
- See [list of publications](#).
- See [mobility plan](#) in the application form.
- See possible [letter\(s\) of collaboration](#).

**4 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal****4.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks****TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING****4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications (no numerical rating)**

- Summary assessment of the application including main strengths with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of the application including main weaknesses with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1 and 2.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):**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] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked.