



**2026 Thematic research infrastructures:
Local research infrastructures to
strengthen regional R&D activities**

Spring call 2026

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

How to review 2026 Thematic research infrastructures: Local research infrastructures to strengthen regional R&D activities applications

This funding scheme is designed to support the building and updating of regionally significant local research infrastructures to promote regional vitality and ambitious research and development (R&D) activities.

The main focus of the review should be on the call objectives: funded research infrastructures must contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives, which have been mapped out, for example, in smart specialisation strategies and other regional strategies. Funded research infrastructures must generate added value for the region in terms of innovation potential and/or other societal impact and support partnerships and cooperation between R&D actors. They must have operating principles that enable their services to be widely utilised by user groups of the RDI system. The intersectoral collaboration of the research infrastructure in the development project creates mutual added value to the collaborators and for the development project.

Other important evaluation items are the quality of R&D activities facilitated by the research infrastructure, the implementation of the development project as well as the operational aspects of the research infrastructure.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Wide and versatile impact and project's relevance to call), section 2 (Quality of R&D activities), section 3 (Implementation of development project) and section 4 (Operation of research infrastructure) and give an overall rating in section 6. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones.

Please note that section 5 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel only 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)	Has potential to substantially contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives; provides highly significant support to economic growth and/or society



	as well as includes significant cooperation between R&D actors; enables R&D activities with potential for exceptional quality, ambition and innovation as well as impact with crucial relevance; presents a very high-quality plan that may include risks; operational aspects are well aligned to reach the objectives of the research infrastructure
5 (excellent)	Has potential to substantially contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives; provides significant support to economic growth and/or society as well as includes significant cooperation between R&D actors; enables R&D activities with potential for very high quality, ambition and innovation as well as impact with significant relevance; presents a high-quality plan that may include risks; operational aspects are suitable to reach the objectives of the research infrastructure
4 (good)	Has potential to contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives; provides support to economic growth and/or society as well as includes good cooperation between R&D actors; enables R&D activities with potential for good quality as well as impact with relevance; is in general sound but contains some elements that could be improved
3 (fair)	Has some potential to contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives; provides some support to economic growth and/or society as well as includes cooperation between R&D actors; is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved
2 (poor)	Has low potential to contribute to achieving regional R&D-related objectives; has low potential for impact in support of economic growth and/or society or cooperation between R&D actors; contains flaws and needs substantial modification or improvement
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

1 Wide and versatile impact and project's relevance to call

1.1 Support for regional specialisation, added value for region and cooperation between R&D actors Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- research infrastructure's support for regional specialisation. Is the significance of the research infrastructure in supporting strategic regional R&D goals described in a clear and convincing manner?
- added value generated by the research infrastructure for the region in terms of innovation potential and/or other societal impact, such as renewal or growth of business sector and/or new knowledge for the benefit of society



Research Council of Finland

- research infrastructure's promotion of partnerships and cooperation between R&D actors
- added value generated by the planned intersectoral regional collaboration in the development project in terms of impact of development project, strengthening research infrastructure and its services, and growth of R&D competencies of collaborators
 - See **action plan**, especially section 2 'Impact'.
 - See **letter(s) of collaboration**.
 - The objectives of the call are described in more detail in the **call text**.

2 Quality of R&D activities

2.1 R&D potential of research infrastructure

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- research infrastructure's potential in enabling and supporting high-quality, innovative and ambitious research and development (R&D) activities
 - See **action plan**, especially section 1 'Background and significance'.

3 Implementation of development project

3.1. Feasibility of development project

Subrating (1-6)

Please review:

- clarity and credibility of the implementation plan of the development project, including attainment of goals within the funding period
- identification of relevant risks in the development project and appropriateness of risk management plan
- appropriateness and sufficiency of personnel, who are directly working for the development project
- added value of intersectoral R&D collaboration activities in the development project for attainment of project goals
 - See **action plan**, especially section 3 'Implementation'.

4 Operation of research infrastructure

4.1. Quality of research infrastructure organisation

Subrating (1-6)

Please review ownership:

- clarity of the description of the research infrastructure
- clarity of the ownership, organisational structure and governance of the research infrastructure



Research Council of Finland

- relevance of staff expertise in terms of research infrastructure activities and appropriateness of the plans for skills development
- risk management plan of the research infrastructure
- sustainability of the research infrastructure's long-term financial plan

Please review users and services:

- clarity of what services the research infrastructure provides
- versatility and wideness of user base and level of utilisation rate of services provided
- concreteness of plans to develop and expand the use and user base of the infrastructure
- open access to users and availability of information on how to access the research infrastructure (access may require approval of a research plan and/or reasonable user fees)

Please review digital transition and data management policy:

- consideration of necessary steps related to increase in digitalisation and data intensity
- adequacy of data management policy in terms of responsible and secure data processing

Please review responsible science, i.e. does the research infrastructure consider the following aspects appropriately in its activities:

- promotion of gender equality and nondiscrimination
 - research ethics and good scientific practice
 - open science
 - green transition and sustainable development goals
- See **action plan**, especially section 4 'Operational activities'.
 - See **action plan**, especially section 'Responsible science'.
 - See **long-term financial plan** appendix.
 - See **data management policy** appendix.
 - *Please note that the research security appendix is not part of the review.*

5 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and justifications; possible other remarks

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT PANEL MEETING

5.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications

(no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main strengths with justifications
 - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1–4.
 - To be completed only at the panel meeting

5.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications

(no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main weaknesses with justifications



Research Council of Finland

- Refer to the review criteria in sections 1–4.
- To be completed only at the panel meeting

5.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

6 Overall rating	Rating (1-6)
------------------	--------------

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the subratings. 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.

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

Your application was placed in ranking group [number] of all [number] applications reviewed in this panel. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were placed in ranking groups. No separate ranking of the applications was done within the groups.

