



## Instructions for reviewing funding applications - 2026 INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION IN HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING

### Content

1. Objectives of the Research Council of Finland and the funding schemes	1
1.1. 2026 International collaboration in high-performance computing	1
2. Role of experts and the RCF	2
2.1. Panel chair	2
2.2. Individual reviewers and panel members	2
2.3. Panels	3
2.4. RCF officials	3
2.5. Decision-making bodies	3
3. Review and ranking	3
3.1. Review criteria and rating scale	3
3.2. Individual review	5
3.3. Review panel meeting (online)	5
3.4. How to review applications in the RCF's online services	6
4. Expert remuneration	6

### 1. Objectives of the Research Council of Finland and the funding schemes

The Research Council of Finland's (RCF) mission is to open up new avenues for excellent, responsible and high-impact research. Our objectives are to advance new scientific breakthroughs and solutions for the benefit of society; the capacity of research for renewal and reform; and better and higher-impact skills and competence. Our funding is based on open competition, independent peer review and responsible science. We grant funding to researchers and research teams as well as to the most promising early-career researchers through different funding instruments.

#### 1.1. 2026 International collaboration in high-performance computing

The aim of the call is to fund internationally significant research where the use of EuroHPC or LUMI supercomputing resources is necessary for the success of the research project. The



## Research Council of Finland

themes of the projects have not been confined to any particular thematic area, but the call is open to all projects relevant in terms of the necessary use of EuroHPC or LUMI supercomputing resources in the attainment of the project objectives.

The funding granted under the present call will support international research collaboration focusing on using EuroHPC's high-performance computing resources in cooperation with partners from EuroHPC's European user states (incl. the United Kingdom), or on cooperation in using the LUMI supercomputer with researchers from the following states, organisations or countries: US state of Colorado, US state of Minnesota, US state of Texas, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) of the US federal government, Japan or Canada. The funding is not intended for coordination or planning of collaborations.

The focus of the review should be on scientific quality and implementation of the research plan together with the specific objectives of the call. The funding is applied for to hire a research team, and it may be applied for by individual research teams or consortia composed of two or more research teams. Read more in the [call text](#).

## **2. Role of experts and the RCF**

Experts are invited to review the scientific excellence of the applications. The experts are esteemed, mostly international researchers in the field of the applications concerned. The funding decisions are made by the RCF's decision-making bodies based on the scientific review and science policy factors of the RCF and its scientific councils or subcommittees.

### **2.1. Panel chair**

Each panel is assigned a chair from among the panel members. The duties of the chair are to chair the panel meeting via an online platform (Teams), lead the discussion and ensure that all applications are reviewed in a responsible and fair manner. The chair also has duties as a panel member.

### **2.2. Individual reviewers and panel members**

Experts may act as individual reviewers and panel members. The duties of individual reviewers are to review and write review reports of the applications allocated to them. As a rule, individual reviewers also participate in the panel as members. All panel members are expected to actively participate in the panel meeting.



## Research Council of Finland

Applications will be allocated to at least two individual reviewers and/or possibly a reader in the panel review phase. The reader is asked to form an opinion of the application without writing a review. One of the reviewers will be a summariser in the panel meeting and will write the final panel summary review for the application.

### 2.3. Panels

A panel consists of a chair, a possible vice chair and panel members representing the scope of the panel.

### 2.4. RCF officials

The RCF's officials invite the panel members and, if needed, additional external individual reviewers to support the panel, provide instructions on the review process and organise instructive webinars and pre-panel meetings when relevant. The officials also take care of the practical arrangements in the panel meeting and follow that the review process is carried according to established RCF procedures.

### 2.5. Decision-making bodies

After receiving the review reports and panel rankings, the [subcommittee appointed by the RCF Board](#) (link takes you to the RCF website) makes the final funding decisions. The decisions are based on the peer review and the panel ranking, but factors related to science policy may also influence the decisions. Examples of such factors are the promotion of equal opportunities for all genders, the advancement of early-career researchers' careers and impact beyond academia.

## 3. Review and ranking

### 3.1. Review criteria and rating scale

The main criteria in the review are:

- project's alignment with the call's objectives
- scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research as well as its impact within the scientific community
- feasibility of the research plan and the quality of research environment, including responsible science
- competence of applicant



## Research Council of Finland

- human resources, expertise and collaborations including researcher mobility, and researcher training.

Please note that the research security appendix is not part of the review.

**Written reviews:** Evaluative comments are particularly valuable to the decision-making bodies. Also, after the funding decisions have been made, the applicants will receive the individual reviews and the panel summary assessment including the names of the experts on their own applications. Written reviews play a crucial role in aiding decision-making bodies. In addition, they provide important feedback to applicants. Reviewers should therefore:

- write evaluative comments and give justifications using full sentences
- avoid descriptive comments and copying text directly from the application
- write comments and give subratings under each review item, taking into consideration the specific guidelines for each item (however, item 'Review panel's summary assessment' will be developed and finalised during the panel meeting)
- maintain coherence throughout their comments and give constructive feedback.

**Numerical rating:** The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important. The rating scale ranges from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). At all levels of the review process, please pay close attention to the potential for breakthrough research.

Rating	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
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



\* Below threshold for panel discussion if all individual overall ratings are below 5.

### 3.2. Individual review

Each application is assigned to at least two individual reviewers. Reviewers write individual reviews, using specified sections in the review forms, and give sub- and overall ratings to the applications. Applications given an overall rating of 5 or 6 from at least one reviewer will continue to the panel review phase. The other applications will continue directly to the decision-making process. Therefore, the deadline for submitting the individual review reports is strict. It supports the preparation of the panel meeting following the individual review phase. The individual review reports will be given to the applicants as is, including the names of the reviewers. It is important to note that these reports provide important material for the decision-making bodies and valuable feedback for the applicants.

### 3.3. Review panel meeting (online)

The panel members have access to all applications submitted to the panel, with exceptions made in the case of conflicts of interest (see Review principles, section 1.3). Also, individual reviews for applications continuing to the panel review phase will be made available to all panel members at the latest one week before the meeting. However, please note that these review reports will only be made available to panel members once all review reports have been submitted to the RCF.

At the panel meeting, the panel discusses applications that reached the panel review phase. The individual reviewers appointed to the application will present their opinion on the application and, typically, a third panel member (read-only/reader) may be assigned to read the application to form an additional, more general view of it. The review panel's summary assessment will be written for each application during the panel meeting by a dedicated summariser (a panel member). The summary is based on the discussions and the individual reviews. The panel decides the final overall rating for each application. When the final overall rating is 5 or 6, the panel will also decide subratings for specified review criteria. To complete the review, the panel is asked to rank the applications with **both** a final overall rating of 5 or 6 **and** a rating of 5 or 6 for the project's relevance to the call. The applications are ranked based on the review criteria used and the instrument-specific objectives listed in the review forms - no additional criteria will be used.



### **3.4. How to review applications in the RCF's online services**

Please use the [RCF's online services](#) (link takes you to the online services via our website) to review applications. You can find the review instructions and offline versions of all our review forms under [Guides for reviewers](#) on our website. Both individual reviews and panel review reports are completed in the online services. You can access the research plan or other sections in the application form directly from the review form questions. However, we do expect you to read the whole application.

## **4. Expert remuneration**

There will be a modest compensation for participation, EUR 460 (EUR 600 for panel chair) per panel day (taxed as per your national taxation rules). This compensation also covers participation in a short pre-meeting. Furthermore, EUR 75 (EUR 100 in the case of consortium applications) will be paid for each individual review.

To claim your remuneration, please enter your own personal banking details in the online services. The remuneration will be paid into your personal bank account. Please note that IBAN is mandatory for bank accounts in Europe. Also fill in the BIC/SWIFT code/clearing code/routing number.

Please note that if you are not a Finnish citizen and you do not have a Finnish social security number, you need to fill in a foreign identity number. This information is mandatory so that the Finnish Tax Administration can allocate it to the correct individual. Please also fill in the Tax Identification Number (TIN) or equivalent if you have it.

Make sure that you have entered your personal details correctly in the online services to avoid any unnecessary delays in the payment. The payslip will be sent to your home address.

