

## Application review form

### Flagship Programme interim evaluation 2026

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

Application number:

#### How to review Flagship Programme applications

The aim of the Finnish Flagship Programme is to support wide-ranging economic and other societal impact based on particularly high-level scientific research. The funding is targeted at competence clusters that are based on cooperation between organisations and that have convincing track records of results and impact. Finnish Flagships bring together expertise from different fields into competence clusters that strengthen the quality and impact of Finnish research.

In this call, the Flagships selected in the 4th Flagship Programme call are invited to submit funding applications for the second funding period.

The focus of the review should be on the Flagship Programme's objectives concerning internationally top-level research, impact in support of economic growth and/or society, and the role and participation of collaborators. Support provided by the Flagship for the building of internationally competitive competence clusters and ecosystems in Finland, together with the principles of responsible science, will also play a role in the review.

**Provide both a written review and numerical ratings in section 1 (Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society), section 2 (Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society) and section 3 (Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship). Provide a written review in section 4 (Summary assessment of proposal) and give an overall rating in section 6. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones.**

**Please note: Section 5 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.**

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (poor). Where relevant, please consider both scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society. The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.



Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty, innovation as well as impact with crucial relevance; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that extremely significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
5 (excellent)	Demonstrates novelty, innovation and impact with very high relevance – contains no significant elements to be improved; has such novelty or timeliness and promise that very significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
4 (good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved; has impact with high relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that significant support to economic growth and/or society is likely
3 (fair)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved; has impact with relevance, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that some support to economic growth and/or society is likely
2 (poor)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement; has low potential for impact in support of economic growth and/or society
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

**1 Demonstrated scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society during first two years of Flagship operation**

**1.1 Progress made, efficiency and effectiveness of activities during first two years of operation  
Subrating (1-6)**

Activities since project kick-off; advancement of project goals; validity of identified needs/changes from the point of view of achieving Flagship goals and added value generation; risks encountered and managed; etc.

- See item 2 in the research and impact plan.
- See Flagship progress report available on the panel site in the online services.

**2 Plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact in support of economic growth and/or society for remaining funding period and beyond**

**2.1 Plan for remaining funding period and beyond, including aspects of responsible science****Subrating (1-6)**

Clarity and appropriateness of the Flagship goals and how the plan builds on previous work; appropriateness of the planned actions; risk management and mitigation; significance of expected outcomes by the end of the funding term; appropriateness of the strategy beyond the Flagship term and expected outcomes; consideration of gender equality and nondiscrimination, research ethics and good scientific practice, open access to research publications and data, data management, and sustainable development etc.

- See item 3 'Implementation of proposed plan for promoting scientific excellence and impact including aspects of responsible science'.

**3 Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship****3.1 Demonstration of innovative, dynamic ecosystem****Subrating (1-6)**

Links of the proposed activities to host organisation's strategic choices and synergies; identified needs for changes and strategy for ecosystem development; appropriateness of allocated resources and their evolution for implementation of proposed activities; clarity of roles of different actors; demonstration of active collaborations with business sector and/or other sectors of society; appropriateness of planned actions for increasing appeal of research environment; etc.

- See item 4 'Ecosystem and organisation of candidate Flagship' in the research and impact plan.
- See resource table appended to the application.
- See Flagship progress report, available on the panel site in the online services.
- See summary of Flagship stakeholder survey, available on the panel site in the online services.

**4 Summary assessment of proposal****4.1 Progress made and added value of candidate Flagship**

(no numerical rating)

Added value of candidate Flagship for attainment of objectives

**4.2 Expected significant scientific impact**

(no numerical rating)

Expected significant scientific impact of candidate Flagship

**4.3 Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or society** (no numerical rating)

Expected impact in support of economic growth and/or society of candidate Flagship



## 5 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

### TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT PANEL MEETING

Section 5 of the form is applicable only to the applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

#### 5.1 Main strengths and their justifications

(no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application including main strengths with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

#### 5.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications

(no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application including main weaknesses with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

#### 5.3 Other remarks (if any):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion (incl. societal effects and impact)
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting.

## 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 (e.g. lack of some expertise in a local team but compensated through international collaboration).