Joint mobility programmes with foreign funding agencies

This form is used in the Academy of Finland’s collaboration with China/NSFC, China/CAS, China/CASS and Germany/DAAD.

Research council: ________________________________________________________________

Proposal number: ________________________________________________________________

Project coordinator: ______________________________________________________________

Target country: ________________________________________________________________

☐ New project

☐ Third-year extension

☐ Previous funding with the same partner

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 10 to 1:

- 10–8 = eligible for funding
- 7–4 = to be discussed
- 3–1 = not eligible for funding.

If one of the ratings (A, B, C) falls below 4, the whole proposal must be rejected as it is not eligible for funding.

A bonus of 0.1 to 0.3 points can be awarded for proposals from which particular additional outcomes can be expected from working together with the partner.
Rating

A) Project Quality (rating A__)

1. Presentation of project (sub-rating __)
   • Clarity of project goals
   • Preliminary work
   • Work and time schedule

2. Scientific quality of project (sub-rating __)
   • Topicality and degree of innovation
   • Methodology
   • Appropriateness of question within the work and time schedule

B) Qualifications of research teams (rating B__)

1. Project-relevant competence of Finnish team (sub-rating __)
   • Publications
   • Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
   • Project-relevant research infrastructure

2. Project-relevant competence of foreign team (sub-rating __)
   • Publications
   • Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
   • Project-relevant research infrastructure

3. How do the two teams complement each other? (sub-rating __)
   • In terms of content, methodology and equipment
   • Previous joint scientific/research activities or publications
   • How meaningful is this cooperation for achieving the aspired goals?

C) Participation of young scientists and researchers (if relevant) or other relevant added value of cooperation (rating C__)
1. Scientific importance of project for young scientists and researchers  
   (sub-rating __)

2. Project-appropriate ratio between number of participating young scientists and number of visits  
   (sub-rating __)

D) Aspired additional outcomes of cooperation (bonus points D __)

1. Particular exploitability of results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal)  
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

2. Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. junior-senior partnerships)  
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

3. Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of cooperation  
   □ Bonus 0.1 points

Overall assessment and rating

Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions

Strengths:
Weaknesses:
Comments:

Overall rating: Mean rating A–C + bonus points D = _________________