Programme: DAAD – ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Referee: _______________________________________
Proposal Number: __________________________________
Project Coordinator: ______________________________

- New Project? □ Yes □ No
- Previous funding with the same partner? □ Yes □ No
- For follow-up proposals: Status Report: □ Yes □ No

Information on the Referee’s Form

Assessment Scale:
Please use the whole range of the assessment scale. Please enter the grade as a whole number in the given column. Please round off the Mean Values and the Overall Grade to one decimal point.

If the grade falls below 4 points for one of the mean values (A,B,C), then the whole proposal must be rejected as 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.

Text Fields:
For free text comments and remarks – including on the individual sub points – please use the appropriate “Comments” space located beneath the Overall Grade.

If you would like to recommend any conditions, for example, in respect of the length and number of trips or the participation of young and early-stage scientists and researchers, please do so in the given text field “Recommended Conditions”.

Thank you very much.

Assessment

Assessment Scale:
Please write the grade (whole number) in the given column under consideration of the listed sub points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) Project Quality</th>
<th>Not eligible for funding</th>
<th>To be discussed</th>
<th>Eligible for funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentation of the project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Clarity of the project goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Preliminary work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Work and time schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scientific quality of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Topicality and degree of innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Appropriateness of the question within the context of the work and time schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Value A:
### Carry over Mean Value A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Scale:</th>
<th>Not eligible for funding</th>
<th>To be discussed</th>
<th>Eligible for funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please write the grade (whole number) in the given column under consideration of the listed subpoints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B) Qualifications of the Research Groups

1. Project-relevant competence of the Finnish group
   - Publications
   - Thematic relevance of the project coordinators and project participants
   - Project-relevant infrastructure

2. Project-relevant competence of the German group
   - Publications
   - Thematic relevance of the project coordinators and project participants
   - Project-relevant infrastructure

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

### Mean Value B:

### C) Participation by Young Scientists and Researchers

1. Scientific importance of the project of the young scientists and researchers

2. The project-appropriate ratio between the number of participating young scientists and the number of stays

### Mean Value C:

### Mean Value A – C:
### Carry over Mean Value A – C:

**D) Aspired Additional Outcomes of the Cooperation**

| Particular exploitability of the results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal) | Maximum of 0.3 points: [ ] |
| Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. Junior-Senior partnerships) |
| Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of the cooperation |

**Total Grade:** [ ]

**Comments:**

**Financing:**
Are the proposed travel plans plausible?  
- yes [ ]  
- No [ ]

**Comments:**

**Recommended conditions:**

---

Signature of the Referee: __________________________

Date: __________________________

Referee’s name in block letters: __________________________