

Application review form

Special funding for system-level research into climate change mitigation and adaptation

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

Application number:

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings to each of the following items.

- [Blue text with bulleting refers to technical instructions for the online services \(SARA\).](#)

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (poor).

Grade	Science (Q2.-5.)	Relevance and impact (Q1.)
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; is a high-gain project that may include risks	Research and impact of crucial relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that an extremely significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
5 (excellent)	Is extremely good in international comparison – contains no significant elements to be improved	Research and impact of very high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a very significant contribution to policy or practice is likely; high potential to address a solution to an important problem or a critical barrier
4 (very good)	Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved	Research and impact of high relevance to users, i.e., such novelty or timeliness and promise that a very significant contribution to policy or practice is likely
3 (good)	Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved	Research and impact of relevance to users, i.e. such novelty or timeliness and promise that a moderate contribution to policy or practice is likely
2 (fair)	Contains flaws; is in need of substantial modification or improvement.	Research and impact that will add to understanding but that might not be of sufficient relevance or urgency to influence policy or practice



1 (poor)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application.	Neither research nor impact is considered relevant; proposal is in need of substantial modification or improvement
----------	--	--

1 Q1 Project's relevance and societal impact

1.1 Project's relevance to call

Sub-rating (1-6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

- See all items of the [research and impact plan](#) and special item **1.4 Special objective of call** in the [research and impact plan](#).

1.2 Societal impact of project

Sub-rating (1-6)

Significance of the potential societal impacts; ambitiousness of planned actions for promoting impact

- See all items of the [research and impact plan](#) and special item **5.1 Impact** in the [research and impact plan](#).

2 Q2 Quality of research described in the plan

2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Sub-rating (1-6)

Significance of project; objectives and hypotheses; ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives (possible novel concepts and approaches and development across disciplines); scientific impact of research; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes; etc.

- See item **1 Aim and objectives** in the [research and impact plan](#).

2.2 Implementation of research plan

Sub-rating (1-6)

Feasibility of project (bearing in mind extent to which proposed research may include high risks); materials, research data and methods; human resources and management of research



tasks; research environment including research infrastructures; identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan; etc.

- See item **2 Implementation** in the research and impact plan.

2.2.1 Research consortium

(no numerical rating)

Significance and added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives; significance of previous established collaboration between consortium partners

- See item **2.4 Added value of consortium and previous research and impact collaboration between parties** in the research and impact plan.
- In this call, consortium is a fixed-term body of at least three subprojects and a collaboration of research projects that work within different fields of research under a joint research plan that is implemented in systematic collaboration. A consortium application is reviewed as a single research plan.

2.3. Responsible science

(no numerical rating)

Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly in the application? Please provide further comments if responsible science aspects have not been properly considered.

- See item **4 Responsible science** in the research and impact plan.
- The Academy of Finland is committed to promoting research integrity, responsible conduct of research and the principles and practices of equality and non-discrimination and open science. See 'Instructions for reviewing' for further information.

2.3.1. Research ethics

- Yes
- No, please comment



2.3.2. Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within the project or in society at large

- Yes
- No, please comment

2.3.3. Open access of research publications

- Yes
- No, please comment

2.3.4. Data management and open access to data

- Yes
- No, please comment

3 Q3 Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaboration

3.1 Competence of applicant(s) and complementary expertise of applicant's research team (project personnel)

Sub-rating (1-6)

Merits, scientific, and other expertise of applicants in terms of project implementation; complementary expertise of applicant's research team (i.e. project personnel directly working in/funded for the project); competence of applicants in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers; support for researcher training within project; etc.

- See item **3.1 Project personnel and their relevant merits** in the research and impact plan.
- See **CV(s)** of the applicant(s) in the application form, including scientific and/or societal impact.
- See attached **list(s) of publications**.
- When reviewing consortium applications, competence of all principal investigators should be reviewed.



3.2. Significance of research collaboration and researcher mobility Sub-rating (1–6)

Significance of national and international research collaboration (i.e. collaborators engaged in the project via their own funding), including complementary expertise of collaborators outside academia, and research environment of collaborators in terms of project implementation; significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training; etc.

- See **item 3.2 Collaborators and their key merits in terms of the project** in the research and impact plan.
- See **Collaborators** section in the application form.
- See attached **Letters of commitment**.
- See **Mobility** in the application form.
- See attached **Invitation letter(s) for research visit(s)**.

4 Q4 Overall assessment and rating

4.1. Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions (no numerical rating)


Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as provide any additional comments.

- Please give an overall assessment for the application, including lists of strengths and weaknesses as well as any additional comments. It is important to comment on both the strengths and the weaknesses of the application.
- You are also encouraged to comment principles of sustainable development (see items 4.4 in the research and impact plan). However, this should not affect the scientific review/rating or ranking of the application. Instead, it will be considered as an additional factor when the funding decisions are made.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:



**5 Q5 Overall rating****Rating (1-6)**

- Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings. 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).

Ranking

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel. The [Funding instrument name] applications addressed to the call were reviewed in a total of [number] panels.