

**FIRI: call for local infrastructures**

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

Application number:

**Application review form: FIRI: call for local infrastructures**

**Research infrastructures** constitute a reserve of research facilities, equipment, materials and services facilitating research and development at different stages of innovation, supporting organised research, researcher training and teaching at universities, and maintaining and developing research and innovation capacity.

The aim of the call is to support the upgrading and/or construction of local research infrastructures so that they can better meet the needs of research, education, business and other actors.

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

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 6 (outstanding) to 1 (insufficient). We encourage using the entire scale. The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science; presents high-gain plan that may include risks
5 (excellent)	Is very good – 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; is in need of substantial modification or improvement



1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application
------------------	---

## 1 Scientific significance

Sub-rating (1–6)

1.1 Does the research infrastructure enable high-quality research? Please explain/elaborate.

- See item [1.1 Description of research infrastructure in the action plan](#)
- See item [2.1 Scientific significance in the action plan](#)

## 2 Collaboration and impact

Sub-rating (1–6)

2.1 What kind of added value does the research infrastructure generate for the area in the context of innovation activities, business and the economy? Does it advance and/or support partnerships between RDI actors?

- See item [3.1 Collaboration and impact in the action plan](#)

## 3 Ownership and know-how

Sub-rating (1–6)

3.1 Is the ownership of the research infrastructure clearly described and appropriate? Do the research infrastructure staff have the relevant expertise?

- See item [4.1 Ownership, know-how in the action plan](#)

## 4 Services and users

Sub-rating (1–6)

4.1 Are the services well planned? Is information on how to access the research infrastructure available? Does the research infrastructure provide open access to users (access may require approval of a research plan and reasonable user fees)?

- See item [5.1 Services in the action plan](#)

4.2 What do you think of the user profile and utilisation rate of the research infrastructure?

- See item [5.2 Users in the action plan](#)



## 5 Digitality and data

Sub-rating (1–6)

5.1 Does the research infrastructure take into account the necessary steps related to the increase in digitalisation and data intensity?

- See item **6.1 Digitality** in the action plan

5.2 Are the management, storage, use and rights of ownership of the research data planned well enough?

- See appendix **Data Management Policy**

The research infrastructure must offer feasible guidelines, practices or incentives/demands for researchers in order to support open research data. The research infrastructure must also take the necessary changes brought about by the growth in digitalisation and data intensity into account.

## 6 Responsibility and the green transition

Subrating (1–6)

6.1 Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly in the application?

- See item **7.1 Ethics** in the action plan.
- See item **7.2 Equality and non-discrimination** in the action plan.
- In its activities, the research infrastructure must take into account research ethics, equality and non-discrimination, the principles of open science and the sustainable development goals.

6.1.1 Ethics

- Yes
- No, please comment

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

- Yes



- No, please comment

## 6.2 Comments on responsible science

Please provide further comments if the above-listed aspects of responsible science have not been properly considered.

## 6.3 Green transition

6.3.1 How well does the research infrastructure and project contribute to the production of data supporting the green transition

6.3.2 How well does the research infrastructure and project take into account the necessary steps for the green transition including e.g. carbon neutrality in the construction and/or operation of the research infrastructure?

- [See item 7.3 Green Transition in the action plan](#)

## 6.4 Do No Significant Harm –principle

Can the execution of the project or the application of the results have harmful effects for the environment as outlined by the DNSH-principles.

- Yes
- No

- [See appendix 'Do No Significant Harm' for this information](#)

## 7 Budget

Sub-rating (1–6)

### 7.1 Funding base

Do you think that plans for the research infrastructure's funding base are sustainable and realistic in general?

- [See item 8.1 Budget in the action plan](#)
- [The research infrastructure must have funding plan for maintenance and development of services.](#)



## 8 Risk management

Sub-rating (1–6)

8.1 Does the research infrastructure have a sufficiently detailed risk management plan?

- See item 9 Risk management in the action plan

## 9 Overall assessment and rating

9.1 Main strengths and weaknesses

Please select major strengths and weaknesses of the application. Give justifications for the selection in sub-item 9.2.

Main strengths (select all relevant aspects):

- Scientific significance
- Collaboration and impact
- Ownership and know-how
- Services and users
- Digitality and data
- Responsibility and the green transition
- Budget
- Risk management

Main weaknesses (select all relevant aspects):

- Scientific significance
- Collaboration and impact
- Ownership and know-how
- Services and users
- Digitality and data
- Responsibility and the green transition
- Budget
- Risk management



## 9.2 Justification and comments (no numerical rating)

Please justify the selections above by briefly describing the main strengths and weaknesses of the application. Also, give a written overall assessment for the application

11 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 based on the panel discussion** (the ranking is made during the panel meeting)

Your application was ranked [ordinal number] of all [number] [Funding instrument name] applications reviewed in this panel.

