

**FIRI 2024**

FIRI roadmap and funding call 2024

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Application number:

Name of applicant:

Title of proposed project:

**How to review FIRI roadmap applications**

The aim of this call is to create a roadmap to ensure that research infrastructures respond to both current and future scientific challenges by generating new knowledge, strengthening the diverse impact of research environments, remaining internationally competitive, increasing knowledge and interacting with RDI actors.

Provide both a written review and numerical ratings for section 1 (**Scientific significance of research infrastructure**), section 2 (**Wide and versatile impact**) and section 3 (**Operation of research infrastructure**), and give overall comments for section 4 (**Development project**). Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 5 (Review panel's summary assessment) is written by the panel during the panel meeting.

Use a rating scale ranging from 6 (**outstanding**) to 1 (**insufficient**). The consistency between the numerical rating and the written comments is particularly important.

Rating scale	Description
6 (outstanding)	Demonstrates extremely high novelty and/or innovation; has potential to substantially advance science at global level; presents a high-gain plan that may include risks
5 (excellent)	Is very good in international comparison - 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 and needs substantial modification or improvement
1 (insufficient)	Contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application



## 1 Scientific significance of research infrastructure

### 1.1 Scientific significance of research infrastructure and its position in the research landscape Subrating (1-6)

Is the scientific significance of the research infrastructure and its position in the research landscape described in a clear and convincing manner?

Please review the following aspects:

- Does the RI strengthen the existing national and international RI landscape?
  - Does the RI strengthen the research field(s) that it represents?
  - Has the RI contributed to the development of the research fields it represents or to scientific breakthroughs in these?
- See [action plan](#) (section 1.1)

### 1.2 Responsible science

Have good scientific practice and governance, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination within the activities of the research infrastructure been considered appropriately? If they have not, please provide comments in the text box below.

- Yes
- No

- See [action plan](#) (section 1.2)

## 2 Wide and versatile impact

### 2.1 Wide and versatile impact Subrating (1-6)

Does the research infrastructure have impact beyond the scientific community? Is it clearly and convincingly described?

Please review the following aspects:

- Does the research infrastructure have impact on the research, development and innovation ecosystem (including international networks)?
- Does the research infrastructure have wide and versatile impact beyond the scientific community?
- Is impact discussed with the stakeholders and monitored sufficiently in relation to the lifecycle phase of the research infrastructure?



- See [action plan](#). (section 2.1)

## 2.2 The green transition (no numerical rating)

Has the green transition been considered appropriately in the operation of the research infrastructure? If it has not, please provide comments in the text box below.

- Yes
- No

## 2.3 Sustainable development (no numerical rating)

Have relevant sustainable development goals (other than the green transition) been considered appropriately in the operation of the research infrastructure? If they have not, please provide comments in the text box below.

- Yes
- No

- See [action plan](#) (section 2.2).

## 3 Operation of research infrastructure

### 3.1 Activities and operation

**Subrating (1-6)**

Are the activities and of the research infrastructure appropriate considering the lifecycle phase of the research infrastructure?

Please review the following aspects:

- services and use of research infrastructure
- ownership and organisational structure of research infrastructure
- skills and know-how of research infrastructure personnel
- risk management plan of research infrastructure
- how the research infrastructure considers aspects related to digitalisation and data.

- See [action plan](#) (sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6)

### 3.2 Data management policy



## Research Council of Finland

Is the data management policy of the research infrastructure sufficient? If it is not, please provide comments in the text box below.

Yes

No

- See [separate appendix](#) for data management policy

### 4 Development project (no numerical rating)

#### 4.1 Comments on development project

The preliminary plan for the development project must be well founded and contribute to the strategy of the research infrastructure and to the development of its activities and services.

Please review the following aspects:

- How well does the development project support the vision and long-term plans of the research infrastructure?
- Are the planned activities in the development project and its scale appropriate? Please explain.

- See [action plan](#) (section 4)

### 5 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

#### 5.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of proposal and their justifications; possible other remarks

##### TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

##### 5.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of the application's main strengths with justifications

- [To be completed only at the panel meeting](#)

##### 5.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of the application's main weaknesses with justifications

- [To be completed only at the panel meeting](#)



## Research Council of Finland

### 5.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

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).

