Academy of Finland – FIRI 2018 Call 2 review report

Date
Review panel
Experts
Application number
Call
Applicant
Project title

Reminder to reviewer

Definition: *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.*

Research infrastructures must:

- provide potential for world-class research and scientific breakthroughs
- be of broad national interest and enhance international impact
- have a long-term plan for scientific goals, maintenance, financing and utilisation
- be used by several research groups/users for high-quality research
- be open and easily accessible to researchers, industry and other actors
- have a plan for access to and preservation of collected data and/or materials
- be extensive enough so that individual groups cannot manage them on their own
- introduce new cutting-edge technology (if relevant).

Please rate the applications using the scale below. We encourage using the entire scale.

6 Outstanding: stands for exceptional novelty, innovativeness and enabling of renewal of science at a global level
5 Excellent: extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved
4 Very good: contains some elements that could be improved
3 Good: contains elements that could be improved
2 Unsatisfactory: in need of substantial modification or improvement
1 Weak: severe flaws intrinsic to the proposed infrastructure project or the plan

In addition to a numerical rating, please give a written assessment under each of the questions below.

1 Relevance of research infrastructure Rating (1–6)

1.1 How does the research infrastructure facilitate / is going to facilitate scientific excellence in terms of scientific results, breakthroughs and scientific progress and renewal?

1.2 How is / will be the research infrastructure positioned in the national and international research environment?

1.3 Does the infrastructure fill a certain gap in the national or international research infrastructure landscape?

1.4 How is the research infrastructure engaged in national or international collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the project?

1.5 What is / will be the added value of infrastructure for science, industry and/or society at a national and international level?

1.6 Can the research infrastructure be used by user communities from different research fields?

1.7 How do host organisations support / is going to support the research infrastructure? How well is the project aligned with the research strategies of the organisations?

2 Feasibility of research infrastructure Rating (1–6)

2.1 Is the project plan clearly presented and realistic? Are the potential risks and problem areas acknowledged, and how are alternative approaches being considered? How will the research infrastructure be sustained after the project period?

2.2 Does the project plan show maturity of the concept in order infrastructure to develop into national/international RI?

2.3 What is the user profile? Is the research infrastructure continuously used by excellent researchers and research groups?

2.4 Does the infrastructure offer feasible guidelines, practices or incentives/demands for researchers in order to support open access and open research data? How does the research infrastructure provide open access to users (access may require approval of a research plan and reasonable user fees)? How are the management, storage, use and rights of ownership of the research data planned?

2.5 Does the infrastructure have an exit plan?

2.6 Good research practices. Are there ethical issues concerning the structure and methods of work at the infrastructure or in its guidelines for using the infrastructure?

3 Feasibility of finance Rating (1–6)

3.1 Are the overall expenses appropriate and well-planned?

4 Management and competence of personnel Rating (1–6)

4.1 Are the project management, resources and division of labour for maintenance, services and user support appropriate and well-planned? Are the merits and scientific expertise of the principal director (coordinator) and other key persons appropriate and sufficient for the Infrastructure? What are the merits of the principal director and other key persons in terms of managing the research infrastructure? Do the personnel have adequate expertise for maintenance, service provision and user support? How is the training and development of the personnel taken care of or planned to take care of?

5 Impact of research infrastructure Rating (1–6)

5.1 What kind of added value does the research infrastructure generate for society at large or for innovation activities, business and the economy? Can the project produce new innovations, business activities or other societal benefits?

5.2 How does the research infrastructure support education and researcher training? Does the research infrastructure enhance mobility?

6 Overall assessment Final rating (1–6)

6.1 Assess the main strengths and weaknesses of the research infrastructure project. You can also provide additional comments and suggestions.