

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.	Not eligible for funding			To be discussed				Eligible for funding		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A) Project Quality										
1. Presentation of the project ►										
▪ Clarity of the project goals										
▪ Preliminary work										
▪ Work and time schedule										
2. Scientific quality of the project ►										
▪ Topicality and degree of innovation										
▪ Methodology										
▪ Appropriateness of the question within the context of the work and time schedule										
	Mean Value A:									

								Carry over Mean Value A:			
Assessment Scale: Please write the grade (whole number) in the given column under consideration of the listed subpoints. ►	Not eligible for funding			To be discussed				Eligible for funding			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
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	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
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	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Particular exploitability of the results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal) ▪ Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. Junior-Senior partnerships) ▪ Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of the cooperation 	<p>Maximum of 0.3 points: <input style="width: 30px; height: 15px;" type="text"/></p>
	Total Grade:

Comments:

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

Comments:

Recommended conditions:

Date Signature of the Referee
 Referee's name in block letters