Research Council of Finland

Application review form

Sustainable energy solutions 2025

Spring call 2025

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

Application number:

How to review 'Sustainable energy solutions' applications

This call for consortia aims to strengthen advanced energy research on sustainable energy solutions and impact by fostering collaborative and systemic research among various RDI actors. The multidisciplinary research should address the evolving challenges and opportunities within sustainable energy solutions aiming at increasing the carbon handprint. Applicants should identify the relevant end-users and beneficiaries of the research, and their role in the project.

Reviewers should assess the scientific quality of the proposed research, the feasibility of the implementation plan, the potential to advance science in sustainable energy research, and the broader impact beyond academia. Furthermore, they should evaluate the consortium's potential to generate significant added value through enhanced collaboration among partners contributing to the achievement of the call's objectives.

This call will fund four-year consortium projects with a maximum of 1 million euros per consortium. The funding is primarily intended to support research teams and to cover associated research costs.

Provide both a written review and numerical rating in section 1 (Project's relevance to call), section 2 (Quality of research) and section 3 (Implementation), and give an overall rating in section 5. Write evaluative comments rather than descriptive ones. Section 4 (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

Research Council of Finland

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 Project's relevance to call

1.1 Project's relevance to call

Subrating (1–6)

Contribution of the application to achieving the objectives of the call

Please review:

- Promotion of innovative solutions contributing to sustainable energy systems aiming at increasing the carbon handprint
- Strengthening of collaboration between various RDI actors, including universities, research institutes and companies to foster multidisciplinary research and innovation
- Creation of long-term potential and direct benefits for society through future sustainable energy systems
- Identification and involvement of relevant end-users and beneficiaries of the research and/or its implementation

- See **call text** for complete description of the objectives of this call.
- See **research plan**.

2 Quality of research

2.1 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research

Subrating (1–6)

Please review:

- scientific quality and significance of project's objectives and hypotheses
- ambitiousness and state of the art of objectives, including possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines
- scientific added value of consortium for attainment of research objectives
- impact of research within academia
- potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes including possible high-risk, high-gain research
- project's potential to generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices

- See **research plan**.
- **The consortium application** consists of two or more subprojects each with nominated PIs and separate budgets but a common research plan. The consortium implements a joint research plan with a view to achieving more extensive added value than through normal cooperation.

3 Implementation

3.1 Feasibility of research plan, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1–6)

Please review:

- feasibility of project, taking into account extent to which proposed research may include high risks
- materials, research data and methods
- working arrangements and management of research tasks
- research environment including research infrastructures
- identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan
- consideration of research ethics, open access to research publications and data, data management, promotion of equality and nondiscrimination in society at large, and sustainable development within the project

- See **research plan**.

3.2 Expertise, human resources and collaborations, including aspects of responsible science

Subrating (1–6)

Please review:

- competence and scientific expertise of all applicants of consortium in terms of project implementation
- added value of consortium's collaboration for sustainable energy solutions
- involvement of relevant end-users and beneficiaries of the research and/or its solutions
- contribution of both national and international research collaborators, engaged with their own funding, and impact of their environment on project's potential success
- complementary expertise of teams directly working for/funded in the project, including appropriateness and sufficiency for proposed project
- adequateness of human resources for project implementation, with attention to promoting equality and nondiscrimination within project

Research Council of Finland

- description of planned interaction with stakeholders, beneficiaries and end-users, communication and dissemination of results (key actors, means, channels and optimal timing)
- significance of planned mobility for implementation of research plan and researcher training
- promoting research careers

  - See **research plan**.
  - See **most relevant publications and other key outputs** in the application form.
  - See **CVs** of the applicants in the application form.
  - See **lists of publications**.
  - See **mobility plan** in the application form.
  - See possible **letter(s) of collaboration**.

4 Review panel's summary assessment of proposal

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

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY AT THE PANEL MEETING

Section 4 of the form is applicable only to applications selected for discussion during the review panel meeting.

4.1.1 Main strengths and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main strengths with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.2 Main weaknesses and their justifications (no numerical rating)

- Summary assessment of application's main weaknesses with justifications
  - Refer to the review criteria in sections 1, 2 and 3.
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

4.1.3 Other remarks (if any):

- For example: possible contradictions in individual reviews, or other relevant remarks from the panel discussion
  - To be completed only at the panel meeting

Research Council of Finland

5 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).

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. Only applications with a final rating of 5 or 6 were ranked.