1. Program XXX

[Brief description of number of topics to be reviewed in the following.]

[Text]

* 1. Topic n

General remarks

[Text]

Scientific performance and impact

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you rate the scientific quality and the innovative potential of the research activities?
At what level is the research internationally competitive?*
* *How do you rate the transformative impact of the research on the field and/or potential for significant societal or economic impact?*
* *How do you evaluate the scientific achievements in relation to its size, available infrastructure, and funding?*
* *What are specific strengths and weaknesses?*
* *Can you identify novel contributions to the field? If so, which are they?*
* *Please indicate the most prominent research results (up to three).*
* *Can you identify scientists with exceptional contributions to the field?]*

[Text]

Contribution to the topic

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you rate the impact of the center’s contributions to the topic? Which are essential, important, or additional contributions?
Please comment in view of originality and strategic relevance for this research field, the re- search policy objectives as well as the topic’s key objectives and milestones.*
* *How do the different research groups of the topic interact with each other?]*

[Text]

Potential contributions to future strategic priorities of the research field (future program period)

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you rate the future scientific prospects and direction of the topics with respect to the strategy of the research field, but also in comparison with national and international roadmaps in the respective research area?]*

[Text]

* 1. Evaluation with regard to program XXX

General remarks

[Text]

Contribution to the program

*[Key questions:*

* *How would you evaluate the center's impact on the program, considering scientific quality (including achievements, impact, originality, and international competitiveness) and strategic relevance (program milestones, senate recommendations, research policy objectives)?*
* *Can you highlight specific contributions that stand out in advancing research policy objectives?*
* *What notable contributions demonstrate transformative impact in the field and/‌or possess substantial potential for societal or economic influence?*
* *How do the research topics within the program intersect, and where do synergies and additional value emerge?]*

[Text]

Potential contributions to future strategic priorities of the research field (future program period)

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you rate the future scientific prospects and direction of the program and its topics with respect to the strategy of the research field, but also in comparison with national and international roadmaps in the respective research area?]*

[Text]

* 1. User facility XYZ

General remarks

[Text]

Scientific performance and strategic relevance

[Key questions:

* *Does the facility enable users to carry out excellent scientific work?*
* *How do you rate the scientific results produced at this facility? Please indicate the most prominent results (up to three).*
* *How do you rate the facility on a national, European, and international level?*
* *How would you judge the technical design and implementation?*
* *How would you evaluate the interaction with the programs and its topics? Is the infrastructure vital for carrying out the research activities?*
* *To what extent has the facility been exploited for excellent in-house research?*
* *What role does the facility play in national or international roadmaps in the respective research areas?]*

[Text]

Access and service for users

*[Key questions:*

* *Does the facility attract an outstanding community of scientists?*
* *How do you judge the technical and scientific support provided for external users?*
* *Do the procedures ensure equal access to the facility for scientists from Helmholtz and for external users?*
* *Are the present staff qualifications and management structures appropriate to a user-oriented facility aiming to meet international standards?]*

[Text]

Appropriateness of resources used and future costs

*[Key questions:*

* *Taking into account the cost, availability and scientific demand, is the facility operated on a sufficient level to meet requirements (running time and average use)?*
* *Do you consider the estimates of the remaining life span of the facility to be realistic?*
* *What is your assessment of the plans concerning a replacement of the infrastructure and its possible costs?]*

[Text]

1. Strategic topics
	1. General remarks

[Text]

* 1. Talent management

*[Key questions:*

* *How would you evaluate the measures implemented in favor of talent management and career development?*
* *Can you identify rising stars among junior scientists?*
* *Do you see the need to put stronger focus on specific target groups, such as internationally outstanding early career scientists? If so, what are your suggestions for improving the respective recruiting and/or career development mechanisms?]*

[Text]

* 1. Cooperation

*[Key questions:*

* *What is the potential for benefit and synergies regarding the networking and collaboration strategy of the center, both nationally and internationally?*
* *Please indicate potential partners that could further strengthen the center’s capacity for system solutions.]*

[Text]

* 1. Innovation

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you assess the structures and achievements in both areas of knowledge and technology transfer?]*

[Text]

* 1. Diversity and equal opportunity

*[Key questions:*

* *How do you evaluate the center’s goals and measures to promote equal opportunity and diversity?*
* *Which additional procedures, measures, or specific activities seem promising – given the center’s scientific characteristics and its legal environment – to meet the center’s goals?]*

[Text]

* 1. Research for sustainability

*Key questions:*

* *How do you evaluate the center’s efforts towards research for sustainability (as well as towards sustainability in the operation of its research infrastructures, if applicable)?*
* *Can you identify promising examples?]*

[Text]

* 1. Further strategic topic 1: Digitalization [optional]
	2. Further strategic topic 2: Infrastructure [optional]

*Key questions:*

* *What is the potential for benefit and synergies regarding this strategic topic? How do you evaluate its achievements?]*

Place, date

<Signature>

Name, chair of the review panel

Annex

Further participants

To ensure a fair and comparable process for all programs, the following delegates of the Helmholtz Senate and the Helmholtz head office participated in the review.

Delegates of the Helmholtz Senate and Senate Commission

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Family name | Affiliation | Country |
| … |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Representatives of the Scientific Advisory Boards

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Family name | Affiliation | Country |
| … |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Delegates of the Helmholtz head office

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Family name | Affiliation, division etc. |
| … |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The following scientists represented the research in the center during the review

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Family name | Affiliation, division etc. |
| … |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Representatives of strategic partners (if applicable)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First name | Family name | Affiliation, division etc. |
| … |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Definition of grades

|  |
| --- |
| **Definition of grades** |
| **outstanding** | internationally leading, ground-breaking research, transformative impact on the research field and/or high potential for significant societal or economic impact, essentially no weakness |
| **excellent** | internationally highly visible, although not leading, innovative research with significant impact on the research field and/or potential for significant societal or economic impact, only few minor weaknesses |
| **very good** | internationally visible, considerable impact on the research field, minor weaknesses |
| **good** | limited international visibility, moderate contribution to the research field, several minor weaknesses |
| **fair** | minor contribution to the research field, major weaknesses |