

# IMI2 EVALUATION FORM FOR COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTIONS

**Single-stage and two-stage submission procedure**

## History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	3 November 2014	First version	
1.1	27 November 2017	Distinction between stage 1 and stage 2 evaluation	All

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (e.g. by an impartial colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The aim is to help applicants identify ways to improve their proposals.

The forms used by the experts for their evaluation reports will be broadly similar, although the detail and layout may differ. These forms are based on the standard criteria, scores and thresholds. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. The definitive evaluation schemes are given in the IMI2 annual work plan.

A self-evaluation, if carried out by the applicants, is not to be submitted to the IMI2 JU, and has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation.

## **SCORING**

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Half marks may be given. Evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned.

## **INTERPRETATION OF THE SCORES**

- 0** — The **proposal fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1** — **Poor**. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2** — **Fair**. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3** — **Good**. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4** — **Very Good**. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5** — **Excellent**. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

## **THRESHOLDS**

**Two-stage** submission procedure:

For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, the threshold for the two first criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' is 3. The proposals will also be evaluated for the 'quality and efficiency of the implementation' criterion but with no threshold. There is no overall threshold.

For the evaluation of second-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure the threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

**Single-stage** submission procedure:

For the evaluation of proposals under a single-stage submission procedure, the threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

# First –stage evaluation criteria in the two-stage procedure

<p><b>1. Excellence</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the Call for proposal and referred to in the IMI2 JU Annual Work Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity and pertinence of the proposal to meet all key objectives of the topic;</li> <li>• Credibility of the proposed approach;</li> <li>• Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant;</li> <li>• Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures;</li> <li>• Mobilisation of the necessary expertise to achieve the objectives of the topic, ensure engagement of all relevant key stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 1:</b></p>
<p><b>2. Impact</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expected impacts of the proposed approach as mentioned in the Call for proposals;</li> <li>• Added value from the public private partnership approach on R&amp;D, regulatory, clinical and healthcare practice as relevant;</li> <li>• Strengthening the competitiveness and industrial leadership and/or addressing specific societal challenges;</li> <li>• Improving European citizens' health and wellbeing and contribute to the IMI2 objectives<sup>1</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b></p>
<p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence and effectiveness of the outline of the project work plan, including appropriateness of the roles and allocation of tasks, resources, timelines and approximate budget;</li> <li>• Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (where relevant) and strategy to create a successful partnership with the industry consortium as mentioned in the topic description in the Call for proposal;</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the proposed management structures and procedures, including manageability of the consortium.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 3:</b></p>

Any other remarks on this proposal which may be of assistance to the applicants if it is selected for Stage 2 evaluation?

<sup>1</sup> Article 2 of the Council Regulation (EU) No 557/2014 of 6 May 2014 establishing the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking (O.J. L169 of 7.6.2014)

---

Comments:

---

**Total score (1+2+3)**

# Second-stage evaluation criteria in the two-stage procedure and evaluation criteria in a single-stage procedure

<p><b>1. Excellence</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the Call for proposal and referred to in the IMI2 JU Annual Work Plan and is consistent with the stage 1 proposal where relevant:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity and pertinence of the proposal to meet all key objectives of the topic;</li> <li>• Credibility of the proposed approach;</li> <li>• Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant;</li> <li>• Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures;</li> <li>• Mobilisation of the necessary expertise to achieve the objectives of the topic, ensure engagement of all relevant key stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 1:</b></p>
<p><b>2. Impact</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expected impacts of the proposed approach as mentioned in the Call for proposal;</li> <li>• Added value from the public private partnership approach on R&amp;D, regulatory, clinical and healthcare practice as relevant;</li> <li>• Strengthening the competitiveness and industrial leadership and/or addressing specific societal challenges;</li> <li>• Improving European citizens' health and wellbeing and contribute to the IMI2 objectives<sup>1</sup>;</li> <li>• Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b></p>
<p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation*</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence and effectiveness of the project work plan, including appropriateness of the roles and allocation of tasks, resources, timelines and budget;</li> <li>• Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (where relevant);</li> <li>• Clearly defined contribution to the project plan of the industrial partners (where</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score 3:</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> Article 2 of the Council Regulation (EU) No 557/2014 of 6 May 2014 establishing the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking (O.J. L169 of 7.6.2014)

<p>relevant);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including manageability of the consortium, risk and innovation management and sustainability plan.</li></ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
---	--

---

Any other remarks on this proposal which may be of assistance to the consortium if it is selected for grant preparation

Comments:

---

**Total score (1+2+3)**

--

\*Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.