



<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

**Evaluation Form**

<p><b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Soundness and quality of approach to meet the objectives of the call topic</i></li><li>• <i>Application of creative and cutting edge methodologies</i></li><li>• <i>Uniqueness of the approach (no duplication of existing initiative)</i></li><li>• <i>Where applicable, any ethical issues appropriately addressed.</i></li></ul> <p>----- [Evaluators comments to be inserted here.]</p>	<p><b>Score: ..../5</b> <b>(Threshold 3/5)</b></p>
<p><b>2. Excellence of the project implementation plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Adequate and appropriate representation of all relevant stakeholders within the consortium.</i></li><li>• <i>Adequate documentation of the project plan with efficient timelines and well utilised resources. Includes justification of timelines and resource allocation (e.g. for research, management, training or other activities).</i></li><li>• <i>Resource allocation (by value) by the EFPIA project participants should at least equal the funding requested by the participants eligible for funding by the IMI JU (if not, the unequal resource allocation is adequately justified).</i></li><li>• <i>Adequate documentation and appropriateness of the management structure and procedures. Management plan capable of building a cohesive and efficient team within the consortium.</i></li></ul> <p>----- [Evaluators comments to be inserted here.]</p>	<p><b>Score: ..../5</b></p>
<p><b>3. Consistency with Call Topic and stage 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Scope of Full Project Proposal is consistent with the</i></li></ul>	

<p><i>published Call Topic.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Full Project Proposal contains core objectives and plans that do not substantially deviate in scope from the Expression of Interest selected at Stage 1, except to fulfil recommendations from the Stage 1 peer review.</i></li> <li>• <i>The composition of the applicant consortium does not substantially deviate from that described in the Expression of Interest selected at Stage 1, except where adequately justified or to fulfil recommendations from the Stage 1 peer review.</i></li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p><i>[Evaluators comments to be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p><b>Score: ..../5</b></p>
<p><b>4. Potential impact of project results</b></p> <p><i>Likelihood of IMI key benefits (i.e. new multidisciplinary development tools, new development paradigms) to be achieved following dissemination / publication of research results.</i></p> <p>-----</p> <p><i>[Evaluators comments to be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p><b>Score: ..../5</b></p>
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p><i>[Evaluators recommendations to be inserted here.]</i></p> <p>-----</p>	<p><b>Total score:</b></p> <p><b>..../20</b></p>

**For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments** (half scores (0.5) are permissible):

- 0 – Fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 – Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.
- 2 – Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.
- 3 – Fair. Broadly addresses the criterion, with significant weaknesses which require correction.
- 4 – Good. Addresses the criterion well; minor improvements are possible.
- 5 – Excellent. Successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question.