IMI2 JU responses to the Independent Observer's Report

Call ID: H2020-JTI-IMI2-2018-14-two-stage

IMI2 14th Call for Proposals

Stage 2 evaluation

Date of evaluation: 15-16 January 2019

Name of the observers: Charlotte Andersdotter

Summary of Recommendations

The IMI2 JU Call 14 evaluation was very well performed and fully in line with the guidelines and requirements to ensure a fair and transparent process. The IMI2 evaluation team was very much appreciated by the experts due to their professionalism, knowledge and overall well organised evaluation.

A few suggestions from the experts came up to consider for the future.

- *It would be helpful for the experts if there was more clarity in the differences between Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposals in terms of content. In some cases, the experts found it difficult to capture what had been further elaborated and/or changed since the Stage 1 proposal.*

- *At the hearing, the questions prepared in advance to be put to the Consortia were checked with the legal team to ensure that these questions, in accordance with IMI rules, sought only clarification on existing points in the proposal and did not introduce new elements and/or requirements for discussion. Experts found it useful if they were additionally briefed by the IMI 2 JU team on what kind of additional questions they could ask at the hearing, besides the ones already prepared. A suggestion is to bring this up at the general briefing so that experts feel comfortable with what possible follow-up question to ask.*

IMI2 JU responses to the recommendations

IMI2 JU is pleased to have the conformation of the independent observer that the evaluation was a fair and transparent process, very well performed and fully in line with the guidelines and requirements. IMI2 JU is also happy to receive suggestions and will make sure they will be considered for the future evaluations.

Regarding the first suggestion, as is clearly explained in the guidance to applicants and experts, proposals at stage 2 should still address the original topic and should not deviate substantially from the proposal submitted at stage 1. When proposals do deviate, then applicants should clearly explain the differences and any changes should be scientifically justified. In light of the comment, IMI2 JU will review the guidance and update it as necessary.

IMI2 JU thanks the independent observer for the suggestion regarding the hearings and will take measures to better brief the experts about the way they can interact with the consortium during the hearing.