Research and Innovation Actions (RIA)
Innovation Actions (IA)

IMI2 Evaluation form
Single-stage and two-stage submission procedure

Version 1.5
8 April 2019

History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	24 June 2014	First version	
1.1	3 October 2014	Clarified threshold text	2
1.2	25 January 2015	Amended to ensure consistency with new proposal template	all
1.3	10 March 2016	Inclusion of third criteria at first stage, updating of sub-criteria and updating of scoring	all
1.4	14 April 2016	Editorial corrections	all
1.5	8 April 2019	Amended evaluation criteria and thresholds	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 and submission by the 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 is 3 for all the three evaluation criteria ‘excellence’, ‘impact’ and ‘quality and efficiency of the implementation’.The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

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 4. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 12.

First –stage evaluation criteria in the two-stage procedure

1. Excellence *The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the call for proposals and referred to in the IMI2 JU annual work plan:* ▪ Level to which all the objectives of the Call topic text are addressed; ▪ Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology; ▪ Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art and demonstrates innovation potential; ▪ Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and use of stakeholder knowledge. Comments:	**Score 1:**
2. Impact *The following aspects will be taken into account:* ▪ Demonstration of how the outputs of the project will contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the relevant Call topic text; ▪ Outline of how the project plans to leverage the public-private partnership model to achieve greater impact on innovation within research and development, regulatory, clinical and healthcare practices, as relevant ; ▪ Impacts on competitiveness and growth of companies including SMEs; ▪ Quality of the proposed outline to: - Disseminate, exploit and sustain the project results; - Manage research data; - Communicate the project activities to relevant target audiences. Comments:	**Score 2:**
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation *Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:* ▪ Quality and effectiveness of the work plan outline, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables; ▪ Appropriateness of the outline management structures and procedures; ▪ Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role; ▪ Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise; ▪ Strategy to create a successful partnership with the industry consortium as mentioned in the Call topic text. Comments:	**Score 3:**

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

Comments:

Total score (1+2+3)

*Experts will also be asked to assess the exceptional funding of third country participants/international organisations

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

1. Excellence *The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the Call for proposals and referred to in the IMI2 JU annual work plan and, for two stage procedures, is consistent with the stage 1 proposal:* ▪ Level to which all the objectives of the Call topic text are addressed; ▪ Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology; ▪ Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art and demonstrates innovation potential; ▪ Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and use of stakeholder knowledge. Comments:	**Score 1:**
2. Impact *The following aspects will be taken into account:* ▪ Demonstration of how the outputs of the project will contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the relevant Call topic text; ▪ Demonstration of how the project plans to leverage the public-private partnership model to achieve greater impact on innovation within R&D, regulatory, clinical and healthcare practices, as relevant ; ▪ Impacts on competitiveness and growth of companies including SMEs; ▪ Quality and effectiveness of the proposed measures to: - Disseminate, exploit and sustain the project results, - Manage research data, - Communicate the project activities to relevant target audiences. Comments:	**Score 2:**

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation* *The following aspects will be taken into account:* ▪ Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables; ▪ Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including management of risk and innovation;. ▪ Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role. ▪ Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise; ▪ Clearly defined contribution and effective integration of the industrial partners to the project.	**Score 3:**

Comments:	

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.
*Experts will also be asked to assess the exceptional funding of third country participants/international organisations