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IMI Call Evaluation process

• Expressions of Interest (EoIs) are **reviewed** and **ranked** by a panel of at least **5 independent experts**

• Experts identified by IMI Executive Office

• Experts in the area

• Have no conflicts of interest
Evaluation Criteria

- Scientific and/or technological excellence
- Excellence of Partnership
- Work-plan outline
- Ethical Issues
Scientific and/or technological excellence

- **Quality** and **soundness** of the scientific and/or technological approach

- Likelihood of the research proposal to meet all the key objectives in order to complement the EFPIA Consortium.

- **Innovation** (i.e. novelty in discovery, practical applicability, adaptation, etc.), progress beyond the state-of-the-art.

- Degree of scientific and/or technological **impact** likely to be delivered?

- Has the Applicant Consortium adequately explained the **balance between potential impact and residual risks** based on the proposed approach i.e. are potential complications, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
Excellence of Partnership

• Scientific quality and technological **expertise of the individual participants** in the Applicant Consortium.

• Ability to provide the **contributions** expected from the Applicant Consortium.

• **Unique features, strengths, internal complementarities and balance** of the Applicant Consortium (including appropriate allocation of roles, manageability of consortium and input of each participant).
Work plan outline / Ethics

• Conceptual **quality and soundness** of the work-plan outline, including approximate **budget**, **timelines** for deliverables

• Does this proposal contain **ethical issues** that may need **further attention** if selected for Evaluation Stage 2?
Common Mistakes

• Submission **deadline missed**

• At the time of submission: **parts of the EoI not uploaded** (this should not be a problem anymore with SOFIA)

• Applicants are **not eligible for funding** (enterprises that request but are not eligible for funding can still be partners)

• **Legal status** of applicants is not clear

• **Consortium eligibility** criteria not met (e.g., a single legal entity is not a consortium)

• Applicant consortia **do not have the capabilities to address all of the objectives** (e.g., redundancy between partners)
Common Mistakes

- Submitted text does not respect the **EoI template** (sometimes received even slides!)

- Submitted text so concise that it **does not clearly state what is proposed** in practice

- EoI **out of scope** (if you have doubts on how to respond to the call contact IMI)

- **Ethical issues** not addressed
Common Sense

• Read all the Call-relevant material that is provided on the IMI website – www.imi.europa.eu

• Understand IMI’s Rules and respect them

• If in doubt ask a member of the IMI Executive Office

• Your EoI should provide reviewers with all the information requested to allow them to evaluate it

• Finalise your submission

• If invited to a hearing answer the questions as precisely and concisely as possible