



Innovative Medicines Initiative

Writing a Successful Proposal

Hugh Lavery

IMI Senior Scientific Project Manager

IMI 5th Call Evaluation process



- Expressions of Interest (Eols) 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 **Eol template** (sometimes received even slides!)
- Submitted text so concise that it **does not clearly state what is proposed** in practice
- The Eol **does not address all the objectives** (in some cases Eols have nothing to do with the topic!)
- Eol **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

