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IMI 5th 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

• The EoI does not address all the objectives (in some cases EoIs have nothing to do with the topic!)

• 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](http://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