



Proposal No.	Acronym
--------------	---------

Evaluation Form – Stage 1

<p>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence</p> <p>1.1. Quality and soundness of the scientific and/or technological approach</p> <p>1.2. Likelihood of the research proposal to meet all the key objectives in order to complement the EFPIA Consortium.</p> <p>1.3. Innovation (i.e. novelty in discovery, practical applicability, adaptation, etc), progress beyond the state-of-the-art.</p> <p>1.4. Degree of scientific and/or technological impact likely to be delivered?</p> <p>1.5. In relation to 1.4, 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?</p> <p><i>Evaluators - Please insert comments here:</i></p>	<p>.</p> <p>Score: .../5</p> <p><i>Weight: 5</i></p> <p>Weighted score: .../25</p> <p><i>Threshold: 19/25</i></p>
<p>2. Excellence of Partnership</p> <p>2.1. Scientific quality and technological expertise of the individual participants in the Applicant Consortium compared to the expectations outlined in the Call topic text. In the specific case where clinical trials are to be conducted specific consideration should be given to evaluating the ability of each clinical centre to fulfil all the site requirements as outlined in the Call topic text.</p> <p>2.2. Ability to provide the contributions expected from the Applicant Consortium.</p> <p>2.3. Unique features, strengths, internal complementarities and balance of the Applicant Consortium (including appropriate allocation of roles, manageability of consortium and input of each participant).</p> <p><i>Evaluators - Please insert comments here:</i></p>	<p>.</p> <p>Score: .../5</p> <p><i>Weight: 3</i></p> <p>Weighted score: .../15</p> <p><i>Threshold: 10/15</i></p>
<p>3. Work-plan outline</p> <p>Conceptual quality and soundness of the work-plan outline, including approximate budget, timelines for deliverables.</p> <p><i>Evaluators - Please insert comments here:</i></p>	<p>.</p> <p>Score: .../5</p> <p><i>No weight</i></p> <p><i>No threshold</i></p>



Innovative Medicines Initiative

Evaluation form – Stage 1

Proposal No.	Acronym
--------------	---------

TOTAL score	,,/45
<p>4. Ethical Issues Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention if selected for Evaluation Stage 2? <i>Please identify these issues below:</i></p>	NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Other remarks: Do you have any other remarks on this proposal which may be of assistance to the applicants if it is selected for Stage 2 evaluation?</p>	

For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments (half scores (0.5) are permissible):

- 0 – Fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 – Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.
- 2 – Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.
- 3 – Fair. Broadly addresses the criterion, with significant weaknesses which require correction.
- 4 – Good. Addresses the criterion well; minor improvements are possible.
- 5 – Excellent. Successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question.



Proposal No.

Acronym

Signatures for auditing purposes:

.....
Name and surname of Rapporteur

.....
Date and signature

.....
Name and surname of Moderator

.....
Date and signature

1.....
Name and surname of Independent Expert

.....
Date and signature

2.....
Name and surname of Independent Expert

.....
Date and signature

3.....
Name and surname of Independent Expert

.....
Date and signature

4.....
Name and surname of Independent Expert

.....
Date and signature