

IMI2 JU two-stage evaluation procedure

Criteria that may be used to deviate from the ranking list established by independent experts following the evaluation of short proposals

1. Introduction

As part of the revision of IMI2 JU's evaluation process, IMI2 JU Members have agreed that, under exceptional circumstances, the IMI2 JU Governing Board may deviate from the ranking list established by the independent experts as regards the first ranked proposal.¹

For reasons of transparency and legal certainty, the related criteria should be pre-established, publicly available and strictly observed at each occurrence.

2. Criteria

The criteria that may be used by the IMI2 JU Governing Board in order to deviate from the ranking list established by the independent experts as regards the first ranked proposal may only concern specific and critical aspects that the independent experts were not able to take into account, and that any of the IMI2 JU Members would be aware of due to its specific knowledge.

These criteria are the following:

- a) New scientific evidence that invalidates the approach proposed by the applicant consortium
- b) Implementation of the project is not possible in the given budget and / or in the given time;
- c) Integration into industrial processes and practices after the end of the project is not possible.

The appreciation of the specific and critical aspects against the above criteria may be grounded in the IMI2 JU Members' specific knowledge.

3. Conditions

The conditions for deviating from the independent experts' ranking are the following:

- a) Deviation should remain exceptional;
- b) Deviation can only be based on at least one of the above criteria;
- c) Invitation can be made only to the next ranked proposal, according to the ranking list established by the independent experts;
- d) Deviation should in all instances be duly motivated and justified in writing, highlighting the reason why independent experts were not able to take into account such elements;
- e) A relevant Governing Board motivated decision should be adopted;
- f) The concerned applicant consortium must be informed of the Governing Board motivated decision and may submit a request for review;
- g) The Governing Board decision may be challenged by the relevant applicant consortium through the applicable judicial remedies.

¹ Moreover, and beyond the scope of this Note, according to Article 13(3) of EU Regulation No 1290/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 laying down the rules for participation and dissemination in Horizon 2020 — the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), a proposal which contravenes ethical principles or any applicable legislation, or which does not fulfil the conditions set out in Decision No 2013/743/EU, in the work programme, in the work plan or in the call for proposals may be excluded from the evaluation, selection and award procedures at any time.