

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

Evaluation form - Stage 1

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the approach • likelihood to meet the key listed objectives of the project • complementarities with the EFPIA Consortium • Innovation, progress beyond the state-of-the-art and impact <p><i>[Evaluators are requested to score each sub-criterion separately. Evaluators comments will be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p>Each sub-criterion shall be score /5</p> <p>Total score: XX/20</p> <p>Threshold 14/20</p>
2. Partnership case <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants • Appropriateness of the allocation of role/ input of each applicant <p><i>[Evaluators are requested to score each sub-criterion separately. Evaluators comments will be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p>Each sub-criterion shall be score /5</p> <p>Total score: XX/10</p> <p>Threshold 7/10</p>
3. Quality of the Applicant consortium as a whole <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique features, internal complementarity and balance of the consortium <p><i>[Evaluators comments will be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p>Score: XX/5</p>
4. Quality and soundness of the work plan, including budget <p><i>[Evaluators comments will be inserted here.]</i></p>	<p>Score: XX/5</p>
Total score	XX/40
Any other remarks including ethical issues <p><i>[Evaluators comments will be inserted here.]</i></p>	

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention if selected for Stage 2?

NO ☐

YES ☐

For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments: 1

0 - fails to address the criterion under examination 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 that need correcting.

4 - Good. Addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.

5 - Excellent. Successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.