



TABLE OF CONTENTS

CALL EVALUATION REPORT (CER)	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE CALL	2
3. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, ADMISSIBILITY, ELIGIBILITY, NON-EXCLUSION, OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY CHECKS AND RE-ATTRIBUTION	3
4. EVALUATION	3
4.1 Evaluators	3
4.2 Evaluation calendar	3
4.3 Briefing	4
4.4 Evaluation: Award criteria and scoring	4
4.5 Evaluation procedure: Individual evaluation, consensus group and panel review	4
4.6 Evaluation outcome	4
5. EU CALL RANKED LISTS AND LISTS OF BELOW-THRESHOLD PROPOSALS	5
5.1 EU call ranked lists and lists of below-threshold proposals	5
6. THEMATIC COVERAGE OF PROPOSALS (OPTIONAL)	5
6.1 Area coverage	5
7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CALLS (OPTIONAL)	5
It was deemed appropriate not to impose a limit on the number of people trained to remain in line with the flexibility permitted by the specific topic conditions and the objectives of the topic, thereby also adopting the most favorable interpretation for consortia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND STATISTICS FOR THE CALL	5
ANNEXES	6

1. INTRODUCTION

This **call evaluation report (CER)** provides an overview of the evaluation for the above-mentioned call.

 It reflects the situation at a specific point in time. During grant preparation, proposals may still be taken off or added to the list proposed for funding.

 Please note that the information contained in this report is confidential and may be used only within the EU institutions bodies and agencies and for members of Governing Board.

2. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE CALL

The total **budget** for the call is **EUR 53.000.000**.

The call covers the following topics and types of actions and was evaluated by the following evaluation committee/panel (one or several for each topic/budget envelope):

Topic ID	Topic short name	Types of action	Budget (EUR)	Panel identifier
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-03-NETWORKS-01-two-stage	NETWORK	CSA	53.000.000	HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-03-NETWORKS-01-two-stage

The **deadline** for submission of proposals was 3 September 2025 (stage 2).

The call is a two-stage call (*i.e. submission of stage 1-outline proposals, followed by submission of stage 2-complete proposals only for selected outline proposals*). This report presents the evaluation and selection exercise of stage 2.

3. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, ADMISSIBILITY, ELIGIBILITY, NON-EXCLUSION, OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY CHECKS AND RE-ATTRIBUTION

The number of proposals received in response to this call is 11.

For statistics on **inadmissible and ineligible proposals**, see Annexes 3 and 4.

Exclusion grounds under Article 138(1) and 143(1) of the Financial Regulation 2024/2509¹ have not yet been verified. This will be done during grant preparation.

Operational capacity of the applicants was verified as part of the evaluation (on the basis of the information available in the proposal); the **financial capacity** will be checked during grant preparation.

4. EVALUATION

4.1 Evaluators

The evaluation of proposals for this call was carried out between 20.10.2025 and 22.10.2025, by the evaluation committee/panel appointed by the responsible authorising officer, composed of 19 external experts.

The **evaluation committee/panel** was composed of external experts.

The **external experts** were selected in a way to ensure a high level of skills, experience and knowledge in the areas of the call (*including project management, innovation, exploitation, dissemination and communication and financial aspects*).

Special attention was given to achieve an appropriately balanced composition (*skills, experience, knowledge, geographical diversity, gender and private-public sector balance*) and regular rotation.

For an overview on gender, geographic origin and affiliation of the experts, see Annex 7.

As a result, out of the invited 19 experts:

- (42 %) were **women**.
- (53 %) came from **universities** and public or private research organisations.
- (16 %) were from **private commercial firms**.

The rotation rules that applied to the Programme were respected.

The evaluation procedure was also observed by an observer (*i.e. independent external expert to advise on the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions, the application of the evaluation criteria and ways to improve the processes*). For the observer report, see Annex 9.

4.2 Evaluation calendar

¹ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2024 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union (recast) ('EU Financial Regulation') (OJ L, 2024/2509, 26.9.2024).

The evaluation meetings for this call were held according to the following schedule:

Meetings	Dates	Place
Consensus group meeting	20.10.2025-21.10.2025	online
Panel meeting	22.10.2025	online

4.3 Briefing

At the start of the evaluation, the evaluators were briefed on applicable rules, process, procedures, evaluation criteria and scope and objectives of the call.

Where appropriate, a special briefing was held for consensus group rapporteurs, remote evaluation and specific details on LumpSum MGA evaluations were provided.

The briefings emphasised confidentiality requirements and rules on conflict of interests.

All evaluators received the documentation with respect to the programme and the call (*e.g. call conditions, financial tables, etc.*).

4.4 Evaluation: Award criteria and scoring

The evaluation was made against the award criteria and evaluation rules as set out in the call conditions.

In order to respect time-to-grant, the proposals were evaluated as they are (not on the basis of their potential, if changes were made).

4.5 Evaluation procedure: Individual evaluation, consensus group and panel review

Individual evaluation

Each proposal was evaluated against the award criteria, independently by at least 5 evaluators.

The evaluators prepared, for each proposal, an individual evaluation report (IER), with comments and scores for each criterion (directly on-line in the Funding & Tenders Portal Electronic Evaluation System).

Consensus group

The individual evaluators then formed, for each proposal, a consensus group, in order to reach a common view and agree on comments and scores (consensus report).

Panel review

Finally, the evaluation committee/panel examined and compared the consensus reports together, to check on the consistency of their scores and comments and — in case of equal scores — to agree on a priority order.

The above-threshold proposals (*i.e. proposals that passed both the individual and overall thresholds*) were then ranked in order of their overall score in the **panel ranked lists**.

4.6 Evaluation outcome

For the evaluation statistics, see Annex 5.

5. EU CALL RANKED LISTS AND LISTS OF BELOW-THRESHOLD PROPOSALS

5.1 EU call ranked lists and lists of below-threshold proposals

Based on the ranking by the evaluation committee/panel and the budgetary constraints, the responsible authorising officer drew up the **EU call ranked lists** (see Annex 1) , with:

- a **main list** of proposals (to be invited to grant preparation)
- a **reserve list** of proposals (if any) and
- the **list** of proposals that cannot be funded because **below available budget**.

A second list contains the proposals that failed one (or more) of the thresholds (**below-threshold proposals**) (see Annex 2).

Annex 6 shows a track-list for all evaluated proposals submitted for the call.



Please note that these lists are provisional and may still change during grant preparation.

6. THEMATIC COVERAGE OF PROPOSALS (OPTIONAL)

6.1 Area coverage

The proposals submitted under this topic are expected to contribute to increased international cooperation among researchers and funders, catalyse research synergies, and leverage resources and investments in order to achieve the strengthening of the Regional Networks of Excellence and Epidemic Preparedness Consortia, as outlined in the call's description.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CALLS (OPTIONAL)

The group of experts agreed that there is need to be more information, guidance, education on how to create lump budgets as the budget seem to poorly written in many of the assessed proposals, leading to low scores for quality and efficiency of implementation.

8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND STATISTICS FOR THE CALL

For other statistical information (details on activity type of participants, SME participation, country participation and share of requested EU contribution in evaluated and retained for funding), see Annex 7.

Michael MAKANGA

Authorising Officer

ANNEXES

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 1	EU call ranked lists
Annex 2	Lists of below-threshold proposals
Annex 3	List of inadmissible proposals
Annex 4	List of ineligible proposals
Annex 5	Evaluation statistics: number of proposals, number of participants and EU requested contribution in evaluated, retained for funding and reserve list proposals
Annex 6	Track-list of evaluated proposals
Annex 7	Statistical information on the call and the external experts used
Annex 8	ESRs (will be provided upon finalisation)
Annex 9	Observer reports (to be provided after finalisation)
Annex 10	Report on SEP actions on behalf of experts — INTERNAL
Annex 11	Report on conflict of interests — INTERNAL
Annex 12	List of evaluators — INTERNAL