



SENSITIVE

PANEL REPORT

CALL	
Call:	HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-two-stage
Topic(s):	HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-NTD-03
Type(s) of action:	RIA
Service:	GH EDCTP3 JU
Call deadline:	3 September 2025 (stage 2)
Submission model:	stage 2
Evaluation model:	single
Panel:	HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-NTD-03-two-stage
Date of the panel meeting	16/10/2025
Evaluators:	[REDACTED]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND AND SCOPE	2
2. PANEL REVIEW	2
2.1 Analysis of consensus results — Evaluation summary reports (ESR)	2
2.2 Panel ranked list — Priority order	3

2.3 Evaluation outcome	3
3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
ANNEXES.....	5

1. BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

This report describes the results of the **panel review** done by the evaluation committee/panel for the evaluation of the following topic

Topic: HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-NTD-03
Call: HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-two-stage
Published: 30.01.2025
Deadline: 20.03.2025 (stage 1); 03.09.2025 (stage 2)
Budget:
 Total call budget: EUR 122.700.000
 Budget for the topic: EUR 45.900.000.

This call covers the following topics/types of action:

Topic code	Topic name	Types of action
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-TB-01	Global collaboration action for the development of vaccines for reducing the disease burden of Tuberculosis in sub-Saharan Africa	Research and Innovation Actions
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-MALARIA-02	Global collaboration action for research on existing Malaria therapeutics and clinical development of new antimalarial candidates	Research and Innovation Actions
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-NTD-03	Accelerating the development of prophylactic vaccines against Neglected Tropical Diseases (NTDs) in sub-Saharan Africa	Research and Innovation Actions

The evaluation was made in accordance with the applicable legal framework and guidance.

2. PANEL REVIEW

The evaluation committee/panel examined and compared the consensus reports (CRs) of the proposals and checked consistency of the comments and the scores against the award criteria set out in the call conditions (**evaluation**).

The committee also examined the answers to the **additional questions** asked (if any; exceptional funding).

The committee/panel made — for each proposal — an **evaluation summary report (ESR)** (see Annex 3).

On the basis of the scores in the evaluation summary reports, the committee/panel then made a **panel ranked list** (see Annex 1) — also recommending (if necessary) a **priority order** for proposals with the same score (in accordance with the procedure set out in the call conditions).

2.1 Analysis of consensus results — Evaluation summary reports (ESR)

After analysis of the consensus results, the evaluation committee/panel considers the evaluation consistent. The scores and the comments on the award criteria in the **consensus reports** are **confirmed**.

Consolidated information on these questions is shown in Annex 4.

2.2 Panel ranked list — Priority order

On the basis of the scores retained in the evaluation summary reports (ESRs), the evaluation committee/panel made a **panel ranked list** for above-threshold proposals.

This ranking is based on the overall score (defined as the *unweighted* sum of the scores of the individual award criteria).

2.3 Evaluation outcome

Table A: Number of evaluated proposals and evaluation outcome (broken down by topic)

Topic code	Number of evaluated proposals	Number of below-threshold proposals		Number of above-threshold proposals	
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-TB-01	6	1	17%	5	83%
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-MALARIA-02	9	4	44%	5	66%
HORIZON-JU-GH-EDCTP3-2025-01-NTD-03	12	9	75%	3	25%
Total	27	14	52%	13	48%

For the panel ranked list, along with a final score and the evaluation committee/panel recommendations for priority order, see Annex 1.

For the list of below-threshold proposals, see Annex 2.

For the evaluation summary reports (ESRs), see Annex 3.

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Comments on panel ranking outcome: Six proposals (**TOVax**, **CHIDENVAC**, **AIDA**, **RIVAC**, **SAVE**, and **huNEOLEISH**) included preclinical studies, such as safety and toxicology testing in animals, which fell outside the scope of the Global Health EDCTP3 topic call. The Programme Officer clarified that only preclinical activities essential for the preparation of clinical studies (e.g., CMC, protocol development, etc.) were considered within scope. These six proposals passed from stage 1 to stage 2 evaluation because on stage 1 evaluation only a short proposal was evaluated, without including preclinical activities in details or implementation.

After an extensive discussion on the scoring, the evaluators agreed to classify this as a “weakness” rendering these proposals not fundable.

During the evaluation phase, evaluators were advised to apply a score reflecting either a “weakness” (2–2.5) or a “shortcoming” (3–4.5), depending on the significance and criticality of the out-of-scope components. For all six proposals mentioned above, the evaluators reached a consensus to classify the preclinical activities as a “weakness,” noting that these activities were

essential prerequisites for initiating clinical trials (Phase I and beyond), and therefore concluded that the proposals were not yet sufficiently mature for Phase I readiness.

At the beginning of the panel ranking session, the Programme Officer invited evaluators to reconsider their scoring of the **Excellence** criterion and to potentially revise the assessment of the preclinical components from a “weakness” to a “shortcoming.” Following an in-depth discussion, the evaluators decided to uphold their initial judgment for five proposals (TOVax, CHIDENVAC, AIDA, RIVAC, and SAVE), maintaining the “weakness” rating under the Excellence criterion. For **huNEOLEISH**, however, the Excellence score was revised upward from 2.5 to 3.5, reclassifying the issue as a “shortcoming.” Despite this adjustment, all six proposals remained below the funding threshold and could not be included on the reserve list for potential future funding.

The evaluation committee/panel has the following comments and observations: The evaluators nevertheless acknowledged that the six proposals involving preclinical activities were scientifically robust in terms of methodology, conceptual framework, interdisciplinary design, and overall scientific excellence—despite the recognition that the preclinical components fell outside the scope of the Global Health EDCTP3 topic.

For future calls, the evaluation committee/panel would recommend the following: Greater investment in preclinical activities, including animal testing, could be considered by Global Health EDCTP3 JU. Increasing support in these areas would help overcome preclinical barriers faced by innovative projects, particularly those led by academic and medical organisations, and would contribute to expanding the range of available treatments for a broader portfolio of neglected tropical diseases.

Panel Chair

Silvia Garcia

Call Coordinator

Erika Gaspari

ANNEXES

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 1	Panel ranked list
Annex 2	List of below-threshold proposals
Annex 3	Evaluation summary reports (ESRs)
Annex 4	Consolidated information on the additional questions: Not applicable
	Annex 4a List of proposals involving exceptional funding
	Annex 4b List of proposals involving hESC: Not applicable
Annex 5	Panel hearing minutes: Not applicable
Annex 7	Report on SEP actions on behalf of experts: Not applicable
Annex 8	Report on conflict of interests

PANEL RANKED LIST

Rank	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Final Score	Evaluation Status	Number of Participants	Proposal Budget	Proposal Duration	Requested Grant Amount	Expert Recommended Grant Cumulative
1	101249063-2	ACT-CHIK	15	Above Threshold	8	15,299,931.75 €	48	15,299,931.75 €	15,299,931.75 €
2	101249075-2	EAVI	14.5	Above Threshold	8	13,695,935.00 €	60	13,695,935.00 €	28,995,866.75 €
3	101249135-2	DENSTAR	14.5	Above Threshold	10	11,091,138.75 €	48	11,091,138.75 €	40,087,005.50 €
4	101249052-2	huNEOLEISH	13	Below Threshold	13	14,923,995.00 €	60	14,923,995.00 €	55,011,000.50 €
5	101248980-2	TOVax	12.5	Below Threshold	13	14,674,718.00 €	60	14,674,718.00 €	69,685,718.50 €
6	101249033-2	VASA3	12	Below Threshold	9	14,999,760.00 €	60	14,999,760.00 €	84,685,478.50 €
7	101248994-2	RIVAC	12	Below Threshold	7	15,283,079.50 €	60	15,283,079.50 €	99,968,558.00 €
8	101249102-2	SAVE	12	Below Threshold	6	13,700,392.50 €	60	13,590,392.50 €	113,558,950.50 €
9	101248925-2	CHIDENVAC	12	Below Threshold	6	15,753,169.25 €	60	15,753,169.25 €	129,312,119.75 €
10	101248929-2	AIDA	12	Below Threshold	8	15,299,036.25 €	60	15,299,036.25 €	144,611,156.00 €
11	101248979-2	RepLeisH	11.5	Below Threshold	10	15,354,932.75 €	60	15,354,931.50 €	159,966,087.50 €
12	101248806-2	PROPHVAC-CL	11	Below Threshold	7	14,110,711.75 €	42	14,110,711.75 €	174,076,799.25 €

LIST OF BELOW-THRESHOLD PROPOSALS

Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Proposal Title	Reason	Requested Grant	ESR Score
101248979-2	RepLeisH	Development of a replicon RNA vaccine to prevent cutaneous leishmaniasis	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	15,354,932 €	11.5
101248806-2	PROPHVAC-CL	Advancing the clinical evaluation of a prophylactic vaccine for cutaneous leishmaniasis in sub-Saharan Africa	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	14,110,712 €	11
101249102-2	SAVE	Accelerating the development of a vaccine for sustainable trachoma elimination: A Sustainable Approach to Vaccine-based Elimination of Trachoma (SAVE)	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	13,590,393 €	12
101248994-2	RIVAC	Rabies: Innovative Vaccines for Africa Consortium	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	15,283,080 €	12
101248929-2	AIDA	Advancing Access to Innovations for Dengue Eradication in Africa	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	15,299,036 €	12
101248980-2	TOVax	The Onchocerciasis Vaccine for Africa	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	14,674,718 €	12.5
101249052-2	huNEOLEISH	ACCELERATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPHYLACTIC VACCINE FOR VISCERAL LEISHMANIASIS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	14,923,995 €	13
101248925-2	CHIDENVAC	Advancing mRNA-Based Chikungunya and Dengue Vaccines for Sub-Saharan Africa: A Multi Arm Clinical and Capacity-Building Initiative.	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 1	15,753,169 €	12
101249033-2	VASA3	Vaccine Against Schistosomiasis for Africa – A multi-center Phase 3 clinical study of the SchistoShield® anti-schistosomiasis vaccine in endemic areas of sub-Saharan Africa	Proposal failed to pass the threshold of criterion 3	14,999,760 €	12

LIST OF EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESRs)¹

The evaluation summary reports for the following proposals are attached:

Project number	Project acronym
101249063-2	ACT-CHIK
101249075-2	EAVI
101249135-2	DENSTAR
101249052-2	huNEOLEISH
101248980-2	TOVAX
101249033-2	VASA3
101248994-2	RIVAC
101249102-2	SAVE
101248925-2	CHIDENVAC
101248929-2	AIDA
101248979-2	RepLeisH
101248806-2	PROPHVAC-CL

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Exceptional Funding

Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Participant(s) that should exceptionally be funded	Participant(s) that should NOT be funded
101249033-2	VASA3	<p>- IVI is study sponsor (S. Korea): This is an international organization. (usually not able to receive funding) Yet, their participation is essential due to sponsor role, unique expertise and established infrastructure.</p> <p>IVI is an international organization based in South Korea. It leads 2 (WP 1 and 5) out of the 6 WPs. Considering its role as the sponsor of the Phase 3 clinical trial, its unique expertise and infrastructure, exceptional funding is recommended for IVI because of its critical involvement in the delivery of VASA3.</p> <p>TTUHSC is a university based in the United States. The SchistoShield® was developed at the TTUHSC. They are the sole partner for delivering WP 2 and will contribute to WP 3. Exceptional funding is recommended.</p> <p>University of Antananarivo/Malagasy Institute of Vaccine Research (UoA/MIVR), based in Madagascar, which is not yet a member of the EDCTP Association, hence not eligible for funding. However, it is recommended for exceptional funding based on its experience in clinical trials for schistosomiasis and its role as one of the clinical trial sites on this project. Also, UoA/MIVR is leading WP 4 and is involved in WP 1 and 5 of this project.</p>	
101249052-2	huNEOLEISH	Tasks 4.1 and 4.2 which will be done in Turkey should be considered for funding due to the contribution to the global knowledge on epidemiology.	
101249063-2	ACT-CHIK	<p>IVI is an international organization based in South Korea. It leads to WP 2 on Clinical Trial Sponsor, Capacity Building, and Training. Considering its central role as the sponsor of the Phase III clinical trial, and its role in capacity building, and training for the clinical trials, its unique experience for the delivery of this project, exceptional funding is recommended.</p> <p>Bio-Manguinhos (Bio-M) is a vaccine manufacturing company based in Brazil. It is a member of the Pasteur Network and has extensive experience in vaccine production and technology transfers. Bio-M is currently working on pre-qualification for a new measles and rubella (MR) vaccine developed in-house with support from the Gates Foundation for the African market. Bio-M plays an important role in ACT-CHIK, as it will provide the clinical trial materials needed for the Phase Ib/III study, as part of WP 4. Therefore, exceptional funding is recommended.</p>	
101249102-2	SAVE	<p style="text-align: center;">Exceptional Funding</p> <p>University of Northern Carolina, based in the USA, has world-leading knowledge of Chlamydia trachomatis pathogenesis and will lead WP6 on safety and immunogenicity studies in mice with CPAF...</p> <p>Vaxcyte Inc., based in the USA is a clinical-stage vaccine innovation company based in San Carlos, California. It developed the CPAF and will lead WP7 to develop the adjuvant CPAF vaccine to be used in this clinical trial.</p>	
101249135-2	DENSTAR	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, US: Specific expertise and infrastructure to handle DEN4 human infection models needed to conduct a dengue virus serotype 4 (DEN4) efficacy study using controlled human infection model (CHIM)	

		<p>study. The partner is critical to the delivery of the project. It is recommended for funding.</p> <p>INTERNATIONAL VACCINE INSTITUTE (IVI), SOUTH KOREA: IVI is an international organisation based in South Korea. It has expertise in establishing large-scale, multi-country clinical trials and disease surveillance programs in Africa. In this project, IVI will be involved in clinical trials implementation monitoring and oversight, capacity building and networking. It will lead Task 1.2, 1.3, and be involved in Tasks 1.1, 5.1, 5.3. It is recommended for funding.</p>	
--	--	--	--