9 October 2023

BP2023 Hearings – cut off 3

Guidelines for applicants

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of the Hearings is to make a final decision regarding the selection of your proposal to be included in the 2023 Business Plan. The Hearings provide you and your team an opportunity to present your proposal to the Evaluation Board and to receive valuable feedback on your project. Each hearing will be evaluated based on the flagship areas highlighted in the call document: New models to deliver Healthcare, Facilitating the uptake of Digital Medical Devices & Diagnostics, Harnessing the full potential of health data for Innovation. The jury will have access to the full proposal and all information submitted on the platform by each team before the Hearings.

In this document, you will find all the information you need about logistics for the Hearings including the Hearings evaluation panels, presentation requirements and evaluation criteria.

2 USEFUL INFORMATION

Dates: 25-26 October 2023

Location: Hybrid Zoom session. A panel of 3 experts will meet face-to-face/online at EIT Health's Central Office (Munich, Germany). Applicant teams will present online to the experts.

Participants:

On EIT Health side (7-8 people, max):

- A Pillar Director/Head will chair the session;
- The panel of 3 independent experts will evaluate the proposals;
- 1 EIT Health pillar lead will join as rapporteur;
- 2-3 staff members may join as observers for learning purposes;
- 1 Collaboration Lead from EIT Health may join as an observer.

On the Team side (4 people max, online via Zoom):

- The Activity Leader presence is mandatory;
- 3 relevant consortium members, max (from minimum 2 entities);

Note: no professional presenter should be present unless this representative will participate actively in the project.

Session structure:

The hearing session will have a duration of 65 minutes + 25 minutes of experts' discussion and scoring (applicant team will be asked to leave) and will follow the structure described below. The session will be recorded for audit purposes only and stored for 3 months.

Time	Content	Recorded
5 min	Introduction	Yes
20 min	Presentation	
40 min	Q&A	
Closed session: Proposal presenters leave the call		
25 min	Discussion & Scoring	No

- The chair will launch a quick *tour de table* where all attendants will briefly introduce themselves (5');
- The chair will then give the floor to the presenter to pitch the proposal (20');
- After 20 minutes, presenter will be asked to conclude the presentation and reviewers will start the Q&A session (40');
- The applicants will be invited to leave the call by the chair just after the Q&A session. Applicants will be automatically disconnected by the rapporteur if they do not leave the call right after the Q&A session.

Session etiquette:

- Please, connect 10 min before and wait in the lobby until you are invited to enter;
- Make sure your name and your institution are visible when connecting to the video call;
- Please mute yourself when you are not speaking;
- If you disconnect during the presentation, please join the meeting again using the same dial-in/link sent by EIT Health. If you still face a problem, reach out to flagships@eithealth.eu
- Please respect the rules of participation as well as your role and responsibilities.

Results notification: Results will be notified by e-mail on 16 November 2023.

3 EVALUATION PANELS

Will have four evaluation panels: three for Innovation projects and one for Education projects.

EHDS Panel (Innovation)



Julian Isla is a software engineer by training and works as a Resource Manager for the Artificial Intelligence group at Microsoft. He is also the co-founder of Foundation 29, a non-profit organization focused on how artificial intelligence can empower people to make decisions about their own health, based on the evidence provided by data and supported by decision support systems. Julian is the father of Sergio, a fourteen-year-old boy who has Dravet Syndrome. He founded the Dravet Syndrome Foundation in Spain and the European Dravet Syndrome Federation, where he holds the position of Regulatory Advisor. Julian is also part of the Therapeutic Advisory Group for Eurordis, the largest organization of rare diseases in Europe. In Spain, he is a member of Ciberer (the Spanish Network for research on rare diseases) scientific advisory group, a member of the advisory board of several hospitals research institutions, and a member of the board of three foundations working on healthcare.
LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/julianig/



Alessio Piuma is Investment Manager at Panakès Partners, life sciences-focused VC fund which joined since its inception in 2015. Besides handling deal sourcing, due diligence and negotiations, Alessio is also an observer at the Board of Directors on some of the fund's portfolio companies. Before Panakès, he has worked within the regulatory at ADemori S.p.A., leading italian IVD distributor and was a Researcher on stem cells at IRCCS Instituto Mario Negri. Alessio holds an MSc in Biomedical Engineering from Politecnico di Milano.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/alessiopiuma/



Indra Joshi Hughes has a unique portfolio with experience stretching across data/AI strategy and implementation. She is currently working across the global health and research portfolio of Palantir Technologies to enable better use of data to impact health and care. A world-leading expert in digital health and AI technologies, she created the NHS AI Lab a £250m investment leading to the development and deployment of over 100 AI technologies into UK health and care, whilst determining the right ethical guidance and regulations to protect patients. She is a Founding Member of One HealthTech – a network which campaigns for the need for and importance of better inclusion of all backgrounds, skillsets and disciplines in health technology. Alongside she is an associate editor for BMJ Leader, a former member of the WHO digital health expert group, a consultant on digital health, and most importantly a mum to two wonderful little munchkins.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/indra-joshi-87b74911a/

DMD Panel (Innovation)



John Collins is a tested leader in technology-driven businesses with 40 years of experience focused on accelerating the design, development, and commercialization of innovative technologies, products, and services. Experiences integrate a broad geographic and technology base across industries from clean energy/tech to consumer durables, with a career long focus on medical devices. A proven ability to form and lead high performance project and operational teams, create and manage strong intellectual property portfolios, as well as develop, structure, and drive collaborative business relationships with companies ranging from start-ups to premier multi-national organizations. Maintains a hands-on approach and an intimate working knowledge of technologies, operations, and user needs.He is a frequent speaker and holds over 20 US patents.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/john-collins-b38b306



Robert Harju-Jeanty is a healthcare industry expert, an international sales accelerator, and a business growth coach, with a track record of significant value creation. He has 30 years of experience in life sciences and the medical industry in leading positions. He is board member of a dozen companies and worked for EIT Health in various capacities. He has done business on all continents and lived and worked in five countries. He is a biochemist and economist by training.

LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/robert-harju-jeanty-3571851/



Victor Savevski is Chief Innovation Officer and AI Center Director at Humanitas. He is also Adjunct Professor at Humanitas University in Artificial Intelligence and Digital Health Systems in Medicine. As Chief Digital Officer in Humanitas, he has launched over 50 digital health products, health media platforms, websites, apps and digital therapeutics. C Now leading the Humanitas AI Center, focused on research and development on Clinical Applications based on Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning. Collaborations on numerous A.I projects developed with our team of data scientist, doctors and radiologists together with international institutions. Developing and scaling existing and patient facing digital health products. Victor is also a contributor for Wired and holds a Medical Engineering degree, a Master of Health Management from SDA Bocconi and a Digital Strategy from Harvard University.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/savevski/

NMDH Panel (Innovation)



Yves Verboven created in 2021 EU4HealthSolutions, an external consultancy - advisory services- to support the development and application of instruments to define, assess and guide the rewarding of the value of innovation and accelerate the accessibility of medical technology and life science innovative health solutions in healthcare. Yves Verboven is currently a Sr. Advisor to MedTech

Europe for strategic files as the implementation of the regulation on Health Technology Assessment and advisory member of the EU taskforce for harmonized evaluation of digital medical devices and Artificial Intelligence. Yves has been holding over a period of 20 years multiple leaderships positions within industry in the field of first in human testing, clinical engineering, clinical outcomes and health economics outcomes and reimbursement in the field of cardiac rhythms and heart failure management and ophthalmology, these within Intermedics, Medtronic, Alcon (Novartis) and holds multiple patents and publication.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/yves-verboven-a766438/



Michele Van der Kemp In healthcare, days of business as usual are over. We are struggling with rising costs, high levels of clinician burnout, and lack of adequate quality metrics - or the effective use thereof- on both a national and international scale. This, despite the enormous energy and knowledge healthcare professionals invest on a daily basis. It is time for patient-centric & clinician-led strategies, business models and cooperative operation designs for our healthcare industry. Maximizing value for patients and the system at large should and could be the overarching goal. After more than a decade of experience in training clinician groups, and designing integrated practice units, based on the principles of Value Based Health Care and Clinical Leadership, the time is right for a system approach. Both within healthcare organizations, and in national & regional 'through-the-line' governing structures. I am poised and convinced to help clinicians lead and thrive in a more valuable and sustainable system. Whether it's building a disease specific center, network re-design, creating value-based quality measurements or research, clinical leadership training or help prioritize and structure your healthcare challenges, feel free to contact me and start sharing minds.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/vanderkemp/



Victor Savevski is Chief Innovation Officer and AI Center Director at Humanitas. He is also Adjunct Professor at Humanitas University in Artificial Intelligence and Digital Health Systems in Medicine. As Chief Digital Officer in Humanitas, he has launched over 50 digital health products, health media platforms, websites, apps and digital therapeutics. C Now leading the Humanitas AI Center, focused on research and development on Clinical Applications based on Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning. Collaborations on numerous A.I projects developed with our team of data scientist, doctors and radiologists together with international institutions. Developing and scaling existing and patient

facing digital health products. Victor is also a contributor for Wired and holds a Medical Engineering degree, a Master of Health Management from SDA Bocconi and a Digital Strategy from Harvard University.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/savevski/

DMD/EHDS/NMDH Panel (Education)



Dr. Maria Toro-Troconis is an EdTech Consultant and strategist working for different organisations of The United Nations: UNICEF Office of Innovation, UNICEF Europe and Central Asia, UNICEF Malawi, UNICEF Uzbekistan, UNESCO IESALC, UNDP Iraq and UNDP Azerbaijan. Maria was selected as one of the top international education influencers of 2021 (Edruptors) by ISC Research because of the impact she has had to affect change for educators in Education for Sustainable Development. She is the Founder and Director of the Association for Learning Design & Education for Sustainable Development (ALDESD) and the author of the CoDesignS ESD Learning Design Framework, which has been implemented in several universities globally. She has more than 20 years' experience working with several institutions across the UK, including 10 years as Senior Lecturer and Head of E-learning at the School of Medicine – Imperial College London. Maria has produced several publications, including a chapter on the role of Blended Learning in the delivery of World Health Education as part of a systematic review of eLearning for Health Sciences Education led by the World Health Organisation (WHO). Maria was presented with the Rector's Medal and the Award for Excellence in Supporting the Student Experience in 2014 at Imperial College London.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/dr-maria-toro-troconis-62624520/



Suzanne Murray is the CEO and Founder of AXDEV Group Inc (Canada headquarters); AXDEV EU Gmbh and AXDEV Global (United States) since 1997. Working internationally in the field of Education research/evaluation; Healthcare Performance and Quality Improvement and as a global speaker on these subjects. Published in peer-reviewed journals and over 100 presentations world-wide. Business awards in education research and businesswoman of the year. Board member of the Journal for European CME and the Global Alliance for Medical Education.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/suzanne-murray-b6117a8/



Dr. Homer Papadopoulos is an expert data scientist, research director in NCSR D and startup co-founder of Syndesis Ltd living and working in Athens. A natural polymath, with degrees in

Physics, Telecommunications, Management, Biotechnology design and a PhD in Information Systems Science he loves using his broad skillset to solve difficult problems. He has over 20 years of experience creating multidisciplinary research programs.

LinkedIN: https://www.linkedin.com/in/homer-papadopoulos-3146519/

4 EVALUATION CRITERIA

As stated in the BP 2023 Call document (page 40), the evaluation criteria for Hearings will be as follows:

Project Excellence and Strategic Fit	**20%**
Implementation	**40%**
Impact and Sustainability	**40%**

The reviewers will use specific scorecards to evaluate the proposals. Those scorecards are annexed to this document.

5 PRESENTATION

The duration of your presentation should not exceed **20 minutes**. Please prepare the number of slides accordingly with succinct and coherent information for the jury (20-25 slides are recommended).

The jury is not expecting to have all details on your project in the slides, but rather to see your team prepared to answer the questions during the Q&A session.

As a general recommendation, your presentation should build on the slide deck presented on the Pitching Days, if applicable, and should follow the main structure of the full proposal, including relevant information on Project Excellence and Strategic Fit, Implementation and Feasibility, and Impact and Sustainability.

Specific information required to be presented, depending on the activity type and flagship, are listed below.

For any doubt or question, please be in touch with your Support Programme Point of Contac

Co-funded by the European Union

Specific information requirements for Innovation activities

Harnessing the full potential of health data for Innovation

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	Including acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Unmet Need / Problem	What is the problem that you are trying to solve? To what extent this is important/urgent to improve/solve? How is this problem currently being dealt with? Why do current solutions do not (fully) solve it?
Solution overview & current status	Solution overview: what is your solution/service? How does it solve/address the need/problem (better/cheaper/faster/etc.)? What is innovative in your solution? How does it create value? Solution current status: what has been done and achieved so far? what is next? Include your solution current maturity level using the CIMIT Innovation Maturity Level (IML) framework
Competitor analysis	What are the currently available solutions and likely competitors? Provide a comparative table with key attributes/characteristics. What differentiates your solution from existing solutions (products or services)?
Clinical validation	What is the objective of the trial? What is/are the trial endpoint/s (that you want to validate)? What is the target patient population? What type of trial will be conducted (open label trial/double blind RCT/other)?
Registries/biobanks	Identify the registry/ies you are planning to use and provide information about the current *"access to data"* status.
Go-to-Market Plan / Regulatory	Market size: TAM, SAM, Target Market Market entry: Who will prescribe the solution? How are you going to acquire customers and distribute the solution? Show the roadmap and key milestones towards commercialization and reimbursement. Regulatory pathway: Is the product/service regulated? By what agency? Does it require certificates, quality assurance, etc.? How will these be achieved? What is the clinical impact considered in your reimbursement strategy?
Business Model	What is the Value Proposition for the key stakeholders (Economic buyers; Users)? What is the revenue model? Where will the revenue come from? What are your basic financial projections?
Team / Consortium	Presentation of Partners, names of individual team members from each institution, with dedication to the project for each person.
Budget per WP and per partners	Simplified GANTT chart with critical Milestones and participating partners. Simplified budget table per partners, per WP and per year, including co-funding.

New Models to deliver Healthcare

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	Including acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Unmet Need / Problem	What is the problem that you are trying to solve? How is this problem currently being dealt with? To what extent this is important/urgent to improve/solve?
Solution overview & current status	Solution overview: what is your solution/service? How does it solve/address the need/problem (better/cheaper/faster/etc.)? What is innovative in your solution? Solution current status: is your solution already on the market? Is it CE-marked? what is next?
Competitor analysis	What are the currently available solutions and likely competitors? Provide a comparative table with key attributes/characteristics. What differentiates your solution from existing solutions (products or services)?
Clinical validation	What is the objective of the trial? What is/are the trial endpoint/s to prove added value? What is the target patient population? What are you going to ask patients to report on? **Which PROMS/PREMS will you be measuring?** Have you started your ethical approval process yet?
Business Model	What is the value proposition for the key stakeholders (Economic buyers; Users/patients)? What clinical, social and/or cost- saving impact you need to achieve to secure reimbursement?
VBHC Contract	To what extent have you started conversations about VBHC contracts with the payors in both countries involved in the project? What are the initial VBHC contracting plans?
Go-to-Market Plan Sustainability & Scalability	Market size: TAM, SAM, Target Market Market entry: Who will prescribe the solution? How are you going to acquire customers and distribute the solution? Scalability beyond project: What are your plans for large-scale implementation towards the completion of the project and beyond? Show the roadmap and key milestones towards reimbursement in the various geographical regions targeted.
Team / Consortium	Presentation of consortium members, in particular the two couples *clinical partner + payer* in each of the country targeted.
Budget per WP and per partners	Simplified GANTT chart with critical Milestones and participating partners . Simplified budget table per partners, per WP and per year, including co-funding.

Facilitating the uptake of Digital Medical Devices & Diagnostics

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	Including, acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Unmet Need / Problem	What is the problem that you are trying to solve? How is this problem currently being solved? Why do current solutions not (fully) solve it?
Solution overview & current status	Solution overview: what is your solution? How does it solve/address the need/problem (better/cheaper/faster/etc.)? What is innovative in your solution? How does your solution create value? Solution current status: what has been done and achieved so far? what is next? Include your solution current maturity level using the CIMIT Innovation Maturity Level (IML) framework
Competitor analysis	What are the current and likely competitors? Provide a table with your key competitors, and their key attributes/characteristics. What differentiates your solution from existing solutions (products or services)?
Clinical validation	What is the objective of the trial? What is/are the trial endpoint/s (that you want to validate)? What is the target patient population? What type of trial will be conducted (open label trial/double blind RCT/other)?
Go-to-Market Plan / Regulatory	Market size: TAM, SAM, Target Market Market entry: Who will prescribe/recommend the solution? How are you going to acquire customers? How are you going to distribute the solution? Show the roadmap and key milestones of your overall plan for commercialization and reimbursement. Regulatory pathway: Is the product/service regulated? By what agency? Does it require certificates, quality assurance, etc.? How will these be achieved? What is the clinical impact considered in your reimbursement strategy?
Business Model	What is the Value Proposition for the key stakeholders (Economic buyers; Users)? What is the revenue model? Where will the revenue come from? What are your basic financial projections?
Team / Consortium	Presentation of Partners, names of individual team members from each institution, with dedication to the project for each person.
Budget per WP and per partners	Simplified GANTT chart with critical Milestones and participating partners. Simplified budget table per partners, per WP and per year, including co-funding.
KPI13: European impact	Estimated number of European patients/citizens benefitting from the solution developed or implemented in EIT Health activity.

Co-funded by the European Union

5.1 Specific information requirements for Education activities

Commented [VM1]: @Agnes Schram and @Céline Carrera , please confirm this information. Thank you

Commented [AS2R1]: Done.

Labelled Fellowship Programme – Flagship-related Modules

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	Including, acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit	• Description of the unmet educational need among the target audience including the process to identify the educational gap (in the target audience and educational offerings on the market); • Mention the learner pre-requirements (if any) as well as the profile and attributes (this is, skills, competencies and knowledge) of the participants at the end of the programme; • Description of the details on the necessity of EIT Health public funding and alignment with EIT Health's ambition and strategy; • Description of the innovativeness/uniqueness of the modules compared to similar programmes; • Show the link between the proposed modules and the challenges described in the specific flagship. Present the vision of the proposed modules; • ~~Shortly describe how the content, pedagogical approach and delivery of the modules address the educational need;~~
Impact and sustainability:	• Description of the expected short-term/mid-term/long-term learning outcomes explained in terms of the knowledge, skills, attitud or ethical lessons that can be learned; • Describe the correspondence between Educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes; • Description of the previous efficacy/deployment of the modules; • Description of the project's scalability on the European level in the future years, beyond the currently targeted KPIs. What is the plan (if any) to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
Implementation:	• Description of consortium composition with a clear definition of partners' roles and responsibilities, as well as the required expertise to drive the project forward; • Describe whether non-academic partners participated / collaborated / influenced on the original content; • Describe and confirm on the capacity of the consortium to develop the assessment for the expected KPIs (150 learners in 2023; 280, in 2024 and 300, in 2025); • Describe how the content, pedagogical approach and delivery of the module address educational needs; • Describe how the modules allow personalised learning pathways;

Commented [AS3]: I deleted this, because it's included in the Implementation part.

Co-funded by the European Union

Labelled Fellowship Programme – Innovation & Entrepreneurship & Leadership Modules

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	Including, acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit	• Description of the unmet educational need among the target audience including the process to identify the educational gap (in the target audience and educational offerings on the market); • Mention the learner pre-requirements (if any) as well as the profile and attributes (this is, skills, competencies and knowledge) of the participants at the end of the programme; • Description of the details on the necessity of EIT Health public funding and alignment with EIT Health's ambition and strategy; • Description of the innovativeness/uniqueness of the modules compared to similar programmes; • Present the vision of the proposed modules;
Impact and sustainability:	• Description of the expected short-term/mid-term/long-term learning outcomes explained in terms of the knowledge, skills, attitude, or ethical lessons that can be learned; • Describe the correspondence between Educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes; • Description of the previous efficacy/deployment of the modules, especially in terms of entrepreneurial attitude and to support present –and after-programme- start-up creation from learners; • Description of the project's scalability on the European level in the future years, beyond the currently targeted KPIs. What is the plan (if any) to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
Implementation:	• Description of consortium composition with a clear definition of partners' roles and responsibilities, as well as the required expertise to drive the project forward; • Describe whether non-academic partners participated / collaborated / influenced on the original content; • Describe how the content, pedagogical approach and delivery of the module address educational needs; • Describe how the modules allow personalised learning pathways;

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt
Formatted: Space After: 0 pt
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt, English (United States)
Formatted: Centered, Space After: 0 pt
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt
Formatted: Centered, Space After: 0 pt
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt
Formatted: Centered, Space After: 0 pt
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted ...
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt
Formatted: Centered, Space After: 0 pt
Formatted ...

Training module for professionals

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	• Including, acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit	• Description of the unmet educational need among the target audience including the process to identify the educational gap (in the target audience and educational offerings on the market); • Mention the learner pre-requirements (if any) as well as the intended learning outcomes (in terms of knowledge, skills and attitude); • Describe the details on the necessity of EIT Health public funding and alignment with EIT Health's ambition and strategy; • Describe the data sources for the programme content development; • Shortly describe the pedagogical approach and format of the programme and how it facilitates the achievement of the learning outcomes (demonstrate your knowledge of instructional design); • Specific added value and Innovativeness/uniqueness of the proposed programme compared to existing programmes: who are your competitors and why this programme better solves the identified educational need?

Impact and sustainability:	• Describe the evaluation methodology for the achievement of the learning outcomes:
	  • Plan and format of your post-activity test (MCQ)
	  • Long-term impact evaluation
	
	• Describe how the consortium will ensure the content remains current for the duration of the activity (3 years), so the programme is sustainable.

Implementation:	• Description of consortium composition with a clear definition of partners' roles and responsibilities, as well as the required expertise to drive the project forward; • Provide an overview of the workplan; • Shortly (visually preferable) describe a timeline of the programme and the time commitment from the participants. • Please indicate which partner(s) will be in charge of submitting the application for Continuing Professional Development accreditation

Training module for citizens and patients

TOPIC	QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED
Cover	• Including, acronym, name of the project, budget requested, list of partners (logos OK, but write them also in full text)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit	• Description of the unmet educational need among the target audience including the process to identify the educational gap (in the target audience and educational offerings on the market); • Mention the learner pre-requirements (if any) as well as the intended learning outcomes (in terms of knowledge, skills and attitude); • Describe the details on the necessity of EIT Health public funding and alignment with EIT Health's ambition and strategy; • Describe the data sources for the programme content development; • Shortly describe the pedagogical approach and format of the programme and how it facilitates the achievement of the learning outcomes (demonstrate your knowledge of instructional design); • Specific added value and Innovativeness/uniqueness of the proposed programme compared to existing programmes: who are your competitors and why this programme better solve the identified educational need?

Impact and sustainability:	• Describe the evaluation methodology for the achievement of the learning outcomes:
	  • Plan and format of your post-activity test (MCQ)
	  • Long-term impact evaluation
	• Describe how the consortium will ensure the content remains current for the duration of the activity (3 years), so the programme is sustainable.

Implementation:	• Description of consortium composition with a clear definition of partners' roles and responsibilities, as well as the required expertise to drive the project forward; • Provide an overview of the workplan; • Shortly (visually preferable) describe a timeline of the programme and the time commitment from the participants. • Please indicate how you take into account the context and environment of the targeted learners, potential cultural differences and issues in participating in education activities?

6 Annexes

Annex 1. EHDS Innovation Project Proposal scorecard

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring** 0-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent is the proposed solution addressing a clearly defined unmet clinical need relevant at European level, considering problem severity and people impacted)?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships, Knowledge Triangle (Innovation-Business-Education))?
	Description of the solution	To what extent is there evidence that the suggested approach is unique/novel or better than the existing ones (e.g. 30% faster; 25% cheaper; 5x more accurate…) and has there been previous developments accomplished so far?
	Use of Health Registries and Biobanks	To what extent is the identified biobank or health registry data that the project suggests to use relevant to the clinical validation proposed and in line with EHDS ambitions for secondary use of health data?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Solution Maturity	How would you evaluate the maturity of the proposed solution and how likely the solution can reach the maturity level as foreseen by the consortium? (Please refer to the GAITS framework)
	Work Plan and Feasibility	To what extent is the work plan aligned with the aim to aim to be able to scale the solution/service into the market (or an additional one) 1 year after the end of the EIT Health funding period and the risk mitigation plan well described and feasible? (Please consider Work Packages, OUT/DEL/MSs)
	Budget plan and investments	Is the budget appropriately built (right costs distribution over the activities, right partners distribution and balance, sound investments in terms of co-funding)?
	Team	Do all partners have clear and irreplaceable roles in driving the project and show commitment? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects; Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel; Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Impact (social, economic, health)	Is the impact generated by the proposed solution clearly described and have adequate KPIs been identified with realistic and achievable target values?
	Contribution to Healthcare Systems and societal impact	Does the project identify clear metrics to evaluate societal impact and contribution to the healthcare system? Please consider: Citizen and Patient engagement, Communication, Knowledge dissemination etc.
	Patient Outcomes	To what extent does the proposed solution deliver outcomes that matter to patients?
	Sustainability beyond project	How would you rate the description on how will the project become sustainable beyond EIT Health funding? Please consider: business model elements like identified stakeholders (targeted user, payer, beneficiary etc.), defined revenue streams and other business plan elements such as product launch or market access with a feasible timeline.

Annex 2. DMD Innovation Project Proposal scorecard

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring** 0-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent is the proposed solution addressing a clearly defined unmet clinical need relevant at European level, considering problem severity and people impacted)?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships, Knowledge Triangle (Innovation-Business-Education))?
	Description of the solution	To what extent is there evidence that the patient centric DMD approach is unique/novel or better than the existing ones (e.g. 30% faster; 25% cheaper; 5x more accurate…)?
	Certification and reimbursement pathway	To what extent is the identified certification and reimbursement pathway suggested by the project relevant to the target markets for the adoption of Digital Medical Devices (patient centered DMDs)?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Solution Maturity	How would you evaluate the maturity of the proposed solution and how likely the solution can reach the maturity level as foreseen by the consortium? (Please refer to the GAITS framework)
	Work Plan and Feasibility	To what extent is the work plan aligned with the aim to aim to be able to scale the solution/service into the market (or an additional one) 1 year after the end of the EIT Health funding period and the risk mitigation plan well described and feasible? (Please consider Work Packages, OUT/DEL/MSs)
	Budget plan and investments	Is the budget appropriately built (right costs distribution over the activities, right partners distribution and balance, sound investments in terms of co-funding)?
	Team	Do all partners have clear and irreplaceable roles in driving the project and show commitment? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects; Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel; Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Impact (social, economic, health)	Is the impact generated by the proposed solution clearly described and have adequate KPIs been identified with realistic and achievable target values?
	Contribution to Healthcare Systems and societal impact	Does the project identify clear metrics to evaluate societal impact and contribution to the healthcare system? Please consider: Citizen and Patient engagement, Communication, Knowledge dissemination etc.
	Patient Centricity	How well does the project reflect a patient centered approach and result in a direct patient benefit when the proposed solution is used?
	Sustainability beyond project	How would you rate the description on how will the project become sustainable beyond EIT Health funding? Please consider: business model elements like identified stakeholders (targeted user, payer, beneficiary etc.), defined revenue streams and other business plan elements such as product launch or market access with a feasible timeline.

Annex 3. NMDH Innovation Project Proposal scorecard

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring** 0-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Health condition's unmet need	To what extent is the proposed solution addressing a clearly defined unmet clinical need relevant at European level (considering problem severity and people impacted), and takes a holistic perspective into account considering the whole healthcare pathway?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships, Knowledge Triangle (Innovation-Business-Education))?
	Description of the solution	To what extent is there evidence that the suggested approach is unique/novel or better than the existing ones (e.g. 30% faster; 25% cheaper; 5x more accurate…)?
	Outcomes measures	To what extent are the identified metrics (process, clinical and PROMS/PREMS) that the project suggests to measure relevant to the identified target group (patients or citizens)?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Implementation readiness - Scorecard and data platform	To what extent has a systematic way of capturing data been developed? Is there a scorecard defining processes, costs and outcome indicators while applying case-mix adjustment? Is the data platform allowing interface interactions, data analytics and access to data to different stakeholders?
	Work Plan & Feasibility	To what extent is the work plan and risk mitigation plan well described and feasible within the proposed timeline? To what extent is there evidence that this project will be able to scale the solution/service into the market (or an additional one) 1 year after the end of the EIT Health funding period?
	Budget plan and investments	How well is the budget appropriately built (right costs distribution over the activities, right partners distribution and balance, sound investments in terms of co-funding)?
	Team	Do all partners have clear and irreplaceable roles in driving the project and showing commitment? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity or previous experience in similar projects; Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel; Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Impact (social, economic, health)	How well described is the impact generated by the proposed changes (scope of the project) and how realistic and achievable are the KPIs identified and its target values?
	Contribution to Healthcare Systems and societal impact	How well does the project identify clear metrics to evaluate the societal impact and contribution to and involvement of the different stakeholders in the healthcare system? Please consider: Citizen and patient involvement and engagement plans; Communication, Knowledge and dissemination plans; and Ethical, Legal & Social issues, etc.
	Benchmarking	How realistically is the team's proposal aiming at providing transparent outcome's comparisons across providers?
	Sustainability and Replicability beyond project	How would you rate the potential for sustainability of the proposed approach in the form of a VBHC contract and its replicability, meaning that it should be possible to sustain and implement the project in multiple healthcare settings based on the results of the project?

Annex 4. Labelled Fellowship Programme Flagship-related Modules Project Proposal scorecard

Commented [VM4]: @Agnes Schram and @Céline Carrera, please confirm this information. Thank you

Commented [AS5R4]: Done

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring 0**-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent are the proposed modules addressing a clearly defined unmet educational need relevant at European level?
	Unmet needs	Are the skills, knowledge and competence gaps it aims to solve clearly described?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships)?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and value proposition	How innovative/unique is the proposed programme compared to existing programmes and/or compared to the current state of the art?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and pedagogical approach	To what extent do the content, pedagogical approach and delivery of the programme address the educational needs?
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Educational design leading to demonstrable outcomes	To what extent is the impact generated by the proposed programme clearly described with realistic and achievable target values (number of learners)?
	Definition of the learning outcomes.	Are the intended learning outcomes precisely defined in terms of short-term/medium and long-term outcomes and expressed in terms of skills, knowledge and attitude?
	Content design and the learning outcomes	To what extent is the programme adequate to achieve the learning outcomes? Is there a clear and direct correspondence between educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes?
	Programme structure and coherence	To what extend are the modules developed on previous efficacy/deployment?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	How would you rate the description of the project's scalability on the European level in the future years, beyond the currently targeted KPIs? Has the consortium the opportunity to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Team and expertise	To what extent the team has experts linked to the topic of the project? To what extent are the currently involved partners having clear and irreplaceable roles in driving the project forward and showing commitment? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
	Team and expertise	To what extent did non-academic partners participate / collaborate / influence the original content.
	Team and expertise	To what extent is the consortium capable of developing the assessment for the expected KPIs (150 learners in 2023; 280, in 2024 and 300, in 2025).
	Feasibility of the project	Is the proposal providing convincing elements of expertise in instructional design and validated experience running students' programmes/education?
	Feasibility of the project	To what extent do the modules allow personalised learning pathways?

Annex 5. Labelled Fellowship Programme Innovation & Entrepreneurship and Leadership Modules Project Proposal scorecard

Commented [AS6]: I added the scorecard for the I&E&L module, as this was not included in CO2, as we did not receive proposals for this module then.

Criteria	Question	Help Text Scoring 0-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent are the proposed modules addressing a clearly defined unmet educational need relevant at European level?
	Unmet needs	Are the skills, knowledge and competence gaps it aims to solve clearly described?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships)?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and value proposition	How innovative/unique is the proposed programme compared to existing programmes and/or compared to the current state of the art?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and pedagogical approach	To what extent do the content, pedagogical approach and delivery of the programme address the educational needs?
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Programme's structure and coherence	To what extent the format of delivery is well-structured, coherent? Will the proposed evaluation methodology correctly assess the achievement of the intended Learning Outcomes?
	Content design and the learning outcomes	To what extent is the programme adequate to achieve the learning outcomes? Is there a clear and direct correspondence between educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes?
	I&E skills	To what extent is the I&E content designed to prepare the learners with pitching and prototyping skills?
	Programme structure and coherence	To what extend are the modules developed on previous efficacy/deployment, especially in terms of entrepreneurial attitude and to support present –and after-programme- start-up creation from learners?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	How would you rate the description of the project's scalability on the European level in the future years, beyond the currently targeted KPIs? Has the consortium the opportunity to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Team and expertise	To what extent the team has experts linked to the topic of the project? To what extent are the currently involved partners having clear and irreplaceable roles in driving the project forward and showing commitment? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
	Team and expertise	To what extent did non-academic partners participate / collaborate / influence the original content.
	Feasibility of the project	Is the proposal providing convincing elements of expertise in instructional design and validated experience running students' programmes/education?
	Feasibility of the project	To what extent do the modules allow personalised learning pathways?

Annex 6. Training Module for Patients/Citizens Project Proposal scorecard

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring 0**-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent is the proposed programme addressing a clearly defined unmet educational need relevant at European level?
	Unmet needs	Is the unmet need relevant at a global level?
	Target audience	Has the team provided a good justification for their target audience definition? To what extent is the target audience precisely defined in terms of groups and subgroups and in terms of skills, knowledge and competence gaps? Have they included evidence (literature, surveys) to support the selection?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships)?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and value proposition	How innovative/unique is the proposed programme compared to existing programmes and/or compared to the current state of the art?
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Educational design leading to demonstrable outcomes	To what extent is the impact generated by the proposed programme clearly described with realistic and achievable target values (number of learners)?
	Definition of the learning outcomes.	Are the intended learning outcomes precisely defined in terms of short-term/medium and long-term outcomes and expressed in terms of skills, knowledge and attitude?
	Content design and the learning outcomes	To what extent is the programme adequate to achieve the learning outcomes? Is there a clear and direct correspondence between educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes?
	Programme's structure and coherence	To what extent the format of delivery is well-structured, coherent? Will the proposed evaluation methodology correctly assess the achievement of the intended Learning Outcomes?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	How would you rate the description of the project's sustainability beyond EIT Health funding? Has the consortium a good plan to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	To what extent have they planned which partner(s) will be able to attract potential learners over time and how? And who could pay for the learners to participate in the educational programme, including describe expectations for each target audience?
	Programme evaluation	Is the plan and format of the post-activity test, well described? Will it measure

		the long-term/longitudinal impact on the professional activities of the learners?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Team and expertise	To what extent are the partners having clear roles in driving the project forward and showing commitment? Is the proposal providing convincing elements of expertise in instructional design and understanding of the use of the EIT Health Academy Platform? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
	Feasibility of the project	Is the applicant showing a good understanding of the context and environment of their targeted learners, potential cultural differences and issues in participating in education activities?
	Citizens/Patients Involvement	To what extent are patients and citizens involved in the development and/or implementation of the programme (e.g. co-creation, membership of project consortium; clinical study, usability studies; dissemination activity).

Annex 7. Training Module for Professionals Project Proposal scorecard

Criteria	Question	Help Text **Scoring 0**-5 scoring (with 0.5 increments)
Project excellence and Strategic Fit (20%)	Unmet needs	To what extent is the proposed programme addressing a clearly defined unmet educational need relevant at European level?
	Unmet needs	Is the unmet need relevant at a global level?
	Target audience	Has the team provided a good justification for their target audience definition? To what extent is the target audience precisely defined in terms of groups and subgroups and in terms of skills, knowledge and competence gaps? Have they included evidence (literature, surveys) to support the selection?
	Strategic fit and ground for EIT Health involvement	To what extent has the project described the necessity of EIT Health public funding and is aligned with EIT Health's ambition and strategy (EIT Health goals, EIT Health Flagships)?
	Description of the content of the educational programme and value proposition	How innovative/unique is the proposed programme compared to existing programmes and/or compared to the current state of the art?
Impact and Sustainability (40%)	Educational design leading to demonstrable outcomes	To what extent is the impact generated by the proposed programme clearly described with realistic and achievable target values (number of learners)?
	Definition of the learning outcomes.	Are the intended learning outcomes precisely defined in terms of short-term/medium and long-term outcomes and expressed in terms of skills, knowledge and attitude?
	Content design and the learning outcomes	To what extent is the programme adequate to achieve the learning outcomes? Is there a clear and direct correspondence between educational design, content and chosen format, and the expected learning outcomes?
	Programme's structure and coherence	To what extent the format of delivery is well-structured, coherent? Will the proposed evaluation methodology correctly assess the achievement of the intended Learning Outcomes?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	How would you rate the description of the project's sustainability beyond EIT Health funding? Has the consortium a good plan to exploit the programme and scale it to the EU or more globally over the years?
	Sustainability and Scalability beyond project	To what extent have they planned which partner(s) will be able to attract potential learners over time and how? And who could pay for the learners to participate in the educational programme, including describe expectations for each target audience?

	Programme evaluation	Is the plan and format of the post-activity test, well described? Will it measure the long-term/longitudinal impact on the professional activities of the learners?
Implementation and Feasibility (40%)	Team and expertise	To what extent are the partners having clear roles in driving the project forward and showing commitment? Is the proposal providing convincing elements of expertise in instructional design and understanding of the use of the EIT Health Academy Platform? Please consider: Expertise: Synergies, complementarity, or previous experience in similar projects Responsibility: Meaningful role of assigned personnel Commitment: engagement plans within and after EIT Health funding
	Feasibility of the project	Is the applicant showing a good understanding of the context and working environment of their targeted learners, potential cultural differences and issues in participating in Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activities?
	Citizens/Patients Involvement	To what extent are patients and citizens involved in the development and/or implementation of the programme (e.g. co-creation, membership of project consortium; clinical study, usability studies; dissemination activity).