

First Global Call for Alzheimer's Cure-Focused Research

Executive Summary

The Rosa Maria Vivar Foundation launches this global call to fund one research project with a total budget of €160,000 and a maximum duration of 24 months, aimed at advancing a cure-focused pharmacological approach to Alzheimer's disease. The call is open to R&D&I activities primarily based in Spain, including the possibility of international cooperation, is incompatible with other funding allocated to the same project, requires that all application materials be submitted in English, and limits indirect costs to a maximum of 15% of the total requested budget.

This call is structured as a two-stage process consisting of a Letter of Intent (LOI) followed by a Full Proposal by invitation only.

Introduction

Alzheimer's disease represents one of the most pressing global health challenges of our time, with profound societal, economic, and human impact. Despite significant advances in understanding its pathology, there remains an urgent need to accelerate research that moves beyond description and towards effective disease-modifying and curative interventions.

The Rosa Maria Vivar Foundation is committed to playing an active role in this challenge by mobilizing scientific excellence, fostering collaboration, and supporting research that can meaningfully contribute to the path toward a cure.

This Global Call is designed to identify and fund high-quality research projects that combine scientific rigor, translational potential, and a clear therapeutic logic. The Foundation seeks proposals that are not only innovative, but also

actionable within a defined timeframe, with measurable outputs and a credible pathway toward impact.

By adopting a focused, agile, and internationally open approach, the Foundation aims to position itself as a relevant actor in the global Alzheimer’s research ecosystem, contributing to accelerating progress where it is most needed: at the interface between scientific discovery and therapeutic development.

Call Document

Index

Section	Title
A	Glossary
B	Call Parameters
C	Purpose, Scope, and Cure-Focused Fit
D	Eligibility
E	Timeline
F	Application Process
G	Administrative Review
H	Evaluation Governance and Reviewer Rules
I	Scoring System and Aggregation
J	Evaluation Criteria
K	Communications, Feedback, and Evaluation Reports
L	Award Decision, Alternates, and Right Not to Award
M	Grant Formalization and Pre-Award Requirements
N	Payment Schedule and Milestone Conditions
O	Implementation, Monitoring, Reporting, and Change Control
P	Ethics and Regulatory Requirements
Q	Privacy Notice
R	Intellectual Property, Data Sharing, and Exploitation
S	Eligible and Ineligible Costs
T	Integrity, Non-Discrimination, and Final Provisions
U	Annexes

A. Glossary

For the purposes of this Call:

Applicant means the individual or team submitting an LOI and/or Full Proposal.

Call means this competitive funding process.

Confidential Information means any non-public scientific, technical, commercial, strategic, ethical, legal, or personal information contained in an application or generated during review and award management.

Conflict of Interest (COI) means any situation that may compromise, or reasonably appear to compromise, impartial review or decision-making.

Data Management Plan (DMP) means the document describing how research data will be generated, handled, stored, protected, accessed, retained, and shared.

Evaluation Committee means the external experts appointed by the Foundation to evaluate applications.

Evaluation Report means the written report provided after Full Proposal evaluation, including scores and qualitative comments.

Full Proposal means the second-stage application submitted only by invited applicants.

Grant Agreement means the written agreement between the Foundation and the Host Institution governing the funded project.

Host Institution means the institution that submits the application as administrative beneficiary, signs the Grant Agreement, receives the funds, and assumes overall administrative and financial responsibility.

Letter of Intent (LOI) means the first-stage application used for pre-selection.

Milestone means a measurable scientific or operational deliverable used to assess progress and trigger payments.

Partner Institution means any institution participating in a consortium other than the Host Institution.



Principal Investigator (PI) means the lead scientist responsible for scientific direction and delivery of the project.

Selection Committee means the body designated by the Foundation to validate rankings and approve the final award decision.

B. Call Parameters

- Total budget available: €160.000
- Number of grants: One (1)
- Maximum project duration: 24 months
- Maximum indirect costs: 15% of the total requested budget
- Application language: English
- Territorial scope: Global, with the principal research activity based in Spain, including the possibility of international cooperation
- Funding modality: Activities funded under this Call may not receive concurrent funding from other public or private grants or subsidies intended for the same purpose or the same eligible costs. Co-funding of the funded projects shall not be permitted. Where the proposed work forms part of a broader research programme, applicants must demonstrate that the activities submitted under this Call constitute a distinct scientific project or subproject with clearly identifiable objectives, activities, milestones, deliverables, budget allocation, and expected results.

C. Purpose, Scope, and Cure-Focused Fit

The purpose of this Call is to fund a research project that advances a **cure-focused pharmacological strategy for Alzheimer's disease**. The Foundation seeks proposals that intervene in the **underlying mechanisms of the disease** and that can plausibly contribute to a pathway toward disease-modifying or potentially curative therapeutic development within the project timeframe.

Proposals must demonstrate, at a minimum:



- a clearly articulated disease mechanism or causal pathway relevant to Alzheimer's disease;
- a plausible route toward pharmacological intervention;
- a pre-clinical stage of development, with clinical-stage projects being excluded;
- measurable and realistic outputs within a 24-month timeframe.

Illustrative examples of projects that may fit within the scope include:

- target identification and validation with a defined therapeutic pathway;
- early therapeutic development involving small molecules, biologics, or other modalities supported by a robust preclinical rationale;
- drug repurposing approaches supported by a high level of evidence, strong mechanistic justification, and a clear validation strategy.

Illustrative examples of projects that are generally considered out of scope include:

- projects that are primarily descriptive and do not establish a credible cure-directed translational pathway;
- projects focused exclusively on symptomatic relief without a cure-oriented mechanistic rationale;
- projects lacking feasible milestones to achieve meaningful progress within 24 months;
- clinical-stage projects.

D. Eligibility

This Call is globally open to eligible Host Institutions with their own legal personality, duly incorporated in accordance with applicable legislation, and having their registered office or permanent establishment in Spain, carrying out R&D&I activities within the national territory. Such entities may apply individually or in cooperation through the establishment of, or participation in, international consortia with other foreign public or private entities within the framework of collaborative research projects, provided that, in all cases, a coordinating entity based in Spain is designated, including but not limited to:

- universities and academic research organizations;
- hospitals and research hospitals;
- public or private research institutes and centers;

- biotech startups and companies with demonstrated research and development capacity.

Applications may be submitted by:

- a single Host Institution; or
- a consortium of institutions, provided that one Host Institution is designated as the administrative beneficiary with its principal establishment in Spain.

The Host Institution must be able to:

- legally receive and administer the grant;
- sign the Grant Agreement;
- submit reports and supporting documentation;
- ensure project compliance with applicable ethical, legal, financial, and confidentiality obligations.

Applications may be deemed ineligible if they:

- fail to meet the cure-focused admissibility standard;
- exceed the budget, duration, or indirect cost limits;
- do not identify a valid PI and Host Institution;
- are incomplete after any permitted administrative correction period;
- fail to comply with the territorial requirement;
- involve unmanaged conflicts of interest or integrity issues;
- involve co-funding.

E. Timeline

Milestone	Indicative Timing
LOI submission opens	15 th June 2026
LOI submission deadline	30 th September
LOI administrative review	20 th October
LOI scientific review and ranking	20 th November
Invitation to Full Proposal	30 th November

Milestone	Indicative Timing
Full Proposal submission deadline	20 th January 2027
Full Proposal administrative review	5 th February
Full Proposal scientific review and ranking	5 th March
Final decision and alternates	15 th March
Pre-award due diligence	15 th April
Grant Agreement signature / project start	Approx. 30 th April

F. Application Process

Letter of Intent

All applicants must first submit a **Letter of Intent (LOI)**, together with the justification of eligibility, using the template provided in **Annex A**.

Full Proposal

Only applicants invited by the Foundation following the evaluation of the LOI may submit a **Full Proposal** using the template provided in **Annex B**.

The Foundation may, at its discretion, invite a number of applicants such that the total requested budget represented by the invited Full Proposals amounts to approximately **three times the available budget**, in order to maintain a competitive yet manageable second stage.

Submission Portal

Applications may be submitted through the website:

www.frosamariavivar.org/globalcall

G. Administrative Review

Administrative review is carried out at both stages to ensure that only complete and eligible applications proceed to scientific review.

The Foundation will verify, at a minimum:

- eligibility of the applicants;
- completion of all required online fields;
- correct use of the relevant template;
- readability and completeness of the uploaded files;
- compliance with budget, duration, and indirect cost limits;
- admissibility within the cure-focused scope;
- submission of the required declarations and disclosures.

As a general rule, **no substantive changes** may be made to an application after the submission deadline.

At the Foundation's discretion, applicants may be granted a **48–72 hour** administrative correction period solely to correct **non-material administrative defects**, such as a missing signature, a corrupted file, or a technical submission incident that can be evidenced. No scientific rewriting, expansion of scope, or substantive budgetary changes shall be permitted during this correction period.

Applicants will receive notification of:

- receipt of the application;
- the outcome of the administrative review;
- invitation or non-invitation to submit a Full Proposal;
- the final outcome at the Full Proposal stage.

H. Evaluation Governance and Reviewer Rules

Evaluation Bodies

The Call will be managed through the following bodies:



- **Call Secretariat:** responsible for administrative review, applicant communications, records, and process integrity.
- **Evaluation Committee:** external experts appointed by the Foundation to review and score applications.
- **Selection Committee:** the body designated by the Foundation to validate the ranking, confirm COI safeguards, and approve the final funding decision.

Evaluation Principles

The evaluation process shall be governed by the following principles:

- **Transparency:** criteria and procedures are published in advance; applicants are informed of outcomes.
- **Impartiality:** proposals are assessed on technical merit and scientific rigour, irrespective of origin or identity.
- **Confidentiality:** strict confidentiality is maintained regarding all application materials and deliberations.
- **Objectivity:** applications are assessed on the basis of the submitted information.
- **Consistency:** the same level of judgement is applied across applications.

Reviewer Rules

- review will be conducted **remotely** using an online system;
- each reviewer will have access **only to the applications assigned** to them;
- all reviewers and committee members must sign a **COI and confidentiality undertaking**;
- any reviewer or committee member with a COI must disclose it immediately and will be excluded from evaluation and decision-making for the affected application;
- the evaluation process is confidential. During the evaluation and decision-making process, the identity of reviewers shall remain confidential and shall not be disclosed to applicants or third parties;
- the names of reviewers assigned to individual proposals shall not be disclosed by the Foundation. Following completion of the Call, the Foundation may disclose the names of reviewers who have provided prior written consent for such disclosure through the applicable confidentiality and consent documentation.
- Any disclosure of reviewer identities shall be limited to acknowledging participation in the Call. Under no circumstances shall the Foundation

disclose reviewer assignments, applications reviewed, deliberations, scores, rankings, recommendations, comments, voting positions, or any information that could link a reviewer to a specific application or evaluation outcome.

- Reviewer disclosure preferences shall be recorded through the COI and Confidentiality Form.

I. Scoring System and Aggregation

A score from 1 to 10 will be awarded for each evaluation criterion.

Score	Descriptor
1	Poor
2	Marginal
3	Weak
4	Fair
5	Satisfactory
6	Good
7	Very Good
8	Excellent
9	Outstanding
10	Exceptional

Aggregation Rules

- each reviewer assigns a score from 1 to 10;
- the criterion score is the average of the scores awarded by the reviewers;
- each criterion score is then weighed according to the percentages set out below;
- the weighted criterion scores are summed to obtain a total score;
- total scores may be rounded to two decimal places for ranking purposes.

J. Evaluation Criteria

LOI Criteria

LOIs will be evaluated against the following criteria:

Criterion	Weight	Subcriteria
PI Track Record and Capacity	40%	ability to execute the project; relevant expertise; leadership and independence; capability to deliver
Scientific Excellence and Cure-Focused Fit	40%	novelty; scientific rigor; clarity of hypothesis and objectives; explicit cure-directed therapeutic logic
Impact Potential	20%	potential to advance a cure-focused pathway; likely relevance of expected results; significance to the field

Full Proposal Criteria

Full Proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

Criterion	Weight	Subcriteria
Team	20%	expertise, complementarity, staffing adequacy, and governance; added value of any consortium
Excellence	25%	novelty; quality of the research project; clarity of hypothesis and objectives; potential to generate relevant results; ambition balanced with realism
Implementation	25%	work plan structure; feasibility of timeline; infrastructure and resources; budget justification; identification of critical risks; quality of contingency plan; ethical issues appropriately addressed
Impact	30%	potential scientific and societal impact; quality of communication, dissemination, exploitation, and data-sharing plans; credibility and quantifiability of expected impact; clarity of intellectual property strategy where applicable

K. Communications, Feedback, and Evaluation Reports

All applicants in both the LOI and Full Proposal phases will be informed of the final outcome of their application.

The provision of detailed feedback will be managed as follows depending on the phase of the process:

- In the LOI phase: Due to the undetermined volume of applications that may be received, the Foundation will not provide detailed feedback, scores, or qualitative comments to applicants. The communication will be strictly limited to stating whether the proposal has been selected or rejected to move on to the next phase.
- In the Full Proposal phase: All applicants who reach this final phase will receive an evaluation report.

All decisions made by the Foundation in any phase of the process shall be final and binding.

L. Award Decision, Alternates, and Right Not to Award

The final award decision will be taken by the Foundation on the basis of:

- administrative eligibility and completeness;
- scientific evaluation and ranking;
- confirmation of COI safeguards;
- successful completion of pre-award due diligence.

If the selected applicant withdraws, declines the award, or fails to satisfy pre-award requirements within the required period, the Foundation may offer funding to the **next-ranked** application.

If proposals are not deemed to be of sufficient quality, scientific credibility, feasibility, or compliance readiness, the Foundation reserves the right **not to award** the grant.

M. Grant Formalization and Pre-Award Requirements

Funding shall be conditional upon the execution of a **Grant Agreement** between the Foundation and the Host Institution.

Prior to the signature of the Grant Agreement, the Host Institution must provide, at a minimum:

- evidence of the legal authority of its representative to sign the Agreement;
- documentation demonstrating that it is up to date with **tax and social security obligations**, or equivalent obligations in its jurisdiction;
- confirmation of the ethics and regulatory approval pathway, including copies of approvals where already available;
- acceptance of the obligations relating to confidentiality, reporting, intellectual property, and data management.

An institutional signing ceremony for the Grant Agreement shall be held with the presence of the representative of the Host Institution and the Principal Investigator, together with the highest representatives of the Foundation, and shall be publicly disseminated through the usual communication channels of both entities.

N. Payment Schedule and Milestone Conditions

The total grant of €160,000 will be paid in four tranches of €40,000 each.

Payment	Timing	Condition	Amount
Payment 1	Upon Grant Agreement signature / project start	Pre-award documentation completed; work plan and milestones approved	€40,000

Payment	Timing	Condition	Amount
Payment 2	Month 6	Progress report accepted; milestone review satisfactory	€40,000
Payment 3	Month 12	Annual report accepted; milestone verification satisfactory; budget compliance confirmed	€40,000
Payment 4	Month 24	Final scientific and financial report accepted; contractual obligations fulfilled	€40,000

The Foundation may defer, suspend, re-phase, or withhold payments in the event of:

- overdue reporting;
- material deviation from the approved plan without prior approval;
- significant compliance or integrity concerns;
- failure to meet milestone conditions without adequate justification.

O. Implementation, Monitoring, Reporting, and Change Control

Beneficiaries shall implement the project in accordance with the terms set out in this Call, effectively, directly, and with integrity, and shall submit at least the following reports:

- **Month 6:** progress report (scientific and brief financial status);
- **Month 12:** annual report (scientific and financial);
- **Month 24:** final report (scientific, financial, outputs, dissemination, and data-sharing status);
- The Foundation may request additional supporting documentation where it deems appropriate.

Any material changes to the project, including changes to scope, milestones, partnership structure, or budget reallocations, must be approved in writing by the Foundation prior to implementation.

The Foundation and the Host Institution shall jointly arrange at least one annual visit to the facilities where the funded research activity is being carried out for monitoring purposes.

This section shall be specifically governed in the Grant Agreement between the Foundation and the Host Institution.

P. Ethics and Regulatory Requirements

Ethics and Regulatory Requirements

Applicants must identify whether the proposed project involves any of the following and include a compliance plan where applicable:

- human participants;
- human biological samples or human data;
- animals used for scientific purposes;
- personal data processing.

Human Research and Biomedical Research

Where human participants, personal health data, genetic data, or human biological materials are involved, the project must comply with applicable research ethics and consent requirements. In Spain, **Law 14/2007 on Biomedical Research** establishes guarantees including protection of human dignity, primacy of the health, interest, and well-being of the participant, prior favorable opinion of a Research Ethics Committee, informed consent, confidentiality safeguards, and the requirement that research be scientifically justified and evaluated.

Animals Used for Scientific Purposes

Where animals are used, the project must comply with applicable authorization and welfare requirements. In Spain, **Royal Decree 53/2013** establishes basic rules for the protection of animals used in experimentation and other scientific

purposes, including the principles of **replacement, reduction, and refinement**, and the evaluation and authorization of projects involving animal procedures.

Pre-Award Ethics Readiness

Before any regulated work package begins, the awardee must provide the Foundation with either:

- evidence of the required approvals; or
- an agreed timetable and pathway for obtaining them.

Q. Privacy Notice

The Foundation will process personal data in accordance with applicable law, including:

- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR); and
- Spanish Organic Law 3/2018 on the Protection of Personal Data and Guarantee of Digital Rights (LOPDGDD).

Privacy Notice

Controller: Rosa Maria Vivar Foundation.

Purpose of processing: administration of the Call, evaluation of applications, communication of outcomes, grant management, execution and monitoring of the Grant Agreement, compliance, audit, and accountability.

Legal basis: processing necessary to take steps prior to entering into a contract and, where applicable, for the performance of the Grant Agreement; and/or the legitimate interests of the Foundation in operating a fair, secure, and accountable grant process. GDPR requires lawful, fair, and transparent processing for specified purposes and provides the lawful bases for processing in Article 6.

Recipients: authorized Foundation staff, external reviewers and committee members under confidentiality and COI obligations, and service providers acting as processors where necessary.

International transfers: where access from outside the EEA is necessary, appropriate safeguards under GDPR will be applied.

Retention: data will be retained for the period necessary to evaluate, award, monitor, audit, and close the Call and any resulting grant, and thereafter for legally required retention periods.

Rights: data subjects may exercise rights of access, rectification, erasure, restriction, objection, and other rights recognized by applicable law.

Duty of confidentiality: Spanish Organic Law 3/2018 includes a duty of confidentiality in personal data processing, which also informs the confidentiality provisions of this Call.

R. Intellectual Property, Data Sharing, and Exploitation

Ownership

All intellectual and industrial property rights arising from the funded project shall belong to the beneficiary institution(s), subject to applicable law, institutional regulations, and any consortium agreement.

License to the Foundation

The Foundation shall receive a **non-exclusive, royalty-free license** to use non-confidential project outputs for reporting, accountability, and communication purposes. The Foundation will not publish proprietary confidential information or trade secrets without authorization.

Dissemination and Exploitation

Beneficiaries shall take reasonable measures to ensure that relevant results are disseminated and, where appropriate, exploited, while safeguarding legitimate confidentiality, ethical obligations, and intellectual property rights.

Under the terms specifically regulated in the Grant Agreement between the Foundation and the Host Institution, beneficiaries shall acknowledge in all dissemination activities and through all communication channels that the project is funded by the Foundation and, where logos are displayed, the Foundation's logo shall also be included.

Data Management and Data Sharing

Each funded project shall maintain a Data Management Plan (DMP) addressing:

- the types of data to be generated or used;
- data storage, protection, and access control;
- the processing of personal data, where applicable;
- data retention and destruction rules;
- timelines and mechanisms for data sharing;
- justified limitations based on privacy, confidentiality, ethics, security, or intellectual property rights.

S. Eligible and Ineligible Costs

Eligible costs must be directly attributable to the funded project, necessary for its implementation, reasonable, and properly justified.

Illustrative eligible costs include:

- personnel;
- consumables;
- essential equipment proportionate to the project;
- travel directly linked to milestones or project implementation;
- dissemination and publication costs;
- other direct costs with adequate scientific and budgetary justification.

Ineligible costs include:

- overhead above 15%;
- major infrastructure or building expenditure;
- unrelated institutional costs;
- costs lacking adequate supporting justification or documentation.

T. Integrity, Non-Discrimination, and Final Provisions

The Foundation applies principles of scientific integrity, fairness, confidentiality, and non-discrimination throughout the Call.

Applicants shall not be discriminated against on grounds unrelated to scientific merit, feasibility, compliance, or scope alignment.

The Foundation may exclude applications or terminate funding for fraud, material misrepresentation, plagiarism, serious misconduct, or serious breach of confidentiality or legal obligations.

The Foundation reserves the right to publish clarifications or amendments before the submission deadline. Submission of an application implies acceptance of this document and all annexes.

U. Annexes

- Annex A – LOI Template and Eligibility
- Annex B – Full Proposal Template and Budget Table
- Annex C – Administrative Review Checklist
- Annex D – COI and Confidentiality Form
- Annex E – Scoring Table and Rubrics

Annex A – LOI Template and Eligibility

LOI Template

Instructions: Submit in English in PDF format. Recommended length: 2 pages excluding references (approx.).

Project Title:

Principal Investigator:

Host Institution:

Partner Institutions (if any):

Keywords (maximum 8):

Executive Summary (maximum 200 words)

Describe the problem, the hypothesis, the proposed approach, why the project is cure-focused, and what will be delivered within 24 months.

Cure-Focused Rationale (maximum 200 words)

Explain the targeted disease mechanism and the pathway toward a cure-oriented pharmacological intervention.

Novelty and State of the Art (maximum 200 words)

Explain what is novel and why it is important.

Approach and Methods (maximum 200 words)

Describe the proposed model(s), methods, assays, readouts, and why the work is feasible within 24 months.

Team Capacity (maximum 200 words)

Explain why the PI and the team are well positioned to execute the project.

Expected Results within 24 Months (maximum 200 words)

List 3 to 5 measurable outputs or milestones.

Indicative Budget Summary

- Direct costs
- Indirect costs (maximum 15%)
- Total requested (maximum €160,000)

Ethics, Regulatory, and Privacy Flags

- Human participants/data/samples: Yes / No
- Animals: Yes / No
- EU clinical trial: Yes / No
- Personal data processing: Yes / No
If “Yes,” briefly describe the approvals and compliance pathway.

Declarations

- I confirm that the information provided is complete and truthful.
- I acknowledge that participation in this Call implies full acceptance of its terms and confirm that the application complies with the scope and rules of the Call.
- I confirm that all relevant institutional conflicts have been disclosed.
- I declare that the project submitted to this Call is not co-funded and does not receive concurrent funding from other grants or subsidies intended for the same purpose or the same eligible costs. I further declare that the project constitutes a distinct scientific project or subproject with clearly identifiable objectives, activities, milestones, deliverables, and expected results.

Eligibility

Submit the necessary supporting documentation to justify:

- that the Host Institution has its own legal personality and is duly incorporated in accordance with applicable legislation;
- that the Host Institution has its registered office or permanent establishment in Spain;
- that the corporate purpose of the Host Institution includes the development of R&D&I activities within the national territory;



- where the application is submitted within the framework of a collaborative research project, submission of the cooperation agreement, in which the Host Institution must in all cases appear as the coordinating entity.



Annex B – Full Proposal Template and Budget Table

Instructions: Submit in English as a PDF. Recommended length: 12–20 pages excluding CVs and limited appendices.

Project Title:

Principal Investigator:

Host Institution:

Partner Institutions (if any):

Executive Summary (maximum 1 page)

Background and Rationale (maximum 2 pages)

Hypothesis, Objectives, and Success Metrics (maximum 2 pages)

Include go/no-go criteria where appropriate.

Research Plan and Methods (maximum 6 pages)

Include work packages, methods, statistical considerations where relevant, quality controls, and key readouts.

Timeline and Milestones

Provide a milestone table aligned with Month 6, Month 12, and Month 24.

Implementation, Risks, and Contingency Plan (maximum 2 pages)

Identify critical risks, mitigation measures, fallback strategies, and feasibility constraints.

Ethics and Regulatory Plan (maximum 2 pages)

Describe approvals, consent procedures, animal welfare arrangements, clinical trial requirements, or other regulatory pathways if applicable.

Team and Governance (maximum 2 pages)

Describe key roles, project management arrangements, and consortium governance if applicable.

Impact, Dissemination, Exploitation, and IP Strategy (maximum 3 pages)

Describe expected scientific and societal impact, communication and dissemination plans, exploitation strategy, and IP approach if relevant.

Data Management Plan Summary (maximum 2 pages)

Describe the types of data generated, storage, protection, access, sharing timelines, and justified limitations.



Budget and Budget Justification

Cost Category	Amount (€)	Short Justification
Personnel		
Consumables		
Essential Equipment		
Travel		
Dissemination / Publication		
Other Direct Costs		
Overhead (maximum 15%)		
TOTAL (maximum €160,000)		

Relationship with Other Research Activities (maximum 1 page)

If the proposed work forms part of a broader research programme, describe how the project submitted to this Call is differentiated from other ongoing or externally funded research activities.

Annex C — Administrative Review Checklist

Completeness

- All required portal fields completed
- Correct template used
- PDF uploaded and readable
- All mandatory declarations included
- Total budget does not exceed €160,000
- Overhead does not exceed 15%

Eligibility

- Host Institution identified and eligible
- PI identified
- Cure-focused admissibility met
- Duration does not exceed 24 months
- Consortium roles clear, if applicable

Compliance Flags

- Compliance Flags
- Human research disclosed where applicable
- Animal research disclosed where applicable
- Clinical trial involvement disclosed where applicable
- Personal data processing disclosed where applicable

Subsanation Record

- Defect classified as non-material
- 48–72 hour correction period issued
- Correction received within deadline
- No substantive change introduced

Annex D – COI and Confidentiality Form

Name:

Affiliation:

Role:

Email:

Confidentiality Undertaking

I agree to treat all application materials, evaluation documents, reviewer communications, deliberations, scores, rankings, recommendations, funding decisions, and other non-public information obtained through the evaluation process as strictly confidential. I will use such information solely for the purpose of evaluation and selection within this Call and will not disclose it to any third party unless expressly authorized by the Foundation.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Please tick all that apply:

- Recent scientific collaboration with applicant(s)
- Institutional conflict
- Financial interest in applicant institution or project
- Personal relationship that may affect impartiality
- Direct competing activity constituting a material COI
- Other conflict (please describe)

COI Management Acknowledgement

I will immediately disclose any real or potential COI and will withdraw from evaluation and decision-making for any affected application.

Reviewer Identity Disclosure Preference

I understand that my identity as reviewer assigned to specific applications shall remain confidential throughout the evaluation and decision-making process.

I acknowledge that the Foundation will never disclose the specific applications assigned to me, my evaluations, scores, rankings, recommendations, comments, voting positions, or any information linking me to a particular proposal.

For the period following completion of the Call, I choose one of the following options:

Option A – Permanent Confidentiality

I do not authorize the Foundation to disclose my participation as a reviewer in this Call.

Option B – Disclosure of Participation

I authorize the Foundation to disclose my name after completion of the Call solely for the purpose of acknowledging my participation as a reviewer.

I understand that such disclosure shall not affect my continuing obligations of confidentiality regarding applications, reviewer assignments, deliberations, scores, rankings, recommendations, funding decisions, or any other non-public information obtained through the evaluation process.

Signature:

Date:

Annex E – Scoring Table and Rubrics

Scoring Scale

Score	Descriptor
1	Poor
2	Marginal
3	Weak
4	Fair
5	Satisfactory
6	Good
7	Very Good
8	Excellent
9	Outstanding
10	Exceptional

LOI Rubric

Criterion	Weight	What to Assess
PI Track Record and Capacity	40%	ability to execute; relevant scientific expertise; independence and leadership
Scientific Excellence and Cure-Focused Fit	40%	novelty; rigor; clarity; therapeutic logic directed toward cure
Impact Potential	20%	likely contribution toward cure-directed outcomes; relevance to the field

Full Proposal Rubric

Criterion	Weight	What to Assess
Team	20%	implementation capacity; complementarity; governance; consortium added value
Excellence	25%	novelty; quality; hypothesis and objectives; relevance of expected results

Criterion	Weight	What to Assess
Implementation	25%	work plan logic; feasibility; infrastructure and resources; budget justification; risks; contingency; ethics; clarity and independence of the Foundation-funded project scope
Impact	30%	scientific and societal impact; dissemination; exploitation; data sharing; IP strategy where applicable

Aggregation Summary

- Each reviewer assigns a score from 1 to 10 for each criterion.
- The criterion score is the average across reviewers.
- Each criterion score is weighted.
- Weighted scores are summed to produce a total score.
- Applications are ranked by total score, subject to admissibility and compliance requirements.