Proposal Evaluation Form

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme

Evaluation Summary Report

Call:	H2020-SMEInst-2018-2020-2
Type of action:	SME-2
Proposal number:	850251
Proposal acronym:	APO-2
Duration (months):	24
Proposal title:	Secretome Based Regenerative Therapy
Activity:	EIC

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	Aposcience AG	AT	4,061,603.5	100.00%	2,500,000	100.00%
	Total:		4,061,603.5		2,500,000	

Abstract:
The Austrian SME APOSCIENCE AG develops innovative cell free therapeutics for regenerative medicine which have disruptive potential. The company is poised to commence clinical development in several indications to enter a large global market for regenerative medicine. The intellectual property of ten years innovative research has been protected by a patent portfolio providing extensive freedom to operate in a wide variety of applications. A licensed production process of secretomes of apoptotic white blood cells has been approved by the Austrian regulator and the therapeutic is safe for use in clinical trials.
Chronic wounds are an unmet medical need with a global market worth 3 Bn €. The advanced wound care market is set to grow due to demographic changes and the rising incidence of diabetes at 5.7% annually. APOSCIENCE has identified diabetic foot ulcer (DFU) as a priority indication, which limits the quality of life in up to 6% of diabetics. In the absence of curative therapy DFU progresses in 15% of patients with severe sequelae, accounting for up to 75% of all amputations in developed nations. The product APOSEC will be tested for its safety and efficacy within a phase II clinical trial. Upon marketing authorisation this treatment has the potential to become the first advanced wound care treatment becoming standard of care in DFU. A stepwise expansion to other ulcers and wounds is an integral part of the strategy for sustained growth of APOSCIENCE. Within the global market APOSCIENCE anticipates to market this treatment with a strategic partner already engaged in therapeutic blood products to generate significant revenues by 2025.
Together with a committed investor this revenue will make APOSCIENCE a global leader in regenerative medicine, exploiting secretomes to harness the intrinsic regenerative potential of damaged tissues. The company currently advances a pipeline of more complex indications including heart attack, stroke and spinal cord injury.

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 12.56 (Threshold: 13)

Form information

Scoring:
- The total score is the overall consensus score (weighted sum)
- Criteria scores appear unweighted

For more details on the weighting of scores and thresholds please see the applicant guidelines

Indicative Appraisal Scale per Sub-Criterion:
- Very Good to Excellent (4.5 – 5)
- Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)
- Fair to Good (2.5 – 3.49)
- Insufficient to Fair (1.5 – 2.49)
- Insufficient (0-1.49)

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

If NO, please indicate the partner(s) concerned, and provide a short explanation. In any case, evaluate the full proposal, taking into account all partners and activities.

Not provided

Criterion 1 - Impact

Score: **4.30** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects have been taken into account:
Convincing description of substantial demand (including willingness to pay) for the innovation; demand generated by new ideas, with the potential to create new markets, is particularly sought after.
Total market size envisaged.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Convincing description of targeted users or customers of the innovation, how their needs have been addressed, why the users or customers identified will want to use or buy the product, service or business model, including compared to what is currently

available if anything at all.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions and growth-rate, competitors and competitive offerings, key stakeholders, clear identification of opportunities for market introduction, market creation or disruption (e.g. via new value-chains).
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Realistic and relevant description of how the innovation has the potential to scale-up the applicant company (or companies). This should be underpinned by a convincing business plan with a clear timeline, and complemented, where possible, by a track-record that includes financial data.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Alignment of proposal with overall strategy of applicant SME (or SMEs) and commitment of the team behind them. Demonstration of need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organisational requirements for commercial exploitation and scaling up (and - Phase 2 only) as well as key third parties needed.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Realistic and relevant strategic plan for commercialisation, including approximate time-to-market or deployment. Activities to be undertaken after the project.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

European/global dimension of innovation with respect to both commercialisation and assessment of competitors and competitive offerings.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Evidence of or realistic measures to ensure 'freedom to operate' (i.e., possibility of commercial exploitation), convincing knowledge-protection strategy, including current IPR filing status, IPR ownership and licensing issues. Regulatory and/or standards requirements addressed.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Overall assessment of the Impact criterion (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion):
Taken as a whole, to what extent are the above elements coherent and plausible
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Criterion 2 - Excellence

Score: **4.35** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects have to be taken into account.
High-risk/high-potential innovation idea that has something that nobody else has. It should be better and/or significantly different to any alternative. Game-changing ideas or breakthrough innovations are particularly sought after. Its high degree of novelty comes with a high chance of either success or failure.
Very Good to Excellent (4.5 – 5)

Realistic description of the current stage of development (TRL 6 or something analogous for non-technological innovations) and clear outline of the steps planned to take this innovation to market.
Note: Please see part G of the General Annexes
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Highly innovative solution that goes beyond the state of the art in comparison with existing or competing solutions, including on the basis of costs, ease of use and other relevant features as well as issues related to climate change or the environment, the gender dimension, any other benefits for society.
Very Good to Excellent (4.5 – 5)

Very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to successful market introduction of the innovation from both a technical and commercial points of view. Documentation on the technological, practical and economic feasibility of the innovation.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Objectives for the innovation proposal as well as the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact (i.e. commercialisation or deployment resulting in company growth). Appropriate definition provided of specifications for outcome of project and criteria for success.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Overall assessment of the Excellence criterion (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion):
Taken as a whole, to what extent are the above elements coherent and plausible.
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

Score: **3.80** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

Technical/business experience of the team, including management capacity to lead a growing team. If relevant, the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences, namely through partnerships and/or subcontracting*, and explains why and how they are selected (subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles).
Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Availability of resources required (personnel, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop project activities in the most suitable conditions.
Where relevant, complementarity of participants in a consortium.
Where relevant, realistic description of how key stakeholders / partners / subcontractors could be involved* (subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles).
Where relevant, the estimated budget and the procedure planned for selecting the subcontractors are appropriate*.

NOTE: *Subcontracting is acceptable to the extent required for the implementation of the proposed activities. Subcontracting may be an essential part of the implementation of the project, but should not be a disproportionate part of the total estimated eligible costs. Subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles.

Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Realistic timeframe and comprehensive description of implementation (work-packages, major deliverables and milestones, risk management) taking the company’s or applicant’s innovation ambitions and objectives into account.

Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Overall assessment of the Quality and Efficiency of Implementation Criterion (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion) Taken as a whole, to what extent are the above elements coherent and plausible.

Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)

Subcontracting

Subcontracting is acceptable in terms of 'best value for money except for task(s):

N.B.: A blank section means either a positive assessment of all your subcontracting tasks or that your proposal does not foresee any subcontracting activities.

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?

No

If yes, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please also state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not because of a lack of information.

Not provided

Scope of the proposal

Status: **Yes**

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

Overall comments

Not provided

PARTICIPANT PORTAL DIGITAL SEAL

Digitally sealed by the European Commission
Date: 2018.11.08 16:10:55 CET

This document is digitally sealed. The digital sealing mechanism uniquely binds the document to the modules of the Participant Portal of the European Commission, to the transaction for which it was generated and ensures its integrity and authenticity.

Any attempt to modify the content will lead to a breach of the electronic seal, which can be verified at any time by clicking on the digital seal validation symbol.