



## ANNEX A

### EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR STDR PILOT STAGE

S/N	Criteria
<b>1</b>	<b>Research and Scientific Merit of technology</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Current Scientific Understanding of Target and Platform Validation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence to support the proposed target as a driver of disease</li> <li>Evidence to substantiate proposed mechanism of action (MOA) of disease treatment</li> <li>For platforms: Evidence to support the platform and what is the breadth of applications</li> </ul>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Quality of Research Conducted to Date</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stage of development of the technology; and the corresponding development, reasoning, and appropriateness of the concepts and methodology</li> </ul>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Potential as Platform Technology [For platform projects]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to be developed as a platform technology for multiple products or indications</li> <li>Opportunity matrix of possible therapies that can be developed using this platform</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>Medical Need and Market Evaluation</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Unmet Medical Need and Current Market Size</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevalence of the indication</li> <li>Size of the potential target population</li> <li>Potential of the technology to deliver on the unmet medical need</li> <li>For platforms: Spectrum of possible indications and size of the first target indication</li> </ul>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Research Differentiation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of directly competing technologies in development, or groups known to be working on similar technologies or the same targets</li> <li>Stage of development of the competing groups vis-à-vis the proposed research</li> <li>Medical expertise in team, either through experience or collaboration</li> </ul>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Competitive Landscape</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of commercial competition in the target indication, including other treatment approaches (e.g. surgery or devices)</li> <li>Existence of therapeutics being developed for the target in the same or different indications</li> <li>Clarity on the benefits over current standard of care</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>Development Plans</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Research Plan Feasibility</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realistic deliverables with respect to the timeframe and proposed budget</li> <li>Realistic and quality research plan with a clear roadmap</li> <li>Presence of any significant barriers to achieving stated goals</li> <li>Sufficient budget, expertise and access to research infrastructure or resources</li> <li>Clear identification of go/no-go criteria</li> </ul>



<b>4</b>	<b>Commercialisation and Intellectual Property (IP)</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Commercial Viability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ability of proposed deliverables to position the project for the next funding stage or be attractive to commercial partners</li><li>• Amount of additional development and/or budget outlay to support future development</li><li>• Time taken for technology to be ready for pre-Investigational New Drug (IND) activities and/or clinical development</li><li>• Challenges in-terms of scaling-up, manufacturing and deployment/clinical adoption of the asset or platform technology</li></ul>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Intellectual Property</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How crowded the patent landscape is</li><li>• Potential to generate foreground IP</li><li>• Potential issues with freedom-to-operate</li></ul>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Strategic Partnerships for Future Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identification or engagement of strategic partners</li><li>• Potential for development of technologies with partners</li><li>• Development plan to secure venture capital funds</li><li>• Strategy for licensing</li></ul>