# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL _ RFP-2026-001

Services for Critical Path Institute Quantitative Disease Modelling activities

## Document 2: Submission instructions and evaluation

| | |
|---|---|
| **Issued by** | **Critical Path Institute, (C-Path)** |
| **Address** | **1840 E. River Road, Suite 100, Tucson, AZ 85718-5893** |
| **Website** | **www.c-path.org** |
| **Date Issued** | **13 November 2026** |
| **Questions Due** | **27 November 2026** |
| **Proposals Due** | **18 December 2026** |
| **Anticipated Notice of Intent to Award** | **26 February 2027** |
| **Planned project start** | **March 2027** |
| **Submission Email** | **European Management Office - EOadmin@c-path.org** |
| **Document Reference** | **RFP-2026-001** |
| **Use Case Definition** | A "Use Case" refers to a single designated disease area and its associated modelling and simulation objectives. Each Use Case will be defined or confirmed by C-Path in the applicable Statement of Work, task order, or work package issued under any master services or framework agreement resulting from this RFP. |
| **Currency** | All prices shall be submitted in EUR, exclusive of VAT. VAT, if applicable, must be shown separately. |
| **Budget ceiling** | The initial disease-area Use Case shall not exceed **EUR 350,000, exclusive of VAT**. Additional disease-area Use Cases may be authorized under the resulting agreement, subject to available funding and applicable funding terms, with budgets defined in the relevant Statement of Work or other written authorization. No minimum number of additional Use Cases or aggregate expenditure is guaranteed. |

1 RFP PROVISIONS AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS ..... 4
1.1 Proposal Validity and Liability ..... 4
1.2 Submission Requirements ..... 4
1.3 Questions and Clarifications ..... 4
1.4 Confidentiality ..... 5
1.5 Conflict of Interest ..... 5
1.6 Prior Engagement and Potential Bidder Participation ..... 5
1.7 Reservation of Rights and Procurement Fairness ..... 5
1.8 Assumptions, Dependencies, and Amendments ..... 5
1.9 Out of Scope ..... 6
2 VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA ..... 6
2.1 Criterion 1: Organizational Experience (20%) ..... 7
2.2 Criterion 2: Scientific and Methodological Approach (25%) ..... 7
2.3 Criterion 3: Technical Capabilities and Infrastructure (15%) ..... 8
2.4 Criterion 4: Team and Scientific Expertise (20%) ..... 8
2.5 Criterion 5: Project Delivery and Collaboration (10%) ..... 8
2.6 Criterion 6: Budget and Cost Effectiveness (10%) ..... 9
3 BUDGET TEMPLATE ..... 9
3.1 Personnel Costs ..... 10
3.2 Other Direct Costs ..... 11
3.3 Optional Tasks ..... 11
4 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS ..... 12
5 TERMS AND CONDITIONS ..... 14
5.1 Contract Type ..... 14
5.2 Intellectual Property, Background IP, and Reuse ..... 14
5.3 Publication Rights ..... 15
5.4 Confidentiality and Data Protection ..... 15
5.5 Subcontracting ..... 15
5.6 Payment Terms ..... 15
5.7 Governing Law ..... 15
5.8 Order of Precedence ..... 15
6 EVALUATION PROCESS ..... 16

7 APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS ..... 17
8 APPENDIX B: PROPOSAL CHECKLIST ..... 18

# 1 RFP PROVISIONS AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

## 1.1 Proposal Validity and Liability

The proposal constitutes a firm offer and will be considered valid for **180 calendar days** from the submission date. C-Path shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions on the part of the Bidder in preparing the proposal. The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with preparing and submitting the proposal.

## 1.2 Submission Requirements

All proposals must be submitted electronically by the deadline specified on the cover page. Proposals must be submitted to:

**European Management Office - EOadmin@c-path.org**

Please include the subject line: **"RFP-2026-001 Proposal – [Your Organization Name]"**
Proposals must be provided in PDF format (preferred) or Microsoft Word and must not exceed **24 pages** (excluding appendices specified in Section 4). Appendices are not subject to the page limit but should be concise and directly relevant.

**Bidder Point of Contact**
Each proposal shall identify one primary point of contact for all communications relating to the proposal. The proposal shall include the contact's full name, job title, organization, email address, and telephone number.

**Intent to Submit**
To assist C-Path in planning the proposal review process, prospective Bidders are kindly requested, where possible, to notify C-Path at **EOadmin@c-path.org** in advance if they intend to submit a proposal. This notification is for planning purposes only and is not a condition of participation or proposal submission.

## 1.3 Questions and Clarifications

Questions seeking clarification of this RFP must be submitted in writing by email to the address above, no later than **27 November, 2026**. C-Path will aim to provide consolidated responses within five (5) business days following the questions deadline.
A conference call may be convened if deemed necessary. All questions received will be compiled, de-identified, and distributed to all Bidders simultaneously. Responses will also be posted on the C-Path website at www.c-path.org. Bidders are advised to monitor the C-Path website for any amendments or Q&A updates.

## 1.4 Confidentiality

Information contained in proposals will be evaluated by members of the RFP review committee and will be treated as confidential. Proposals will not be shared with third parties outside the review process without the Bidder's consent.

## 1.5 Conflict of Interest

Bidders must disclose any existing relationships, partnerships, collaborative agreements, or other potential conflicts of interest with C-Path. The existence of such relationships will not necessarily disqualify a Bidder but must be disclosed to allow the review committee to manage any conflicts appropriately and transparently.

## 1.6 Prior Engagement and Potential Bidder Participation

C-Path may occasionally engage with organizations, including those that may submit a proposal in response to this RFP, to provide limited scientific, technical, or facilitation support for CP-DMC workshops or preparatory activities. Such support is separate from this RFP and will not confer any advantage in the evaluation of proposals.

Where information from any such prior engagement is material to this RFP, C-Path will make the same non-confidential information available to all Bidders through the RFP clarification process or a formal addendum. Bidders must disclose in their Conflict-of-Interest statement whether they, or any proposed subcontractor or key personnel, have provided paid or unpaid support to recent CP-DMC preparatory activities.

## 1.7 Reservation of Rights and Procurement Fairness

C-Path reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive informalities, request clarifications, negotiate with one or more Bidders, amend or cancel this RFP, or decline to make an award. C-Path may select one or more Bidders, award separate disease-area, Use Cases or work packages to different Bidders, or establish a primary and secondary contractor arrangement, depending on the evaluation results and the evolving needs of the CP-DMC portfolio. C-Path is not obligated to award a contract as a result of this RFP.

All Bidders will be evaluated against the same criteria set out in Section 2. Prior participation in CP-DMC discussions or related scientific activities does not confer any entitlement to award. Any such relationship must be disclosed under Section 1.6.

## 1.8 Assumptions, Dependencies, and Amendments

Bidders should identify key assumptions and dependencies in their proposals, including data availability, timing of data access, stakeholder input, regulatory feedback timing, resourcing, software requirements, and pass-through expenses. Any material change to

scope, timing, budget, or deliverables after award must be documented through written amendment or change order.

Before execution of the applicable agreement, C-Path may determine that certain anticipated activities are no longer required, should be deferred, or should be performed through separate initiatives or partners. In such circumstances, C-Path may adjust the applicable scope, budget, schedule, and deliverables in the final contract, statement of work, or task order. Following execution of the applicable agreement, any material change to authorized work, including any adjustment to scope, budget, timeline, or deliverables, must be documented through a written amendment, task order, or change order executed in accordance with that agreement. Selection or award under this RFP does not oblige C-Path to authorize all tasks or deliverables described in this RFP, and C-Path will have no obligation to pay for work that has not been expressly authorized under the applicable agreement.

### 1.9 Out of Scope

The following activities are out of scope of this RFP: data acquisition and contracting; data governance and Data Contribution Agreements; central platform development and data infrastructure; program-wide data ingestion or harmonization; sponsor-specific or product-specific regulatory activities; and any work performed under separate programs or funding frameworks.

## 2 VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated by a multidisciplinary evaluation committee appointed by C-Path in accordance with its procurement procedures. The committee will include representatives from C-Path Operations, Regulatory Science, Global Affairs, and relevant scientific stakeholders. Evaluation will be based on the overall quality of the proposal, taking into account the Bidder's relevant organizational experience, the expertise and qualifications of the proposed team, technical merit and commercial considerations. C-Path may award to one or more Bidders whose proposals offer the best overall value in meeting the objectives of this RFP.

The evaluation criteria and associated weightings are presented below.

**Use of an Illustrative Use Case**

To provide a consistent basis for evaluation, each Bidder shall include a single **Illustrative Use Case** demonstrating its proposed scientific and methodological approach. The Illustrative Use Case should be used consistently in responses to Criteria 2–6, including the proposed scientific and methodological approach, infrastructure, team allocation, work plan, risk assessment and budget. The selection of a particular disease area will not, in itself, be scored positively or negatively. The Illustrative Use Case should describe, at a high level:

- the selected disease area and unmet need;

- the proposed Question of Interest;
- a preliminary Context of Use;
- anticipated data sources;
- proposed modelling strategy;
- intended regulatory application.

The Illustrative Proposal Use Case is intended solely for evaluation purposes and will not form part of the contractual scope. The final project scope, Question of Interest, Context of Use, deliverables and regulatory strategy will be agreed with C-Path at contract initiation.

## 2.1 Criterion 1: Organizational Experience (20%)

The Bidder shall demonstrate relevant organizational experience in quantitative medicine and regulatory science. Evaluation will consider experience in:

- development of regulatory-grade quantitative models for regulatory authorities and HTAs;
- disease progression and clinical trial simulation;
- extrapolation framework applied to pediatric and small populations in regulatory context;
- integration of clinical trial and real-world data;
- AI-enabled quantitative methods;
- participation in international, multidisciplinary research collaborations involving regulators, academia, industry and patient organisations.

**Response guidance**
Provide a brief organizational overview (maximum 500 words); and up to five representative projects illustrating relevant experience.

## 2.2 Criterion 2: Scientific and Methodological Approach (25%)

The review committee will evaluate the scientific quality, feasibility and regulatory relevance of the proposed approach using the Illustrative Use Case. The proposal should demonstrate the Bidder's approach to:

- evidence review and gap assessment;
- data readiness assessment;
- disease progression and treatment-effect modelling;
- extrapolation and evidence integration, where applicable;
- clinical trial simulation;
- model validation (internal / external validation if possible) and uncertainty quantification;
- translation of modelling outputs into regulatory-facing evidence.

The proposal should explain the rationale for the proposed methodology, key assumptions, anticipated challenges and mitigation strategies, and how the approach would adapt to different levels of data availability and evolving regulatory feedback.

## 2.3 Criterion 3: Technical Capabilities and Infrastructure (15%)

Evaluation will consider the Bidder's capability to deliver reproducible, secure and scalable quantitative modelling activities. The proposal should address:

- analytical infrastructure;
- secure computing environments;
- data standards and interoperability;
- quality assurance;
- reproducibility and version control;
- model verification and validation;
- data governance and information security.

## 2.4 Criterion 4: Team and Scientific Expertise (20%)

Evaluation will consider the suitability of the proposed team and its ability to deliver the required scientific activities. Assessment will include:

- qualifications and experience of key personnel;
- leadership structure;
- multidisciplinary expertise;
- adequacy of resource allocation;
- availability throughout the contract.

**Response guidance**

Provide concise CVs (maximum one page per individual), together with a role-compliance matrix showing how the proposed team satisfies the requirements specified in Section 8, Document 1.

## 2.5 Criterion 5: Project Delivery and Collaboration (10%)

Evaluation will consider the Bidder's ability to successfully deliver work within a complex, international, multi-stakeholder environment. Assessment will include:

- project planning and timeline;
- project management methodology;
- risk management;
- resource flexibility;
- stakeholder engagement;
- participation in scientific workshops and regulatory meetings;
- communication and reporting;

- scalability to additional disease programmes.

The proposal should include an indicative work plan and Gantt chart based on the Illustrative Proposal Use Case.

### 2.6 Criterion 6: Budget and Cost Effectiveness (10%)

The review committee will assess the clarity, completeness, reasonableness, and cost-effectiveness of the proposed budget for the base scope of the Illustrative Proposal Use Case. Evaluation will consider:

- **Transparency:** Costs are clearly itemised by task, deliverable, personnel category, and level of effort.
- **Reasonableness:** Rates, resource allocations, and other costs are proportionate to the proposed activities and consistent with comparable quantitative modelling and regulatory science services.
- **Value for money:** The proposed budget represents an appropriate balance between cost, scientific quality, regulatory relevance, and expected project outcomes.
- **Compliance with the budget ceiling:** The total base-scope budget shall not exceed **EUR 350,000**, exclusive of VAT.
- **Optional extension pricing:** Any optional or additional activities shall be priced separately and excluded from the base-scope total unless expressly requested by C-Path.

Proposals exceeding the stated budget ceiling may be considered non-compliant unless C-Path has authorized an exception in writing before the proposal submission deadline.

## 3 BUDGET TEMPLATE

Bidders shall prepare the base-scope budget using the same **Illustrative Use Case** presented under Criterion 2.

The indicative deliverables provided in **Document 1, Annex 1** shall serve as the common basis for budget preparation and comparison. Bidders may adapt the titles, scope, sequencing, or timing of deliverables where justified by the proposed Use Case, provided that each proposed activity is clearly mapped to the corresponding indicative deliverable in Annex 1.

The budget shall:

- provide a cost breakdown by task and deliverable;
- identify the personnel categories, level of effort, and applicable rates;
- distinguish direct service costs from pass-through expenses;

- identify all subcontractor and consultant costs;
- specify travel, software, computing, licensing, and other out-of-pocket expenses;
- identify any overhead or indirect costs and the basis on which they are calculated;
- state all assumptions and dependencies affecting the price; and
- link proposed payment terms to defined deliverables or contractual milestones.

All prices shall be submitted in euros and exclusive of VAT. VAT, where applicable, shall be shown separately. The total base-scope budget, including direct service costs, pass-through expenses, subcontracting, and overhead or indirect costs, shall not exceed **EUR 350,000 exclusive of VAT for the Illustrative Use Case submitted for evaluation**.

Optional activities and extensions shall be presented separately and shall not be included in the base-scope total.

## 3.1 Personnel Costs

| **Proposed task or deliverable / corresponding Document 1 Annex 1 reference** | **Indicative Due Date** | **Person-Months (all staff)** | **Blended Daily/Hourly Rate** | **Total Cost (EUR, excl. VAT)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 - Project Initiation Plan | Month 1 | | | |
| D2 - Preliminary Question of Interest (QoI) and Context of Use (CoU) | Month 2 | | | |
| D3 - Data Landscape, Readiness and Gap Assessment | Month 3 | | | |
| D4 - Modelling Strategy and Analysis Plan | Month 4 | | | |
| D5 - Initial Data Characterisation Report | Month 8 | | | |
| D6 - Proof-of-Concept Quantitative Model (Version 1) | Month 10 | | | |
| D7 - Model Validation Report | Month 12 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| D8 - Scenario exploration of potential model impact | Month 13 | | | |
| D9 - Model Documentation and Computational Package | Month 14 | | | |
| D10 - Regulatory-Ready Technical Report | Month 15 | | | |
| D11 - Final Project Report and Knowledge Transfer Package | Month 16 | | | |
| Additional base-scope tasks, if any (please specify) | | | | |
| **TOTAL DIRECT COSTS** | | | | |

## 3.2 Other Direct Costs

| **Expense** | **Description** | **Units** | **Cost per Unit** | **Total Cost (EUR, excl. VAT)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Travel (consortium meetings, regulatory interactions) | | | | |
| Subcontracting (external statistical/modelling review, specialist consultants) | | | | |
| Computing / Cloud Infrastructure | | | | |
| Software Licenses | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | |
| **TOTAL PASS-THROUGH COSTS** | | | | |
| **TOTAL PART A BUDGET (Direct + Pass-Through)** | | | | |
| Indirect Costs / Overhead (specify rate applied) | | | | |
| **GRAND TOTAL PART A** | | | | |

## 3.3 Optional Tasks

| **Optional Task** | **Description / Assumptions** | **Total Cost (EUR, excl. VAT)** |
|---|---|---|
| Additional data-readiness support | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Model refinement | | |
| Expanded simulation scenarios | | |
| Enhanced credibility assessment | | |
| Follow-up regulatory support | | |
| Handover to related initiatives | | |
| Other (please specify) | | |

# 4 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

To facilitate consistent evaluation, proposals must follow the structure below.

1. **Executive Summary (maximum 2 pages)**
   Provide an overview of the organization, proposed approach, key differentiators, and total proposed base-scope budget.

2. **Response to Criterion 1 – Organizational Experience (maximum 3 pages)**
   Provide a brief organizational overview (maximum 500 words) and describe relevant experience addressing the requirements set out under Criterion 1. Up to five representative projects may be provided as case studies in the appendix.

3. **Response to Criterion 2 – Scientific and Methodological Approach, including the Illustrative Use Case (maximum 7 pages)**

   - Begin with the **Illustrative Use Case** described under *Use of an Illustrative Use Case* in Section 2, which should not exceed **2 pages**.
   - Describe the proposed scientific and methodological approach for that Use Case, including the rationale for key methodological choices, assumptions and dependencies, adaptation to data availability, validation and uncertainty quantification, and translation of modelling outputs into regulatory-facing evidence.

4. **Response to Criterion 3 – Technical Capabilities and Infrastructure (maximum 3 pages)**
   Describe the technical, computational, quality, reproducibility, data-governance and information-security capabilities relevant to delivery of the Illustrative Use Case.

5. **Response to Criterion 4 – Team and Scientific Expertise (maximum 3 pages)**
   Describe the proposed team, leadership structure, roles and responsibilities, multidisciplinary expertise, resource allocation, and availability. Include a role-compliance matrix demonstrating how the proposed team meets the requirements

specified in **Section 8 of Document 1**. Concise CVs (maximum one page per individual) should be provided in the appendix.

6. **Response to Criterion 5 – Project Delivery and Collaboration (maximum 2 pages)**
   Describe the proposed work plan, project-management approach, key dependencies and risks, resource flexibility, stakeholder-engagement approach, communication and reporting, and ability to scale to additional disease programmes. An indicative Gantt chart based on the Illustrative Use Case should be provided in the appendix.

7. **Response to Criterion 6 – Budget and Cost Effectiveness (maximum 2 pages)**
   Provide a summary and rationale for the proposed budget, including key pricing assumptions and considerations relevant to cost effectiveness and value for money. The completed budget template in Section 3 should be provided in the appendix.

8. **Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Prior-Engagement Disclosure (maximum 1 page)**
   Provide the disclosure required under Section 1.5 and 1.6.

9. **Assumptions, Dependencies, and Exclusions (maximum 1 page)**
   Identify any material assumptions, dependencies, or exclusions not otherwise captured in the technical response or budget.

10. **Appendices**
    Appendices are not subject to the 24-page limit but should be concise and directly relevant. They may include:
    - representative project case studies;
    - key personnel CVs;
    - role-compliance matrix;
    - indicative Gantt chart;
    - completed budget template; and
    - supporting references or other specifically requested supporting materials.

The **Illustrative Use Case shall be described only once, under Criterion 2**. Responses to Criteria 3–6 should refer to the same Illustrative Use Case without repeating its full description. The disease area selected for the Illustrative Use Case will not, in itself, influence the evaluation score.

# 5 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

## 5.1 Contract Type

This RFP may result in the award of one or more Contractor Services Agreements consistent with C-Path's standard terms and conditions. The contracting entity and final agreement structure will be confirmed by C-Path during award and contracting.

The resulting agreement may support multiple Use Cases and multiple applicable funding sources within the scope competed under this RFP. C-Path currently anticipates an estimated budget of approximately EUR 350,000 for the initial disease-area Use Case, subject to available funding, program needs, applicable funding terms and conditions, and the scope of work ultimately authorized.

Specific Use Cases may be authorized under the resulting agreement through a Statement of Work, task order, work package, or other written instrument defining the applicable scope, deliverables, timeline, budget, funding source, and acceptance criteria.

Selection under this RFP does not guarantee any minimum volume of work or expenditure and does not, by itself, authorize work beyond the scope expressly included in the executed agreement or applicable written instrument. Any future work must remain within the scope and contractual framework established through this RFP and the resulting agreement.

## 5.2 Intellectual Property, Background IP, and Reuse

All deliverables produced specifically under this contract will be owned by C-Path/CP-DMC, subject to final contract terms. Background intellectual property, pre-existing methods, tools, libraries, software, templates, and know-how owned by the vendor before the contract will remain the property of the vendor, provided that such background intellectual property is clearly identified in the proposal or contract.

To the extent that vendor background intellectual property is necessary for C-Path to use, reproduce, review, maintain, submit, or build upon the deliverables, the vendor must identify such dependencies and propose appropriate licence terms. Bidders should not include third-party or open-source components that would restrict C-Path's intended use, regulatory submission, sharing, or future reuse of the deliverables unless such restrictions are disclosed and approved in writing by C-Path.

C-Path may, subject to confidentiality, data-use restrictions, and governance approvals, choose to make selected outputs available under open-science or controlled-access principles. Any such release will be determined by C-Path/CP-DMC and relevant governance bodies.

## 5.3 Publication Rights

The vendor may publish results from this work in peer-reviewed journals or other public communications only with prior written review and approval by C-Path and, where applicable, CP-DMC member companies, data contributors, or governance bodies. Publication review(s) will be designed to protect confidential information, data-contributor rights, intellectual property, and regulatory strategy.

## 5.4 Confidentiality and Data Protection

The vendor will be required to maintain the confidentiality of all proprietary data, methodologies, consortium information, unpublished materials, stakeholder discussions, and regulatory materials. The vendor must comply with applicable data-protection requirements and any C-Path security, privacy, access, and data-use policies applicable to the work.

## 5.5 Subcontracting

Any subcontracting arrangements must be disclosed in the proposal and approved by C-Path in advance. The selected vendor will remain responsible for subcontractor performance, confidentiality, data protection, deliverable quality, and compliance with contract terms.

## 5.6 Payment Terms

Proposed payment terms, tied to specific deliverables or defined milestones for direct costs, must be provided in the proposal. Pass-through expenses will be invoiced as costs are incurred and should not be included in milestone payments unless otherwise agreed in writing.

## 5.7 Governing Law

This RFP and any resulting contract shall be governed by the laws of the State of Arizona, United States, unless otherwise agreed in the final Contractor Services Agreement.

## 5.8 Order of Precedence

In the event of inconsistency between this RFP, the selected proposal, and the final executed agreement, the final executed agreement will control, followed by any written statement of work or amendment agreed by C-Path and the vendor.

# 6 EVALUATION PROCESS

Upon receipt of proposals, C-Path will:

1. Confirm administrative completeness and eligibility of each proposal.
2. Post all proposals to the designated SharePoint library accessible to the RFP review committee.
3. Complete the vendor proposal evaluation grid for each proposal, including cost assessment and strengths/weaknesses analysis.
4. Convene the review committee to discuss evaluations.
5. Optionally invite top-ranked Bidders to provide presentations to the review committee.
6. Select the preferred Bidder or Bidders based on the evaluation criteria, business needs, and overall value to C-Path.
7. Notify the preferred Bidder or Bidders and proceed to the applicable contract, statement-of-work or work-package negotiations.

C-Path reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, to waive informalities, and to accept the proposal deemed most advantageous to C-Path and the CP-DMC. C-Path is not obligated to award a contract as a result of this RFP.

# 7 APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| **CDISC SDTM** | Clinical Data Interchange Standards Consortium Study Data Tabulation Model; a standard for organizing and formatting clinical trial data for submission to regulatory authorities. |
| **Context of Use (CoU)** | A statement that fully and clearly describes the way the proposed biomarker, endpoint, or model is to be used and the medical product development context in which the proposed use is applicable. |
| **CP-DAP** | C-Path Data Analytics Platform; a secure, cloud-based, GDPR-compliant analytics environment that enables FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) data sharing, standardization, and integration. |
| **DDT** | Drug Development Tool; a method, material, or measure that aids drug development and regulatory review, which can be submitted for formal qualification by regulatory agencies. |
| **Disease progression model** | A mathematical model that describes the natural history of a disease and/or the effect of treatment on disease progression over time, using patient-level data. |
| **GDPR** | General Data Protection Regulation; the EU regulation governing the processing of personal data. |
| **ICH E11A** | International Council for Harmonization guideline on extrapolation of data to support pediatric drug development. |
| **ICH M15** | International Council for Harmonization guideline on general principles on model-informed drug development. |
| **Illustrative Use Case** | A non-binding example developed by the Bidder solely to demonstrate its proposed scientific, methodological, technical, regulatory and delivery approach during proposal evaluation. It is presented and evaluated under Criterion 2 and does not replace the formal contractual Use Case defined or approved by C-Path at contract initiation. |
| **OMOP CDM** | Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership Common Data Model; a standardized data model for observational health data that enables large-scale analytics across diverse data sources. |
| **RWD / RWE** | Real-World Data / Real-World Evidence; data and evidence derived from sources other than randomized clinical trials, such as registries, electronic health records, and claims databases. |
| **Use Case** | A single designated CP-DMC disease area and its associated modelling and simulation objectives, as defined by C-Path at contract initiation for each engagement under this strategic partnership. |

# 8 APPENDIX B: PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

| Requirement | Included by Bidder? |
|---|---|
| Executive summary | |
| Organizational overview | |
| Primary bidder point of contact identified, including full name, job title, organization, email address, and telephone number | |
| Criterion 2 includes the required Illustrative Proposal Use Case, and the same Use Case is applied consistently, where relevant, in Criteria 3–6, the Gantt chart and the base-scope budget. | |
| Responses to Criteria 1–6 | |
| Completed base-scope budget template in EUR exclusive of VAT | |
| Optional extension pricing, if proposed, clearly separated from base scope | |
| Gantt chart with dependencies and data-triggered milestones | |
| Key personnel CVs or biographies | |
| Conflict-of-interest disclosure and Prior-Engagement Disclosure | |
| Assumptions, dependencies, and exclusions | |
| Description of reproducibility, version control, and handover approach | |
| Disclosure of subcontractors, third-party tools, and background IP dependencies | |
| Confirmation of ability to work in CP-DAP or C-Path-approved secure environment when required | |