



**International Union of Societies for Biomaterials Science and Engineering  
(IUSBSE)**

**Assessment and Evaluation Criteria  
Proposals for World Biomaterials Congress 2028  
(WBC2028)**

To:

Presidents and Secretaries of IUSBSE Member Societies and  
Members of the IUSBSE Board of Delegates

On behalf of IUSBSE, I am providing you with the assessment and evaluation criteria used to judge the "Request for Proposal" documents submitted by the member societies to host the World Biomaterials Congress in 2028. This document will guide the discussions of the duly appointed delegates and will help you in preparing a successful proposal. Please contact me any time if you need additional information.

For the selection of WBC2028, we will use a point system to provide a more transparent and objective evaluation process for your proposal. This point system is described in more detail at the end of this document.

**Eligibility**

This is an administrative step being conducted by the Secretary of IUSBSE. The Secretary will scrutinize all submitted proposals for eligibility and adherence to the prescribed submission deadlines, proposal format, content and page limitations.

The deadline for submitting to IUSBSE fully developed proposals, compliant with the Proposal Guidelines, will be clearly communicated to all Society Presidents. Failure to submit a fully executed proposal by the deadline is a reason for automatic disqualification which is a final and non-reversible decision.

Rules for eligibility to submit a proposal and guidelines on proposal format, content and page limitations are provided in the "Request for Proposals". Proposals that materially violate the guidelines will be disqualified by the Secretary. The decision to disqualify a submitted proposal based on proposal format, content, and/or page limitations is subject to approval by the majority of IUSBSE delegates. There is no opportunity to submit a revised or corrected

proposal. Disqualified proposals will not be further evaluated and will be returned to the submitting society with an explanation of the reasons for disqualification.

### **Evaluation of the Administrative Section**

The purpose of the Administrative Section is to convey to IUSBSE that a talented and experienced team of leading scientists has been assembled to organize the WBC. IUSBSE delegates will evaluate the scientific standing as well as the past track record of the proposed leaders of the WBC organizing effort, in particular the proposed WBC chairperson(s), the members of the Local Organizing Committee, and the members of the National Organizing Committee. Proposed leaders who have successfully organized major international meetings will be rated highly. Past experience working with international partners is also important. IUSBSE will be looking for a track record of successful collaboration between the proposed leaders.

The Administrative Section also includes information about the proposed “Professional Conference Organizer” (PCO). The PCO is usually an outside firm that is hired to implement the vision developed by the leading scientists. Having an experienced and highly rated PCO is a critical condition for success of the WBC. IUSBSE understands that the selection process takes place approximately 2 years before the contract with the PCO needs to be finalized. Therefore, it is not required that a final contract with a specific PCO is already in place. However, the Applicant must identify potential PCOs, and must have had initial conversations with appropriate PCOs. The IUSBSE will be looking for a compelling description of the experience, size, and prior track-record of the proposed PCOs. If available, a “term sheet” that outlines the proposed structure of the PCO contract will be very helpful.

*The IUSBSE delegates will rate the Administrative Sections of all submitted proposal and rank them in order of overall quality. If x proposals are being evaluated, the highest rated Administrative Section will receive x points, the second highest x-1 points etc.*

### **Description of Host City, Travel Arrangements and Conference Facilities**

The purpose of this section is to provide IUSBSE with a clear and well-presented overview of the Proposed Conference Location, the host city, focusing on the potential attraction this city has for visiting participants. Applicants are strongly encouraged to be honest and accurate in the description of the specific attractions and features. IUSBSE delegates will look for accuracy of the description including the disclosure of possible negative aspects. The Applicant will be rated highly for providing an accurate, yet compelling narrative of the advantages the Applicant has to offer to WBC participants. Locations that offer touristic attractions (including touristic activities for accompanying persons), an appealing atmosphere and easy travel connections will be highly rated.

Based on an assumed participation of 5,000 delegates, all Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide sufficient and detailed information about hotel availability and costs. The proposal must be sufficiently detailed to allow IUSBSE to evaluate the quality and cost, attractions and possible issues of the proposed venue for WBC. Proposals that provide the requested information (see “Request for Proposals”) will be rated higher than proposal that do not provide the necessary detailed information requested in the “Request for Proposals”

document. This includes detailed information about travel connections and costs and the quality and facilities of the conference center (venue) where the WBC will take place. This section is very important. Higher ratings will go to modern and/or recently renovated venues, cost-efficient locations, locations with easier travel connectivity, and locations that provide an attractive ambiance and/or touristic attractions. There are hundreds of meetings each year that compete for a limited amount of travel funds. To make sure that WBC is a high-impact meeting, it needs to be able to attract several thousand participants. IUSBSE will rate proposals in terms of their ability to attract participants and in terms of the applicant's demonstrated ability to provide an exceptional conference experience. Visa arrangements for international visitors should be adequately described.

*The IUSBSE delegates will rate this section of all submitted proposal and rank them in order of overall quality. If x proposals are being evaluated, the highest rated Administrative Section will receive 3x points, the second highest 3x-3 points etc.*

### **Economic and Political Considerations**

The purpose of this section is to allow IUSBSE to evaluate the economic viability of the Applicant and the Applicant's plans to reduce the registration costs through fundraising and government/industry participation. IUSBSE will rate proposals higher if the applicant can demonstrate that WBC is important for the host country or host city as evidenced by government cost sharing. IUSBSE will also rate proposals higher if the applicant can demonstrate the collaboration with a vibrant sector of biomedical industries. To ensure that WBC is fiscally secure, a range of co-funding strategies are important. Proposals showing fiscal viability of the proposed WBC through multiple funding sources will be highly rated.

*The IUSBSE delegates will rate this section of all submitted proposal and rank them in order of overall quality. If x proposals are being evaluated, the highest rated Economic Section will receive 2x points, the second highest 2x-2 points etc.*

### **Potential risks to WBC**

The selection for WBC2028 will take place in 2023, a full 5 years before the event. This requires a detailed risk analysis over several years to ensure that the proposed location of WBC is exposed to as few risks as possible. Almost all risks can be evaluated. While nobody can predict the exact time of an earthquake, some locations are more prone to earthquakes than others. The Applicant is strongly encouraged to consider all factors that could potentially impact WBC2028 in a negative way. This includes but is not limited to the potential for earthquakes, weather-related calamities, the likelihood of military activity in neighboring countries, labor disputes, and crime or political unrest in the host city. Proposals that describe these risk factors and provide well-considered contingency plans will be rated highest.

*The IUSBSE delegates will rate this section of all submitted proposal and rank them in order of overall quality. If x proposals are being evaluated, the highest rated section will receive x points, the second highest x-1 points etc.*

### **Scientific Value of WBC**

While it is premature to provide a detailed program for WBC2028 at this time, it is important that Applicants describe their scientific vision for WBC2028. It is important that Applicants demonstrate that they can create a program that will address the needs of a large proportion of the global biomaterials community. Applicants should also consider how they can distinguish WBC2028 from the World TERMIS conference. A very important evaluation criterion is the level of innovative features that the Applicants can introduce to make WBC2028 noteworthy and different from other meetings.

International collaboration is an important aspect of WBC. Applicants should demonstrate how abstract review will be conducted to ensure international participation. Use of the International College of Fellows in abstract review, selection of key speakers and general program input will increase the positive ranking of the proposal. A well-written description of the International Advisory Committee and its function and authority will also increase the ranking of the proposal.

*The IUSBSE delegates will rate this section of all submitted proposal and rank them in order of overall quality. If  $x$  proposals are being evaluated, the highest rated section will receive  $2x$  points, the second highest  $2x-2$  points etc.*

### **Partnering Arrangements for collaborating societies**

For the first time, IUSBSE allows two member societies to jointly propose to host WBC. Since such partnering arrangements are new, it is important to describe these arrangements in great detail. It is important to note that proposals of two collaborating societies are not preferred over proposals by one single society. To receive a high rating, collaborative proposals should describe in detail the arrangements made between the leading partner society (defined as the society in control of the venue and host city) and the supporting society partner. To receive a high rating, the proposal must also provide a compelling reason and rationale for the partnership and explain how this partnership can enhance both societies. For practical reasons, it seems that partnering arrangements between societies that are in close geographic proximity will be higher rated than societies that far from each other. An outstanding and well-described partnership will definitely enhance the overall rating of a partnering proposal as compared to a single society proposal. On the other hand, a poorly described partnership that does not seem to be compelling can reduce the overall rating of the partnering proposal as compared to a single society proposal.

*No points will be given to this section since not all proposals will be partnering proposals.*

### **Final composite ranking of proposals**

In the final step, the total number of points received by each proposal will be added up to obtain a numerical ranking of all proposals. This numerical ranking is then modified by taking partnering arrangements into account. As outlined above, outstanding partnering arrangements can enhance the composite ranking of a proposal.

Finally, the geographic location of the proposed WBC relative to its two immediate predecessor is considered. IUSBSE has made the decision to encourage the rotation of WBCs among three geographic areas: North and South America, Europe, and Australasia. IUSBSE tries to

discourage that successive WBCs take place within the same area. For this discussion, the following societies are regarded as being part of Australasia: India, Korea, Taiwan, China, Japan, Australasia. The following societies are regarded as part of North and South America: Canada, USA and Latin America. European societies are organized under the umbrella of the European Society for Biomaterials and will be part of Europe.

Upon conclusion of the discussion, a final composite ranking of all proposals will be generated by majority vote of all IUSBSE delegates. The proposal with the highest composite ranking will be first to be offered to host WBC2028. The proposal with the second highest ranking will be the Follow-up Applicant. In case the first Applicant refuses to accept the offer or subsequent events make it impossible for the first Applicant to complete the organization of WBC, the offer to host WBC will be transferred to the Follow-up Applicant.

---

Example of a Table of Points for a group of 4 proposals

Admin section:	Maximum 4 points for the highest rated section
Host City, Travel and Facilities:	Maximum 12 points for the highest rated section
Economic & Political Considerations:	Maximum 8 points for the highest rated section
Potential risks to WBC:	Maximum 4 points for the highest rated section
Scientific Value of WBC:	Maximum 8 points for the highest rated section

If a particular proposal is highest rated in every single section, it could receive a theoretical maximum of 36 points.