



# NCP4MISSIONS

## NCP4Missions

### Network of National Contact Points for the five EU Missions (G.A. 101121092)

#### FAQs Collection - FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

This document brings together the contents of the Q&A sessions that took place during the [Info Day](#) held by the European Commission on 25 and 26 April 2024.

This publication reflects only the authors' views – the EU Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. Therefore, for more information and details please refer to the [Funding & Tender Portal](#) and read the topic text carefully.

## Table of Contents

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01.....	8
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-01: Rethinking urban spaces towards climate neutrality.....	8
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-02: Zero-pollution cities.....	9
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-03: Mobility Management Plans and Behavioural Change.....	12
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-04: Integrated peri-urban areas in the transition towards climate neutrality.....	12
General questions.....	15
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01.....	22
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-01: Bringing available and actionable solutions for climate adaptation to the knowledge of the regions and local authorities.....	22
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-02: Bringing together the national level with the engaged regional and local levels (multi-level governance).....	24
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-03: Develop and refine outcome indicators to measure progress on climate resilience at national, regional and local levels, including knowledge and feedback developed from the Mission.....	28
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-04: Research the complex interplay between the climate and biodiversity crises towards more systemic approaches and solutions.....	28
HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-05: Improve design for transformative approaches and build local capacity for implementation of available solutions focused on climate adaptation.....	30

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-06: Demonstration of approaches to improve bankability of solutions by design, addressing the co-benefits (mitigation and adaptation) to improve revenues streams .....31

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-07: Demonstration of solutions specifically suited to rural areas and small/ medium size population local communities .....33

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-08: Demonstration of approaches by regions and local authorities focused on increasing climate resilience of the most vulnerable social groups (just climate resilience) ..... 36

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-09: Systemic and cross-sectoral solutions for climate resilience, tailored to the local needs of regions and local authorities ..... 36

General questions.....37

HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01 .....40

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01: Co-creating solutions for soil health in living labs .....40

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02: Living labs in urban areas for healthy soils..... 42

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-03: Towards a dynamic monitoring system to assess status and spatiotemporal changes of soil erosion at European scale .....44

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-05: Soils health pollinators and hey ecosystem functions.....44

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-07: Development of high special-resolution monitoring approaches and geographically-explicit registry for carbon farming .....45

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-09: Assessment of Soil Health in Africa ....48

General Questions..... 50

HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01..... 54

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-01: European Blue Parks – Offshore marine protected areas ..... 54

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-02: Danube river basin lighthouse – Protection and restoration of migratory fish habitats..... 56

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-04: Science for Community – Building the marine Citizen Science data network of the future to valorise data coming from the ocean and increase engagement ..... 57

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-05: Our Blue Future – Co-designing a future vision of a restored ocean and water system in the EU by 2030 and 2050 ..... 59

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-02-01: Community-led actions to restore our ocean, seas and waters..... 59

    HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-02-02: Support for the Coalition of waterfront cities, regions and islands for Mission Ocean and Waters..... 63

HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01 ..... 64

    HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-01: Exploiting the potential of secondary bio-based products..... 64

    HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-02: New governance models for the co-design and co-construction of public spaces in neighbourhoods by communities ..... 66

    HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-03: Setting up a New European Bauhaus hub for results and impact..... 72

General questions..... 75

HORIZON-MISS-2024-CANCER-01..... 81

When does the Quality of Life Cluster plan to meet ? is the meeting open to external audiences ?..... 81

Where and when can we get the blueprints for the ECPDC and UNCAN? 81

How does the Cancer Mission relate to the Europe Beating Cancer Plan? 82

Is there a website with more information about the Cancer Mission implementation plan? ..... 83

When will the Cancer Mission 2024 specific calls open and when will they close? ..... 83

We have another H2020 project in the Cancer Survivorship: AI for Wellbeing cluster. How do we synergize with the QoL cluster? ..... 83

01-03 Could you explain in more detail what exactly "written commitment from regions" means? .....84

For cancer-01-01, does this call expect the consortium to develop the UNCAN platform from scratch based on the blueprint to be published?... 85

For topic 01-05 what is the definition of "late" ? Are we talking about 2 years? 5-10 years? ..... 85

Can charities participate in topic 5 on late AYA cancer effects understanding ? ..... 86

How should policy makers receive the test programmes for early detection of heritable cancers? ..... 87

I saw a reference to that the application could be 70 pages. Is it the same for all topics? ..... 87

In the CSA for pragmatic clinical trials funded by charities, what is the minimum expected budget commitment per call (total)? ..... 88

It is necessary to deploy the ECPDC information portal also for the virtual assistant to support quality of life of cancer survivors?..... 88

01-04 is there a minimum number of charities that should be involved? And what is defined as across europe?..... 89

Where can we find information on other UNCAN initiatives apart from 4.UNCAN project?..... 90

As a small cancer charity, how can we best get involved? By applying, but also how can we best support researchers in our country to apply? ..... 90

May you please clarify the targeted age group within the definition of AYA? ..... 91

01-03 regarding AYA, only one exclusive AYA specific will be funded? What about the others ? Interested in mixed population ages or non-AYA at all? ..... 92

Is there no topic dedicated to early TRL levels 1-4 ? ..... 92

01-04:should the two calls be on both rare cancer and OS <50% or can it be one on rare cancer and one on OS <50%? ..... 93

Can individual PIs apply for any of the topics? ..... 93

Is the AYA topic focus limited to poorly understood cancers? ..... 93

What is the page limit for the applications? ..... 94

Do we have to integrate early detection methods also for late AYA effects in topic 4 ? ..... 94

01-04: how detailed should the pragmatic calls be defined already? ..... 95

Is it necessary to support pragmatic clinical trials with a network of registered charities or can others participate as well? ..... 95

01-03 how long is the project period? ..... 96

How does 6 calls synergize with current EU4Health actions ? ..... 96

01-03 piloting partners (eg hospitals) suffice for regional commitment or regional authority to apply tests to general population needed? ..... 96

Is the dialogue towards the national cancer nodes limited to digital platforms or can national infrastructures be included? ..... 97

## Versioning and History of Changes

Version	Date	Contributor	Description
<b>v.2</b>	<b>18/07/2024</b>	<b>APRE, MCID, ETAG</b>	

## HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01

### HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-01: Rethinking urban spaces towards climate neutrality

#### Question 1

Should the proposal address all challenges in both energy and mobility?  
When addressing energy or mobility challenges can we mix both categories or do we need to stick to all four energy and all four mobility challenges?

#### Answer 1

In this topic we have two main areas of interventions: one really related to relocation of urban space and redesign of infrastructure which both cover energy and mobility and there is a second area of intervention related to Dynamic curb-side management which is mostly focusing on Mobility, so both areas should be covered but having said that in the first area of intervention there are eight total research actions four for mobility and four for energy and the one related to mobility or energy should be covered so it's either the mobility ones or the energy one which will be covered and you should cover also the other one on curb side management having said that in particular in the mobility area a lot of related activities are related also to energy, when we speak about for example electromobility.

The energy and Mobility parts, some of them, are totally connected to each other so it's a little bit artificial actually even to separate them, so the key point is indeed that you cover four areas and then in reality they will be mixing easily or going across the energy versus Mobility border.



**HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-02: Zero-pollution cities****Question 1**

Are the domains air, soil and water all required or is it possible to focus on one domain?

**Answer 2**

If we look at the expected outcomes for instance what is listed if you have the list of the different types of pollution what it says is air, water soil and slash or noise pollution, so in that sense it's an and - or that being said what might be useful in your reflection is to think how you can add most value with what you do so what kind of proposal if you look at the outcomes and the scope would add most value also in in this sense but it's an and - or in in the text.

**Question 2**

Is source apportionment emphasized (vs. expected outcomes: “methods for determining the source of air pollutants at urban level”)?

**Answer 2**

The term source apportionment which is one that is used for instance in the context of air quality; so determining the sources means “source apportionment”. So in that sense the term source proportion is what is meant there.

**Question 3**

How many pollution streams need to be included in this topic on zero pollution cities? will the EC fund one proposal per type of emission?

### Answer 3

In the expected outcomes it is said “**and...or**” in the list of different types of emissions so “**and... or**”.

On the second question whether there would be a funding for one proposal per type of emission, the answer is “[it]depends on the proposals we get what will be chosen and on the merits of those proposals. It is expected about four projects and that coincides with the number of different pollution types that you see in the list, so I understand where the question comes from but my understanding is it would depend on the merits of the projects. So we can consider that we could have two projects addressing the same type of emission even though it would be nice to have the whole coverage of the of the topic in the projects that are being selected. So again it will depend very much on the quality of those proposals that are submitted.

### Question 4

Do you emphasize more the methods and tools for “assessing exposure” or the “health impact assessments”?

### Answer 4

These two are intrinsically linked and so there is not necessarily an emphasis more on one than the other, because basically exposure to pollution is what leads to health impacts. So if you want to assess impacts exposure is involved in this so I don't think you can put that apart and say one is more important than the other and there's no emphasis stronger on one side or the other, both are just linked simply.

### **Question 5**

Projects funded under this topic should involve at least two cities? Is it a benefit to have more than two cities?

### **Answer 5**

It really depends on the proposal and what you're planning to do. You should look at what you're planning to do and what makes sense. Would it add value to have one city or the other would it add value to do it with two specific cities three four however many? It depends on what you do. There is not a clear answer that more is better or less good it depends really on the proposal and of course whatever you do explain it well why you have made that choice, why you have gone for two cities three cities or whatever you have gone for also possibly which cities you have gone for, because there can be in terms of pollution very differing situations in different local circumstances which then might lead for instance for this to be more replicable or not so just the reasoning for whatever you do as a choice there would be important to explain.

### **Question 6**

Are actual abatement actions to be also delivered through this topic?

### **Answer 6**

No, doesn't have to be the case but of course depending on what you do you might be working in conjunction with actions that are being taken; for instance if you look at the exploration of the effectiveness of dynamic abatement strategies by monitoring changes in pollution levels you might do that with an action that is being taken but that would not necessarily have to be an action that without this project wouldn't have been taken.

### HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-03: Mobility Management Plans and Behavioural Change

#### Question

Can local transport Authority be member of the Consortium instead of the city itself?

#### Answer

Local transport authorities are of course members that we encourage also to apply

and be part of the Consortium, instead of the city itself I would say no because. What we had in mind when designing and writing the topic was that coordination usually happens at city's level and we want the authority to have a good overview to see the missing links and to have an integrated urban planning happening and this is usually the city who is in charge of that, therefore I encourage you to be part of the consortium but instead of a city I would say no.

### HORIZON-MISS-2024-CIT-01-04: Integrated peri-urban areas in the transition towards climate neutrality

#### Question 1

What is the definition of peri-urban?

#### Answer 1

In the topic we refer to regions that lie at the outskirts of the urban area where urban and rural meet. There are generally zones characterized of a mixture of functions and of an agglomeration not in a very organized way of different activities, you should not think necessarily at entities that have a certain administrative or a geographical limit, but these are territories

where you should think at the function part, so is this interface between rural and urban. These are areas that are often under high pressure from the urban core where there is this uncontrolled and uneven urban expansion, where you also have in terms of demographics a mixture of populations: there can be residents that are there for a long time accustomed to a certain way of living that is more rural and then you have some new dwellers that are coming from an urban environment. [There are also many challenges in terms of transport] where you have all kinds of infrastructure scattered over a large territory.

There is a kind of a way to explain what kind of peri-urban we are looking into if you look at the scope of the topic in the first paragraph following the scope you have a brief presentation of what we understand by peri-urban in this specific topic.

## **Question 2**

To what level need each of the four requirements be addressed? Hard to do with all cities with that budget. Can aspects be done by only one city in a project ?

## **Answer 2**

From the first page it is clearly written that only two of the areas that are listed which are four should be addressed by a proposal, so this means you can choose for mobility and governance or you can choose for industry and governance or for mobility and energy it's up to you to decide which one depending on the topic that you want cover best. Then the topic also mentions that at least three cities, at least three lead Urban, peri-urban areas and at least three replicator peri-urban areas. If we consider only two of the domains then it is clearly written that three lead cities and or peri-urban and three replicator cities so hard to do with all the cities. So, if only

with two domains it would be possible to cover three cities or peri-urban areas.

Concerning the second part of the question “can aspects be done by only one city in a project”? The topic is clear three so : no.

### **Question 3**

Can a peri-urban municipality be selected as a twin to a neighbouring city that is among the 112 Cities or should the twin be in another country?

### **Answer 3**

[...]I think yes it can be but always keep in mind that overall the proposal should provide a certain geographical diversity and not limits only to a region or to a country.

### **Question 4**

Regarding the MoUs: Should we somehow take into account in the proposal?

### **Answer 4**

Indeed this is a condition, you should be taken into account considering that at some moment during the project lifetime perhaps you will need to dedicate some time and resources to see how this memorandum of understanding can be signed and prepared, but it's just a condition so this is not the main requirement of the topic. (So it should receive not too much importance not too less importance but of course yes it's good to mention that you foresee some way of collaborating with the mission platform).

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

### Question 1

Are the topics open to all city or is there a restriction to the 112 cities selected for

the EU Mission on Climate Neutral and Smart Cities?

### Answer 1

There is no restriction. What we have in the cities Mission Work Program is a program that is really there to support cities that commit to the objective of the mission and that is something that we spell out very clearly in the introduction of the Work Program. We are happy to have cities participating in any of the activities even if they are not part of the 112 cities of the Cities Mission and that, as long as the cities that will be participating in those actions commit to the objective, all cities are eligible because this is our objective in the Green Deal to have Europe as a continent climate neutral by 2050. So basically if you are a city and you commit to one or two or the first one or the second one of the objective of the mission you are eligible so there is no restriction to the calls that we have to the 112 cities that are directly participating in the mission, all the other cities are eligible as long as they subscribe to the objective of the mission. In some calls specific conditions where we say that for instance “we need to have so many cities coming from the mission” and the reason for that is not that we want to restrict the call to only those cities that are participating in the mission but we want to take advantage of the fact that those cities are front runners, are in the lead and they have already a lot of experience and know-how that they can share to other cities; so that's the reason why we in these calls usually specify that we would like to see so many cities coming from the mission participating in the Consortium but it's not an exclusivity condition other cities are welcome.

## Question 2

Who are you expecting the applications to come from within the cities? City councils/Government systems? Universities and research organizations?

## Answer 2

[It] depends very much on the type of the topic that we are talking about but, it goes without saying, that when we are referring to the participation of cities we have in mind city authorities which could be city councils or governments, local governments, local authorities, and of course it goes without saying particularly for those topics that have a specific research and innovation dimension (like the RIA or IA) to some extent as well universities and research organizations should be considered as part of the consortium.

So, it depends very much on the content of your proposal but it goes without saying that all those entities should be welcome and participate in the projects that are going to be prepared to respond to the call that we have in the work program.

[Some specificities] for the topic on Urban Space Management it will be important to have City Authority involved but to have also service providers, so from the industry as well but also infrastructure management, as we are re-using the infrastructure for different use. It would be very important to have all these entities involved in the proposal.

Also for topic four in many cases these topics intend to establish these local Partnerships between different local stakeholders that are relevant for the specific topic and to kind of learn them how they can better cooperate sure and to engage towards different solutions and to implement together these solutions. So city councils of course should be in the lead and so on but then this definitely has to be complemented by all the others that are there



because it doesn't make it possible and sometime citizens as well which can be involved

in the different applications.

### **Question 3**

Considering the request of having at least one or two of the 112 cities on board for all topics, can the same city participate in more City Mission topics?

### **Answer 3**

There is no rule that will prevent cities to participate in more than one proposal and more than one project. [There are a lot of very active cities that are participating in in many research activities supported in Horizon Europe and before in Horizon 2020].

The only thing that those cities will need to be attentive to is: their own capacity to participate in several projects. Bearing in mind that the Departments that are responsible for the preparation and implementation of the climate city contracts are usually limited resources, so if they start participating in quite many projects they have to make sure that they have the staff and the manpower to do so. But in principle there is nothing preventing cities to participate in in more than one topic.

[Furthermore] geographical balance is also something that needs to be taken into account.

### **Question 4**

The work Mission platform (currently managed by NZC) is doing is very relevant and impactful are there ideas to increase resources to deliver even more impact and support to cities?

**Answer 4**

Yes, we have in mind to provide additional resources but not in this work program. In the upcoming work programs 25, 26 and 27.

The mission platform was actually launched as part of the Horizon 2020 Green Deal call that was prepared in 2019, so that was the first tranche of funding that we provided to the mission platform and then since that first project that we had in Horizon 2020 we had two tranches of funding that were added to the resources that the mission platform has to support the cities of the mission through what we call the framework partnership agreement so we have two specific Grant agreements Horizon Europe that were added the support that was initially provided by the mission platform.

In the work program 2024 we did not include an additional tranches of funding through a specific Grant agreement so all the activities that the mission platform presently manage (namely the pilot projects the twinning activities the technical assistance to the to the cities through the city advisers, all the activities related to financial advisories through the upcoming Capital Hub own) are covered through the specific Grant agreements that have been supported in Horizon Europe in the first work programs 21-22 and 23-24, so no additional support to

the mission platform in the Work World 2024.

Having said that, we are also working on the preparation of the next work program 2025 and we are also reflecting on what type of support will be provided in the work program 26- 27 so we could not exclude and we have in mind more specifically for the work program 2025 to have an activity that will top up the existing activities of the mission platform, so indeed we will be very likely increasing resources to the mission platform; so that they deliver on what needs to be done at the time.

When we talk about the work program 2025 we are actually talking about activities that will be implemented very likely at the end of 2025 beginning of 2026 and it's clear that the type of activities that will need to be provided by the mission platform at that time will not be the same as we have today, we are talking about still very much technical assistance to City to help them prepare their City contracts in two years time or in one year and a half time we will be in the deployment of the Climate City contracts, in the implementation of the Climate City contract so the focus will be more on, for instance, the financial advisory services than on helping cities develop their strategy for climate neutrality.

So we will have to adapt the type of support that we'll be providing to the mission platform in the coming few years to the needs of the Cities, of the mission.

### **Question 5**

Are there any plans to foster real collaboration with the Adaptation to Climate Change Mission? How synergies could be made real? Maybe through National Platform?

### **Answer 5**

[There are] plenty of plans to increase [the] collaboration with the Adaptation to Climate Change Mission and the reason for that is that there are real complementarities between what is being done by the climate adaptation Mission and what is being done by the city's Mission; to give an example, in the Climate City contracts- that have been prepared by the cities so far that have been submitted- there are references to climate adaptation activities because in many cases it's very difficult (in a strategy which is focusing on mitigation) to ignore the climate adaptation dimension.

So there are many actions that are covered in the Climate City contract that actually relate to climate adaptation and that makes perfect sense to

explain also other opportunities of collaboration that we have had with the climate adaptation mission in the previous work program; we had a joint topic with climate adaptation and this happened to be one of the most popular topic that we had in the cities Mission work program, precisely because it addressed a real need from the cities to combine and to address in a complimentary way the requirements of the climate adaptation mission to adapt to the new climatic conditions and the requirements of the city's Mission which is about reduction of greenhouse gas emission, and climate mitigation. So we have done so in the past this collaboration and we will do it in the future. [For instance, having some common activities or to have a coordinated approach when it comes to financial advisory services, it's clear that for from the perspective of an investors the fact that a project is linked to climate mitigation or climate adaptation does not make too much sense] We could very much consider that in the future the activities of the capital hub -for instance that we have in the that- we'll be launching in a few months and that we have in the city's Mission could also serve the needs of projects that are more related to the Climate adaptation Mission, but this is something that is a reflection that is ongoing and I certainly would not exclude that in the future as for the national platform the same goes in the sense that there are a number of national platforms, National networks that have been established in a number of member states that make build bridges with what is done in the climate adaptation Mission and this is also something that we are supporting.

### **Question 6**

Does EC plan to offer extensive financial tools by the EBI and EU funding to facilitate urgently needed local investment in decarbonization measures?

### **Answer 6**

The support that we are providing through the EBI to the cities using the existing financial advisory services that the EBI has, like the EBI advisory

services and we have it in the work program a reference to Elena which is also a program that is being managed by the EBI and which focus on energy and transport.

Those tools and those services that are provided by the EBI are services that we have topped up through the work program 2024 with a budget of 19 million. Our intention is indeed to continue this support of financial advisory services, so that we can really address the needs of the cities that will come up with their clima City contracts.

At the moment we have provisions in the mission platform and through the top up support that we are providing to the EBI to limited number of cities but that number will increase necessarily, hopefully, we will have this year 100 Climate City contracts that will be submitted for review; so that all cities will have submitted their clima City contract and that means that potentially starting next year and after that there will be sizeable number of projects that will require some support to become bankable and will be ready for investment. So this is something that we are indeed committed to do this reinforced support to financial advisory services that they may come from the EBI or other channels.

### **Question 7**

If a specific city government is part of the mission cities but not its Metropolitan Authority, can the Metropolitan Authority be counted as Mission City too?

### **Answer 7**

No, the Metropole Authority can participate but they can not be considered as the

Mission City itself. So there is nothing preventing Metropolitan authorities participating in projects but they would not be considered as necessarily a Mission City.

### Question 8

As all the projects founded under the different topics have to formalize their collaboration with the city platform through an MoU (pre-requisite): When the consortium has to prepare this MoU? Before the GAP or after the GAP?

### Answer 8

After the GAP. How much time do they have depends on the project and the cooperation with the mission platform. It can happen within the next 6 months following the start of the project. So it's after the official start of the project

## HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01

**HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-01: Bringing available and actionable solutions for climate adaptation to the knowledge of the regions and local authorities**

### Question 1

The duration of project is about 2 years how flexible can this duration be?

### Answer 1

We need to really always reflect what is written in the text. [The text] says that “it is expected that the project will have a duration of **about two years**”, so already in this “*about two years*” you would find a level of flexibility that is embedded in the text. Of course, the duration should fit the proposal and should be duly justified. So within this “about two years” you would find a certain level of flexibility. In any case it's preferable according to the text to be centred around this time frame.

### Question 2

Do you expect to have regions in the consortia?

### Answer 2

We don't expect or prescribe. The colleagues who prepare a proposal choose the best way to reach the objective of the call and it's quite clear that

since the mission is about bringing transformative change to the ground, to the regions that are part of the mission and the local entities you will conclude yourself whether it's better or not to have a region in or not. Some topics are more on the knowledge side others are really on demonstration but we have learned that for effective transformative change involving the end users from the onset in the thinking is quite helpful.

[Moreover] With the idea to always considering the text, in this case it is mentioned in the topic that “regions local authorities are the target group of the proposed activities” for the two topics and [as such strictly replying to the question] they're not expected to participate directly to the consortia but they should receive the services by the successful project of course.

### **Question 3**

How can the regions and localities assure that they will maintain the solution in place for the future? Any additional commitment to be provided?

### **Answer 3**

The text is not explicit asking for instance a letter of support or for the region to come and contribute in financing but surely those could be ways of showing such a commitment. So the text is not prescribing how and will be evaluated as also part probably of the credibility of the proposal. We have seen in the past that the letter of support could be a way to do it but it could be a way of doing it's not the only way of doing. Normally, local and Regional authorities being public bodies are allowed 100% reimbursement rate, but nobody prohibits people also to ask less than what the maximum reimbursement could be; so there are ways but there is not a preferred way which has been indicated so [these are] two ideas but that's could be done like that or in different ways.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-02: Bringing together the national level with the engaged regional and local levels (multi-level governance)**

### **Question 1**

Do you expect to have regions in the consortia?

### **Answer 1**

We don't expect or prescribe. The colleagues who prepare a proposal choose the best way to reach the objective of the call and it's quite clear that since the mission is about bringing transformative change to the ground, to the regions that are part of the mission and the local entities you will conclude yourself whether it's better or not to have a region in or not. Some topics are more on the knowledge side others are really on demonstration but we have learned that for effective transformative change involving the end users from the onset in the thinking is quite helpful.

[Moreover] With the idea to always considering the text, in this case it is mentioned in the topic that regions local authorities are the target group of the proposed activities for the two topics and [as such strictly replying to the question] they're not expected to participate directly to the consortia but they should receive the services by the successful project of course.

### **Question 2**

When talking about National hubs in member states is it restricted to EU member states or can Associated countries also have hubs?

### **Answer 2**

In this case the normal rules of Horizon Europe apply, so nowhere in the text you can find a specific reference to the fact that services and the benefits of the national hubs (and in general of the topic) would only be referred to the member state. Of course when it comes to the specific activities and the reference to the (let's say) policy elements in connection to the implementation of the climate law, in that case, of course, that would apply as a benefit specifically for the member states that are under the scope of the climate law, but in principle the support and the national hubs can also apply for associated countries of Horizon Europe. Furthermore, the



associated countries are very important in the in the mission. They provide also political support from outside the EU strictly but their interest for the mission is appreciated because they also bring knowledge, they bring experience uh I'm thinking about (e.g. the support that we get also from Norway as one example but there are other ones and of course they are aware that they are eligible to Horizon Europe funding but not to funding that is strictly uh limited to EU member states. In other EU funding programs the funding is limited to EU member states but these Associated countries to Horizon Europe know very well and therefore they have to find specific ways to combine the funding from different instruments EU and Associated countries funding instruments and instruments that they have at the national level.

### **Question 3**

Regarding the National Adaptation Hubs: is there a minimum optimum number of hubs?

### **Answer 3**

Referring to the topic text, there is an optimum number of hubs. Indeed in the topic text it's written that there will be one per country. The idea here really is to avoid inefficiencies and try to tailor the hubs within the national context, the best way to do so of course is to have one Hub that would be centralizing the services that the national hubs would give to the multi-level governance element of the topic; so it is one per relevant country.

### **Question 4**

The twinning scheme is it similar to the one in the city's Mission?

### **Answer 4**

I wouldn't know exactly how the twinning scheme is similar to the one in the city's Mission.

What we can mention here is within the context of this topic, you would find there in the text the fact that the national hubs and their specific twinning schemes that is going to be operationalized within those hubs can also address "some elements when it comes to the Nexus between adaptation

mitigations on the basis of the type of multi-level governance that you would find in the in the specific country that we are that we are talking about”; so in a way we cannot mention that it is similar as such but we can certainly say that there might be some opportunities for connecting this exercises to a certain extent to what it's already happening with the city's mission , in a way of increasing synergies also in the context of the multi level governance with a system mission that is of course very much close to the broader objectives the Green Deal and what we do in Mission Adaptation to climate change.

I take the opportunity of this question to say two things: 1) we will go in further details about this question and the information will be placed in the funding and tenders portal 2) as applicants or potential applicants to the calls, the synergies between the different mission is a very important issue to consider in particular **synergy with the climate neutral and smart cities missions** are of course very large in urban areas scientifically it doesn't make sense to address only mitigation without touching upon adaptation to climate change this is just common sense and therefore it's really possible for urban areas to combine in their cities contracts provision on mitigation and on adaptation to climate change and, therefore I invite you to also look (of course) at the calls of the cities missions and see whether there are synergies; the same applies also with other missions such as the Soil mission and the Ocean Mission in particular for coastal urban areas for instance but also for rural areas there are also synergies that can be exploited across the Coast. There are also large synergies with the European Bauhaus Facility and their calls.

I invite you to have a look across all the relevant calls because that will increase the number of opportunities that you may say and also increase the impact of the activities themselves if you are integrating all the relevant components of the calls that we are proposing.

## Question 5

The duration of project is about 2 years how flexible can this duration be?

### **Answer 5**

We need to really always reflect what is written in the text. [The text] says that “it is expected that the project will have a duration of **about two years**”, so already in this “*about two years*” you would find a level of flexibility that is embedded in the text. Of course the duration should fit the proposal and should be duly justified. So within this “about two years” you would find a certain level of flexibility. In any case it's preferable according to the text to be centred around this time frame.

### **Question 6**

One hub per country is expected: should it be in all member states or in number of them? And if so on how many member states should it be?

### **Answer 6**

All member states but the fact is the numbers of hubs at the end will be less than 27 member states because some of the member State already have an hub in place and the idea here is to bring to the member State what's needed; if they already have such structure there is no need and no scope for the applications and efforts. The goal is of course not to multiply the number of entities and create hubs for the sake of creating hubs or creating jobs, the goal is to have an infrastructure that helps in delivering towards the regions and the local entities. Hubs are helpful in this regard but it needs to remain efficient and the hub is mean not an end it's like the results platform, you certainly know that there are many knowledge and results platform, the platform is a mean and not an end to transfer knowledge to those who need to use it.

When we talk about National hubs the text is clear and it's defining this; the national hubs as task forces or working groups they're also defined as “light agile and flexible structure”, so I think this approach and the description should guide the Proposal.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-03: Develop and refine outcome indicators to measure progress on climate resilience at national, regional and local levels, including knowledge and feedback developed from the Mission**

### **Question 1**

Should the framework and indicators be designed for the European scale or at local indicators which trans transferability fine as well?

### **Answer 1**

Here it says that this should be relevant for “national, regional and local level”, so that means that just local level is not good enough. If you feel that you need to expand on this question please contact the research inquiry service or your National Contact Point.

### **Question 2**

Does the project need to ensure indicator data availability beyond the funded period?

### **Answer 2**

If we look at the text it is not specified, but [I think] here what is more important is really to recall like the essence of this topic; and the essence of this topic is really to move research forward into how to measure climate resilience and so, it's much more about developing and putting in place how to measure that as outcome indicators than just having something that is up and running because we don't think it is the case at this stage. So it's not specified in the text but of course if we want the lifetime of the project to and the project to be more impactful it would be better of course if it's beyond the lifetime of the project.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-04: Research the complex interplay between the climate and biodiversity crises towards more systemic approaches and solutions**

### **Question 1**

Can case studies being investigated occur in non -signatory regions? Or should focus be in signatory regions authorities only?

### **Answer 1**

The signatures are an ideal test because they've shown willingness to work on adaptation and willingness to contribute towards the mission but this is not limited to them so it can be on other regions.

**Question 2**

Is there any recommendation on the number of case studies to be used ?

**Answer 2**

There is nothing in the text about that, apart from the fact that we need case studies on both the effect of climate on biodiversity and other sectors and the effect of biodiversity on climates, but it's up to the proposal to put forward what they think is the most valuable or the most logical or the best number.

**Question 3**

With “risk and maladaptation” do you mean possible negative impacts of solutions on climate or biodiversity or maladaptation/ leakage across space?

**Answer 3**

Maladaptation is quite well defined in the scientific literature and risk and maladaptation it's adverse effect on climate itself on other components of the environment or on society. Please check the definition in IPCC document.

**Question 4**

Can the demonstrations be based in the UK as an associated country?

**Answer 4**

UK Partners, now that UK is associated back to Horizon Europe are fully eligible partners and so they can really be partnered in the Consortium: They can be the place where demonstration can take place, they can be the leader in that Consortium.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-05: Improve design for transformative approaches and build local capacity for implementation of available solutions focused on climate adaptation**

### **Question 1**

Are the three regions localities mentioned supposed to be part of the consortia?

### **Answer 1**

The topic text states that “the finding should be presented and tested in at least three regions localities communities and that training module should be developed for them”, so that means that they do not necessarily need to be part of the consortia but if you want to include them in your proposal you can of course.

### **Question 2**

Is this topic aiming to create outputs to resemble what is available from Smart Specialization and Innovation agendas?

### **Answer 2**

The smart specialization strategy is at the root of the thinking in this area and the projects implemented through the missions are on the downstream deployment on the smart specialization strategy, so the goal of the project is not to fuel the strategy itself but more to deliver in the implementation of the strategy; that is the logic that is pursued and mainstream adaptation, of course this is indispensable.

### **Question 3**

How do you suggest to select the regions? A mix of maturities or just the best in class?

### **Answer 3**

There is nothing in the text about that but something to keep in mind is that inclusivity is really at the heart of the mission and this is exemplified by two or the three demos that are trying to target groups that are more traditionally left aside, and so with that in mind and in the spirit of the mission having a mix of maturities is also something that would be very much in the spirit of the mission. Clearly it is up to the proposal also to justify

why certain regions have been chosen more than others and the recently published EUCRA (European wide climate risk assessment report) shows where the impacts of climate change are going to be hitting the most so probably some reference also to who is most need could help to support the reasons why a certain proposal have made a certain choices so it's not that we can tell you how to choose the regions but any argument that actually can prove to the expert and you know vulnerability being one of the of the ways to choose could be considered and has been considered before one of the way to choose. [Please], have a look at the mission implementation plan which is the founding document of this Mission it's also re recalls the uh principle of the mission on how to be inclusive account for the vulnerable while progressing and if you need to progress you know you also need to involve the leaders because the mission is meant to be ahead um and test solutions that can be then replicated by others so it's an experiment on a voluntary basis and the political commitment and the willingness to move forward is a very important feature of the mission.

### **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-06: Demonstration of approaches to improve bankability of solutions by design, addressing the co-benefits (mitigation and adaptation) to improve revenues streams**

#### **Question 1**

What TRL should demonstrations be ?

#### **Answer 1**

TRL 6- 7 by the end of the project. [The goal is] moving a step further in making the solutions proof and possibly keeping that in operation after the end of the project. Being an Innovative approach so not just out of the Shelf deployment [...] so it should be very innovative.

#### **Question 2**

Cascading funding budget could be provided to regional and local authorities to participate in reality?

#### **Answer 2**

No, normally when we have cascading funding this is allowed by the call and we had in a couple of cases in the past under the mission this is already in the call text and it is part of the specific conditions that do apply so, in this case we have not put that as part of the specific conditions so normally the regional and the local authorities will be expected to come in the Consortium themselves.

### **Question 3**

Can an SMEs lead on this call, given that bringing in private investment is key?

### **Answer 3**

Yes, normally every everybody can be leading in a Consortium. [...] Actors being the private investors and actually deploying solutions for region and local authorities it will be very welcome. Normally, we have seen in the past that is maybe less obvious for partners which are not from the academic background, but it will be very welcome in such a case because this really seems to be that they are really the actors that need to be sitting on the leading side. So, participation is a requirement and, I think, if direct participation even becomes leading it will be possibly seen as a positive thing.

### **Question 4**

About the bankability: how can the demonstrations be physical?

### **Answer 4**

All the demonstration do require for some solutions to be implemented on the ground. So, here in terms of bankability the idea is that the solutions that will be implemented on the ground assures better bankability, because it combines different aspects like mitigation aspects; and therefore there is an easier way to secure financing by private sectors banking sectors and contributors. So, again, the idea is similar to the other project that's the solution is hitting the ground and bringing into the Consortium the private partners is a way to prove the bankability. So, it's not a theoretical exercise



as we have reminded the number of times is about implementation of Solutions on the ground.

We can also innovate in bankability, if we look at the criteria and we test criteria on by bankability on the ground with projects that are meant to be deployed. This is an interesting and Innovative experiment how will the EU Mission adaptation ensure that in all member States including urban areas and local Administration get sufficient attention on this urgent topic.

### **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-07: Demonstration of solutions specifically suited to rural areas and small/ medium size population local communities**

#### **Question 1**

Is it required to focus our approach and solution explicitly either on rural or small urban areas, can we include demo cases for both of them?

#### **Answer 1**

The disclaimer here is the published text is what counts. Look because there are the text is over different pages, what it says is “it's not exclusive in one or the other” it's actually again question of credibility can the proposal with the amount of budget that will be available and with the resources that we'll be able to deploy to actually identify reasonable demonstration places and replicator places in the minimum required three member states or Associated countries to actually address the challenge. So, if in some instances there are places where the rural area actually can also combine the small and medium sized population the call text as such does not forbid to do that. But, again, it's question of what will be done evaluated in terms of credibility of the work proposed vis à vis the resources deployed.

#### **Question 2**

Which solutions are we talking about mostly physical technical or also non-tangible solutions (e.g. governance, finance, capacity building etc.)

#### **Answer 2**

The call text normally says “solutions could include technological, social business related aspects or combination of those” and it goes to the fact

that we don't expect technical solutions only will make it in some cases maybe this is possible but in many cases we have seen that, actually, when we tackle climate preparedness there are other dimension including the social dimension in particular for topic like the 07 which really looks into also the social aspect; so it's very important indeed to have combination of those. It cannot be excluded only physical and only technical could be in the proposal but the expert will actually evaluate how that could potentially deliver to the ambition and to the scope that has been called out there (in the call text).

### **Question 3**

Can regions, which are in previously funded demonstration projects, apply again with different communities involved and solutions demonstrated?

### **Answer 3**

Normally there is a rule we cannot finance twice the same thing, so obviously proposal cannot just repropose exactly what has been financed in the context of another project; but on the other side what we're doing this year is very much targeting some specific communities. So, if a region has participated in a previous project which had a broader focus or a sectorial focus and now the same region comes back as demonstration place for a proposal which very much target what we are putting here as a target action there is nothing against it (clearly it will be also in the merit of the proposal evaluation whether by any coincidence it was exactly the same thing that was actually already financed because we cannot actually finance twice the same). Said that, I think that will even show that indeed those regions in need and those regions that we probably have seen also eventually signing the charter and really calling for help and support in accelerating climate preparedness probably are very serious because they really are in need on acting on different dimension so there is nothing against the same region coming back as long as the project is different than what has been already financed

#### Question 4

Regarding demonstrators: publication of papers is enough as objective/result of the project or some physical solutions are needed to be implemented?

#### Answer 4

These solutions need to be hitting the ground really having the region and local authorities being empowered to keep the solution in operation after the project, it is very much question of indeed seeing some solutions them physical or a combination of different elements but those solutions need to be hit in the ground. So, publication is allowed and will be welcome as dissemination of the experience but **publication of papers it cannot be the only result** of such project. So we look at tangible issues and, of course the scientific knowledge that is developed through this experiment should be subject of publication because it enhances knowledge on transformative change and can be then replicated in other areas in Europe and elsewhere in the world, but it's clear that we want to go through the mission beyond the usual remit of what research and innovation has been doing so far.

#### Question 5

Is the COP platform open to all EU mission project? And if yes, should the ongoing Mission projects use it?

#### Answer 5

Of course **it's open to all**. Mission Project can and should engage with the commit of practice. Charter signatories will have a dedicated space in future, also mission project will have a dedicated space. So all the missions project are welcome to join, and there is where the discussion and the connection between the project including in the context of the activities of the committee of practice namely for example the thematic working groups will continue to be and hopefully bring an added value also for the projects themselves.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-08: Demonstration of approaches by regions and local authorities focused on increasing climate resilience of the most vulnerable social groups (just climate resilience)**

### **Question 1**

Are you thinking of solutions in terms of change of welfare benefits and grants for “vulnerable communities” or are those not part of them?

### **Answer 1**

The solution we're looking for is not only a technical solution so other elements could be part of it and so it could be part of it of the solution as the call text is quite open and gives really the freedom of identifying what is needed to make sure that the vulnerable communities are [culture for ]. So whether that is with technical solutions or a combination of different dimension it's all allowed but it's very clear that social innovation is fully part of the solution. We cannot transform society at local level, regional level or national level or European level without combining technical solutions with profound economic and social changes and social Innovation. Literature on transformative change, the theory of change also is quite clear about that and of course all the proposals need to be science-based and be based on what literature is suggesting and what is not yet in the literature so that's how you can innovate.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-CLIMA-01-09: Systemic and cross-sectoral solutions for climate resilience, tailored to the local needs of regions and local authorities**

### **Question 1**

Which solutions are we talking about mostly physical technical or also non-tangible solutions (e.g. governance, finance, capacity building etc.)?

### **Answer 1**

The call text normally says “solutions could include technological, social business related aspects or combination of those” and it goes to the fact that we don't expect technical solutions only will make it, in some cases maybe this is possible, but in many cases we have seen that, actually, when we tackle climate preparedness there are other dimension including the

social dimension in particular for topic like the 07 which really looks into also the social aspect; so it's very important indeed to have combination of those. It cannot be excluded only physical and only technical could be in the Proposal but the expert will actually evaluate how that could potentially deliver to the ambition and to the scope that has been called out there (in the call text).

## Question 2

What is the TRL for demonstrations?

## Answer 2

Activities are expected to be at TRL 6 to 7 at the end of the project which is typical of what we indicate into Innovation action. There are demonstration activities that normally are paid under Horizon Europe but not the deployment of solutions, so I think, obviously, this is the reason why also the TRL level at the end the project is expected to reach level 7 but we are not talking here of the shell solution deployment so always a component of innovative angle is important there.

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

### Question 1

Is it still possible for a city or region to still become **Charter signatory**?

### Answer 1

The engagement through the charter is closed we actually launch it at the beginning of the mission and we had huge return versus what we were expecting ; we were targeting at least 150 region and local Authority and we had in a few month more than 300 subscribing, so due to also matching the effort and the support we can provide through the platform and through different specific actions of the mission towards the community that we have identified participants adhering to the chart that right now is not possible nevertheless. Maybe I did not underline it enough: it is not

necessary to be a charter signatory to participate to the call; I think it's very important to underline the demonstration places or the participation in the call do not need to be chartered signatories. If you are a research and academia and you don't know where to look for partners for Regions and local authorities that actually could play the role of demonstration places I think the our suggestion (but it's just our suggestion) is visit the mission website, visit the miss portal, use the channel of the mission because clearly there is already a group of region and local authority that actually have called for “please help us” to accelerate climate preparedness so those are ideal candidates but there is no legal obligation to work with them and that the call are not restricted to those that's very important information because we often get this question. The mission Charter was a way to connect to the regions and local entity to test their interest for the mission but we cannot discriminate and select only those but as you understand in this Mission if we work at the same time with all actors across Europe we can't show whether the mission is capable of accelerating transformative change with those regions and entities so we have limited the numbers of entities that could sign the charter but there are other ways to join the mission and support the mission through the application in the calls and being part of a Consortium is one and it's a very concrete way to join the mission and to support.

## **Question 2**

How can UK entities participate in these calls should they join other consortia?

## **Answer 2**

The UK is an Associated member to Horizon Europe and they can participate like any other Associated State.

## **Question 3**

Is there a limited maximum number of Partners of the same country?

## **Answer 3**

The minimum and criteria normally depending on the type of action. For a CSA typically one partner is sufficient. For Research and Innovation Action and Innovation actions normally we need minimum three partners from different member states now in our case anyhow we have underlined that we also want demonstration to come from at least three different regions in three different member states so we are actually putting a little bit more challenge there. That said, normally the topic text and the general rules of Horizon Europe prescribe minimum numbers there is nothing like a maximum numbers, there is however a maximum number of pages in the proposal and there is a maximum budget available so clearly there is also typically an evaluation by the expert evaluators of how commensurate is the scope of the work towards the ambition and towards the consortium that is proposed whether every partner in the Consortium has a role to play and. Normally there are also question about efficiency and we have seen before that two large consortia can also be quite inefficient because of managing cost being higher than the outcome. This give me the opportunity also to remind that the specificities of the mission calls are not sufficiently known to actors or potential applicants.

## HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01

### HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01: Co-creating solutions for soil health in living labs

#### Question 1

What indicators can be used to demonstrate the enhancement of soil health? Do you have those indicators in the topic?

#### Answer 1

It is mentioned that we already have indicators both in the submission implementation plan that was mentioned at the beginning, so you will find there a set of proposed indicators, but also in the proposal for the soil monitoring and resilience directive, the soil monitoring law, there is an annex with descriptors that are indicators you should also consider. In any case, depending on the focus of the living lab and the context, other indicators can also be proposed. However, we encourage applicants to really pay a lot of attention to these two initial sets of indicators.

#### Question 2

Living labs is a very generic concept. Where can we find a much more specific definition of what can be considered a soil health living lab?

#### Answer 2

I think the topic is quite explicit. I have already explained a bit when it comes, for example, to the number of sites, the regional and sub-regional approach, and the collaboration between the different living labs. So, I recommend you read the topic carefully, as well as the other frequently asked questions on these living labs, because I think we have already provided a lot of



information about our idea. In any case, we always leave some freedom to applicants to come up with good ideas and to make stronger proposals to address the expected outcomes that we have proposed for these topics.

### **Question 3**

Is there an expectation that the national contact points will facilitate connections between living labs in different countries?

### **Answer 3**

Well, I think it's not in principle their main role. For that, you have the Nations support project. They are organizing, they have a matchmaking tool, and they are organizing brokerage events and exchange networking activities. So, I think they are better positioned to provide that support to the living labs and to the applicants.

### **Question 4**

Is carbon farming included in this topic or out of scope?

### **Answer 4**

No, it's included. Topic 01 is a bottom-up topic, so it's possible to propose living labs focusing on carbon farming.

### **Question 5**

Regarding the proposal table of living labs, to what detail do applicants need to fill this table? Where can further instructions be found?

### **Answer 5**

We expect applicants to provide all the requested details in the table. The table is self-explanatory, but if there are questions, further questions can be submitted to the contact points provided.

## Question 6

Can we include African partners and work on soil health in Africa for living labs?

### Answer 6

Yes, in principle, African partners are eligible, and there is no limit for that.

## HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02: Living labs in urban areas for healthy soils

### Question 1

Shall projects enhance soil health also in urban areas in this topic, not only in topic 01-02?

### Answer 1

Not of course, not directly. So, I think it's a relevant question. You can include urban soils in topic one where relevant, but proposals focusing only on urban soils should be under topic 02. If relevant for the challenge that the topic is considering, such as pollution, sites or living labs in urban areas could be included, but in combination with other sites relevant for the challenge. However, if you are addressing only urban living labs, the topic is about that, whatever the challenge is, it should only be under topic 02.

### Question 2

To what extent can living labs already in existence be included, or do they need to be totally new?

### Answer 2

It depends. We have a definition of soil health living labs in the topic. First, it has to be assessed if the living lab corresponds to the definition. The idea

---

here is to create more living labs, so while something existing could be included, the primary goal is to create more living labs.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-03: Towards a dynamic monitoring system to assess status and spatiotemporal changes of soil erosion at European scale**

### **Question 1**

What type of stakeholders are expected to participate in the Soil Erosion Monitoring Network?

### **Answer 1**

So, we expect colleagues who are in the field and will monitor soil loss by different processes of soil erosion—water, wind, tillage erosion. Practically, they will estimate with visual assessments or will measure with plots in different pedoclimatic conditions across Europe and will give this input to the modellers who will develop this pan-European process-based model. So, we expect a large network for the first time of stakeholders who will measure or estimate with visual assessments or measure with plots soil erosion across Europe. It's expected to have some collaboration with living labs because, in living labs, those erosion processes can be somehow monitored. But the call itself does not establish living labs.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-05: Soils health pollinators and hey ecosystem functions**

### **Question 1**

Is this topic only focused on improving knowledge on pollinators or also on other insects spending part of their life cycle in or on the soil?

### **Answer 1**

We expect to include in general insect species spending part of their life cycle in or on the soil, but with a special focus on pollinators, particularly ground-nesting pollinators. However, it will cover in general all insect species that could spend part of their life cycle in or on the soil.

## Question 2

Can local authorities be part of the consortium?

## Answer 2

Well, I suppose that here the general rules for the project apply. In principle, within the topic, there is no such restriction. I don't know if there is another restriction regarding the general rules for the mission. Exactly, so legally and formally, they can participate. Of course, they have to have a role that makes sense and is consistent with the purpose and the objectives and expected outcomes of the project.

## Question 3

Can you describe the international cooperation that you expect in this topic?

## Answer 3

International cooperation in this topic is not mandatory, but it is encouraged. Of course, the problem of pollinators and insect decline in general is not localized to Europe; it's happening worldwide. So, we encourage cooperation with other research centres or stakeholders from other parts of the world to try to give a more international aspect and solutions to this problem.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-07: Development of high special-resolution monitoring approaches and geographically-explicit registry for carbon farming**

## Question 1

It seems the budget is too small in this topic to allow proposals to contribute to all mentioned outcomes. Is it correct, and should a proposal address all mentioned activities?

**Answer 1**

It is up to the applicant to write the proposal in the most compelling way and make the most efficient use of the available budget. Of course, more weight can be put on some activities than on others. The design of the project is in the hands of the applicants, but to some extent, all mentioned activities must be covered.

**Question 2**

Is it an obligation that all mentioned land uses are covered?

**Answer 2**

Ideally, these digital platforms and registries should be able to include data of all types of carbon farming activities. However, some projects could specifically focus on certain regions of Europe or certain types of land uses. This decision is up to the applicant and the nature of the consortium. The methodology should be able to integrate different types of data. The digital tools themselves should be able to integrate different types of data, and then the piloting of this registry can start with some more specific types of data and eventually be scaled up to cover all types of carbon farming activities.

**Question 3**

Must we suggest a baseline in our proposal, and then it will be validated by JRC and a group of experts?

**Answer 3**

We now have a contract with the JRC to help us establish a methodology to compute this standardized baseline. It's an important feature of our regulation. The JRC's role is to design a methodology to establish the

baseline. What we need is the data to apply this methodology that the JRC will design. The project is supposed to create a monitoring system to gather all this data together, and therefore it's very important that they work together with the JRC. The project is not expected to establish the baseline; it's more about gathering the data needed to establish the baseline. The group of experts comprises member states, so in the end, when we write the delegated acts with the certification methodologies, our national experts from the national government will have a say. That is the role of our expert group.

#### **Question 4**

Considering the expected outcomes and the available budget, is it highly recommended to collaborate with existing pilot sites to cover all land uses across the EU?

#### **Answer 4**

Yes, there are a lot of projects already going on. I mentioned the two MRV projects, MARVIC and MRV4SOC, that were granted two years ago. Last year, there was a call for living labs in carbon farming that is currently in the final negotiations for the grant agreement. The project is expected to coordinate with these existing projects and build on them rather than repeat what they have done.

#### **Question 5**

Is there a specific contact point in JRC that we should contact at the proposal writing phase to get info on their methodology?

#### **Answer 5**

The contract with the JRC started only six months ago, so there is no methodology yet. It should be ready by next year, the end of 2025. You can

contact Panos and his team that are working on this, so I turn the ball to Panos and Manu Lugato and his team.

### **Question 6**

Should the project work on testing digital tools and develop a pilot registry, or should it deliver a fully working registry that is final?

### **Answer 6**

The regulation asks us to put in place an EU-wide registry by 2028. This project should create a pilot registry that can be scaled up at the EU level. The actual EU registry will be created later, and it will be for the European Commission to set it up. The project has to propose a pilot registry to test it with voluntary certification on the ground. It is supposed to be up and running but not the final EU-wide registry; there will be more legislative steps in between.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-09: Assessment of Soil Health in Africa**

### **Question 1**

To which extent (if any) can partners in Africa apply for funding in this topic?

### **Answer 1**

Yes, we said before that at least participants from eight African countries should be part of such a consortium. Participation is encouraged, of course, according to the rules set in the Horizon framework. It's important to have this participation. Low and middle-income countries are automatically eligible for funding, so most African countries are eligible. You have a substantive list of eligible countries available in the general annexes of the work program, so you can check there.



## Question 2

In his introduction, Peter Beheim mentioned a cooperation with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Is it connected with this topic? Can you explain how?

## Answer 2

Yes, we have an open channel with Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation experts on soil, and we speak quite regularly with them because we want to have similar objectives. They appreciate our effort to establish a soil health dashboard in Africa. We speak regularly because we have similar objectives, but they cannot co-fund this call. They can select a different mechanism for funding, but we have a continuous collaboration with them. There are a couple of topics promoting collaboration with philanthropic organizations. The idea is to join forces, but there is no prescription. You are encouraged to collaborate with philanthropic organizations in general to join forces for the same purposes, which is to improve soil health globally, particularly in Africa.

## Question 3

How should links with existing projects be demonstrated in the proposal?

## Answer 3

Of course, it's encouraged that the project makes use of existing knowledge coming from projects already operating in Africa, like Soils4Africa or organizations we have funded projects in Africa, like GARDEN. But this is a completely different project; it's not a follow-up or continuation of Soils4Africa. Here we speak about the establishment of an operational soil dashboard.

## Question 4

What is the expected technology readiness level to be achieved by the end of the project?

## Answer 4

Yes, the final project should be similar to the EU Soil Observatory, with a functioning dashboard with publicly available data and different functionalities. Something similar is expected here as well.

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

### Question 1

If a consortium applying to [HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01](#) or [HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02](#) topics considers using Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP), which aspects should it pay attention to?

### Answer 1

FSTP (Financial Support to Third Parties), also called cascade funding, allows project beneficiaries to award grants to third-party recipients i.e. entities or persons that are not partners in the consortium. The rules and conditions to use FSTP are described in the HE [Model Grant Agreement](#) (Articles 6.2.D.1 and Article 9.4) and state that the consortium must ensure an objective and transparent selection procedure of third-party recipients.

While there is no limitation concerning the percentage of the total project's budget that can be attributed to FSTP, the amount should be proportionate to and consistent with the contributions expected from the FSTP recipients as well as the objectives of the cascade funding. One or more beneficiaries can implement the FSTP. The beneficiary(ies) implementing the FSTP will be responsible for the proper use of the funding by the FSTP recipients and must ensure the following conditions, as defined in Article 9.4 of the AGA: compliance with Article 12 HE AGA (Avoiding conflict of interest), Article 13 (Confidentiality and security obligations), Article 14 (Ethics), Article 17.2 (Give visibility to the EU funding), Article 18 (Respect specific rules for the action implementation), Article 19 (Information obligations) and Article 20 (Record-keeping). It should also be noted that the bodies mentioned in Article 25 (e.g., granting authority; ECA; OLAF) have the right to carry out checks,

reviews, audits and investigations on the recipients, and in particular to audit the payments received.

The FSTP has to be included in the following parts of the proposal/[application form](#):

- PART A: in the budget table in column “other cost category” D.1.
- PART B: where relevant and in particular in Section 3, the work plan should include one or more tasks (as relevant) dedicated to organize and manage the FSTP and the activities it might entail. This can include defining the selection procedure, preparing application templates for the calls and guidance to applicants, setting up a submission system, an evaluation committee, etc.
- FSTP ANNEX: the [FSTP Annex template](#) must clearly describe :
  - the objectives and the expected results to be obtained;
  - the maximum amount of financial support that can be attributed to each third party. For the two topics mentioned, the maximum amount is set to 200 000 EUR per recipient for the entire duration of the project;
  - the criteria for calculating the exact amount of the financial support;
  - the different types of activities that qualify for support, on the basis of a closed list;
  - the persons (natural/legal) or categories of persons that will be supported;
  - the criteria and procedures for giving financial support;
  - how the different conditions specified in [Annex B](#) of the General Annexes will be ensured, in particular: publishing the calls widely;
  - adhering to EU standards of transparency, equal treatment, conflict of interest and confidentiality;
  - publishing the outcome of the calls without delay (which includes a description of third-party projects, the date of the award, the duration, and the legal name of the third party and country of establishment). Please also note that if launching a calls it should be published widely

by participants, as well as on the Funding & Tenders portal and be opened for at least 2 months.

## Question 2

If a consortium applying to HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01 or HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02 topics considers using Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP), why and how would it establish the mechanism without a call?

## Answer 2

Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP) is usually awarded via a call for proposals. Exceptionally and when duly justified, FSTP can be awarded without a call for proposals. Applicants may already have identified smaller actors in the regions where their living labs will be deployed, who can bring complementary skills, knowledge and specific characteristics needed to achieve the proposed objectives. In such cases, the FSTP without a call can be relevant, reducing the time to engage those actors.

**The same legal provisions apply as in the case of FSTP with a call** (i.e. Article 6.2.D.1 and Article 9.4 of the [Model Grant Agreement](#) ; Annex B of the General Annexes); any reference to the organisation of Open calls becomes non applicable. While the FSTP Annex, to be submitted as part of the proposal, refers to FSTP *“in the form of a grant awarded after a call for proposals”*, **when awarding FSTP grants without a call, the same conditions apply**. Therefore, the information to be provided and parameters to be established in the FSTP Annex (see [template](#)) by the applicants are:

1. **justification** for the awarding of FSTP grants without a call;
2. description of **the objectives and the expected results**;
3. the **amount of financial support** attributed to each third party (the maximum amount is set to 200 000 EUR per recipient for the entire duration of the project, for the two topics mentioned);

4. the **criteria** for calculating the exact amount of the financial support;
5. the **different types of activities** that qualify for support, on the basis of a closed list;
6. the **persons (natural/legal) or categories of persons** that will be supported;
7. While [Annex B](#) of the General Annexes relates to FSTP with open calls for proposals, some conditions are still relevant in absence of call. Applicants should therefore describe how these relevant conditions will be met. This includes: **adherence to EU standards of transparency, equal treatment, conflict of interest and confidentiality**; and how **information on the third-party grants will be made publicly available** (e.g. a description of the third-party project, the date of the award, the duration, and the legal name and country of recipients).

Finally, in line with Article 9.4, beneficiaries remain responsible towards the granting authority for the proper use of the funding by the recipients of FSTP. They must also ensure that FSTP recipients accept and comply with the obligations mentioned in that article.

### Question 3

Topics HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01 and HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02 allow the use of Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP). When should applicants consider using this option?

### Answer 3

Applicants can use Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP) in proposals under topics HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-01 and HORIZON-MISS-2024-SOIL-01-02 as one of the options available under Horizon Europe **to engage actors in the living labs' (LLs) activities**. The main aim should be to **encourage and facilitate the active involvement of smaller actors (e.g. land managers, as farmers, or small enterprises) in the activities of one**

**or more of the proposed living labs.** The FSTP should **not be used to fund activities outside of the proposed LL, nor to establish other LLs in other regions or countries.**

While FSTP grants must benefit final recipients, the latter are expected to be **actively engaged in the project through their contributions, including knowledge and expertise.** The FSTP should not be used to bring third parties that are responsible for implementing action tasks (subcontracting) or make available some of their resources to a beneficiary without this being part of their normal economic activity (in-kind contributions). The FSTP does not involve public procurement.

In these two topics, it is up to the consortium to decide whether to make use of the FSTP possibility or not. Attention should be paid to the necessary **time and effort to define the FSTP procedures and to award and monitor of grants.** The selection procedure and the criteria for providing FSTP, including the persons or category of persons that can receive financial support, the number of recipients, the budget per recipient, the activities to be supported, the use of calls or not, will need to be detailed in the proposal (Part A and Part B and in the FSTP Annex).

## HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01

### HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-01: European Blue Parks – Offshore marine protected areas

#### Question 1

There is a chronic lack of marine biodiversity information for potential offshore marine protected area is such data collection eligible for selected cases and encouraged?

**Answer 1**

The lack of marine biodiversity information for offshore MPAs is one of the reasons why we have a call on uh on offshore blue Parks so this is absolutely part of what we would be expecting within the projects funded under this topic.

**Question 2**

Is a blue Park a facility a virtual space or a specific pilot?

**Answer 2**

It is none of the above. The blue Parks should be regarded as being the research and innovation mention of marine protected areas. It is more the blue Parks community that we are developing with these topics, the information, the knowledge about the scientific background about how where to set up Marine protected areas and how to manage them.

**Question 3**

Regarding offshore, am I correct this is between 12 and 200 nautical miles and does not include the high seas in the work program?

**Answer 3**

The explanation of offshore areas states that it is those that are beyond 12 nautical miles from the coast so it does cover the high seas.

**Question 3**

What Basin does the topic cover? Does it include the Baltic and North Sea or other basins?

**Answer 3**

It is not a basin specific, but it should be site specific. The location of the sites is not specified and the projects should be site specific, ecologically relevant and above all impactful.

**Question 4**

Will contributions of social sciences and humanities disciplines be valued in this call?

**Answer 4**

In this topic, there is no specific requirement of social sciences and humanities. Any contributions will be valued in this call that leads to a good result. This will be for the independent evaluators to evaluate. Any contribution that makes sense is always very welcome.

**HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-02: Danube river basin lighthouse – Protection and restoration of migratory fish habitats****Question 1**

This is a local topic (Danube) will it allow involvement of academics and SMEs from other regions?

**Answer 1**

Yes, Horizon Europe is open to everybody. The condition here was that the demonstration sites should be in the region of the Danube River and the Danube Delta.



## Question 2

What is the principle of Associated Regions: does it mean that the EC gives money to project to then be sent to other regions?

## Answer 2

We are very keen for participants from other regions to also be participating even in projects associated with a particular Lighthouse or sea Basin.

EC does not give money to a project, it reimburses eligible expenses.

The concept of Associated regions is to bring in local or regional authorities from other regions, that are not already involved in the project, to replicate the solutions in these other

Regions. So the money is not to be sent to other regions in sense. It is to allow other regions to

participate in a project perhaps in the drawing up of the plans for replication and the the solutions developed within that project. And mostly, observers to be able to spread the word and replicate the solutions in their own regions.

**HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-04: Science for Community – Building the marine Citizen Science data network of the future to valorise data coming from the ocean and increase engagement**

## Question 1

Could you describe what is the EU digital twin ocean in simple language?

**Answer 1**

The digital twin ocean is a replica of the ocean in. It is complex to be able to really create this replica and this is what we are trying to do in the mission. We are on one side developing the public infrastructure underpinning the European digital twin ocean and next to the infrastructure. We are also integrating into these public infrastructure all the different models of addressing different domains from biodiversity to socioeconomic models and to morphological models. Many different types of information are collected to be able to really create a replica of the ocean and the different activities that can take place. It's a tool that could be used by many different actors to take decisions, to create scenarios to reply to questions. So once available, it will be a tool that could be used by many different actors.

**Question 2**

What principles do you use to decide what is citizen science?

**Answer 2**

The main aspect of citizen science is the capacity of citizens to contribute to collection of data and make them usable in science. So we need to have citizens involved in this. We need to have appropriate tools. We need to be able to use the data collected properly and in a useful way. This is what we intend as citizen science activities and this is why it is important also to have a pan European network of citizen science because we need really harmonized approaches to citizen science.

**Question 3**

Is the Marine citizen science network solely comprised of actors, or does it also encompass a digital data network or database?

### Answer 3

It does! It is one of the three groups of activities about data collection and this of

course includes digital data and databases.

### **HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-01-05: Our Blue Future – Co-designing a future vision of a restored ocean and water system in the EU by 2030 and 2050**

#### Question 1

How will the involvement of SSH competence be evaluated in the proposals?

#### Answer 1

The evaluation of proposals as well as the follow-up of the projects resulting from them is handled by the European climate infrastructure and environment executive agency. This is mostly their competence. They are evaluating project according to three criteria: Excellence, quality impact and the quality and efficiency of the proposals. The projects have to demonstrate that they have the necessary competence and expertise in their Consortium for the Mission overall. The societal engagement aspect is of course crucial and here for this topic we need to show necessary knowledge in designing participatory and in inclusive approaches for the co-design. This is something that proposals should be able to demonstrate.

### **HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-02-01: Community-led actions to restore our ocean, seas and waters**

#### Question 1

The topic is indicated as a Research and Innovation Action. What are the research elements? It seems more like an Innovation Action or Coordination and Support Action.

**Answer 1**

It has a lot of different elements: technical assistance including the analysis of data and monitoring; cascading grants where among others pilot innovative solutions will be funded. The definition of RIA includes the elements that new knowledge will be produced and that new services or solutions will be explored. RIA also allows for 100% of funding, so follow the topic description very closely and implement what is written there. And adhere to the scope and the expected outcomes of the topic.

**Question 2**

The mission just launched a call for technical assistance. What is the difference with this topic?

**Answer 2**

This call is intended as a pilot call to reach out to all the communities that the mission would like to attract and work together. Goal is to pilot this approach of providing assistance to communities. The technical assistance that topic 0201 should provide we specified it in detail in the call text. In this topic, the mission is giving a grant of up to 100,000 € for communities to prepare transition agendas which they will do on their own or with the help of a contractor. In this call, the mission aims to be really open to all communities that work towards our mission objectives and attract all stakeholders and actions.

**Question 3**

What are the evaluation criteria for this call? Will science still get most of the marks or not? The topic is slightly different from the other.

**Answer 3**

This is a RIA so it follows the award criteria that is available in the Horizon Europe documentation. Science getting most of the marks - the external evaluators will

look at the composition of consortium and if it's in line with the call. This topic is aiming to advocate for a holistic approach where we are not only looking at scientific or technological expertise, but equally social sciences, humanities and transdisciplinary.

**Question 4**

Cascading Grant to community led actions - can the individual CLA be within one

member state only? For example ports in Germany?

**Answer 4**

For the cascaded grants, the project as a Consortium you will define their own

evaluation criteria. These are not necessarily the Horizon Europe evaluation criteria. However, what is being monitored and checked very thoroughly is that the project will have a fair objective and transparent approach to selecting these CLAs. A very narrow geographical scope would probably not be regarded as fair. Mission recommends really to focus on the entire Lighthouse, in that case the entire Baltic and North Sea basin. Have a equal or at least a fair distribution CLAs that will then grant the funding.

**Question 5**

What type of actors should coordinate such proposals or projects?

**Answer 5**

The consortium should have an adequate expertise to implement this project and it is up to the applicants to judge who should be involved for the cascaded grants for the CLAs or for the transition agendas. The topic text has a list with examples that gives an idea of all kinds of

communities and different types of organizations and stakeholders. If any are not mentioned in the - as long as they work towards the mission objectives, they can apply to these cascaded grants and get the funding.

**Question 6**

Can you clarify what is meant by communities? How many members are to be part of a community to be considered as such?

**Answer 6**

Community by the call text is a group of individuals, public or private sector entities or other actors actively involved in activities relevant for the achievement of mission objectives. It is all encompassing definition the applicant should judge if the type of community you have in mind fits under this description.

**Question 7**

Can National Contact Points or local authorities lead on these grants?

## Answer 7

Local authorities and all actors and organizations that are eligible for Horizon Europe funding are eligible. Any legal entity is eligible, so also NCPs are eligible.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024-OCEAN-02-02: Support for the Coalition of waterfront cities, regions and islands for Mission Ocean and Waters**

### Question 1

How can we have synergies with EIB? Can you give examples?

### Answer 1

The proposal should enable the coalition to leverage funds for implementing the actions and not only facilitated synergies and access to the national or regional private funds,

but from the financial sector. For an example the European Investment has launch

a new pilot scheme the EU Blue Champions to provide financial advisory to selected projects in the blue economy. The Coalition of regions would like to leverage and enhance synergies with European Investment Bank and this could be done through regional funds that

could complement these selected projects in the blue economy. Based on what type of activities are being put in place by different instruments the Coalition can leverage funds in order to complement these activities.

### Question 1

Can cities be part of the Coalition without being part of the Consortium?

**Answer 1**

Yes, the Coalition is designated for Waterfront cities, ports, island and the regions. Of course the Coalition is for one of these target communities.

**HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01****HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-01: Exploiting the potential of secondary bio-based products****Question 1**

This topic seems quite similar to some others that have already appeared in Cluster 6 or 4. How is the risk of overlapping being managed?

**Answer 1**

It's really about secondary bio based products, so products that are made out of waste or residues or by-products from industries or agriculture, so there is a lot of research being done on bio based products, a bit less on secondary bio based products so here we are really bringing added value. Also to note that it's a research innovation action so it's about assessing the properties of materials that have been developed, researched and here it's taking it a step further and really assessing the properties to help the construction sector to better understand what is the potential of those materials. Maybe also another element is that in the destination text we do encourage collaboration and synergies with other running projects or topics and there is a whole list in the text and some of the topics in Cluster 6 and Cluster 4 are mentioned.



## **Question 2**

Secondary biobased materials: should it be four different kinds of biomass or four different kinds of application?

## **Answer 2**

So it's four different products using the same biomass but it would have to be four different products, not different kind of application.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-02: New governance models for the co-design and co-construction of public spaces in neighbourhoods by communities**

### **Question 1**

The title of NEB-01-02 includes governance models, but the text only talks about engagement models. How do you differentiate these?

### **Answer 1**

It targets local authorities, public authorities so as such, those are governance models for local authorities to engage people. It's a governance model to engage citizens stakeholders - residents of neighbourhoods so that they are engaged in the co-creation, co-design, co-development of the public spaces.

### **Question 2**

Do we apply with the project idea, or is our project funded for construction?

### **Answer 2**

Here indeed, it's about research & innovation, so we are funding research projects. It's linked also to those technology readiness levels that Kristoff was explaining. Depending on the technology readiness level, we can fund research or really early demonstration, but through those topics, we won't be funding construction as such. It could be something that you test in a laboratory, for instance, or in real conditions, but it will still be about testing solutions or products, not about really having the end product, if I may say.

The destination New European Bauhaus is a Horizon Europe action, and as such, it is meant to support projects that do research and innovation. It is

not meant to support capacity building. It is not meant to support actual construction costs, so it's focusing on R&I, and that's why the proposals need to connect with the topics depending on the research and innovation gap that they are addressing.

On the second topic, about governance models, here we want you to test the particular governance models that you proposed, that you've identified, and they will be related to the development of public spaces because that's what the topic is about. So, we would cover costs as eligible that are related to the testing of those solutions, but of course, we would not be able to cover the wider costs of actually redeveloping that public space, which would go normally into the millions. It's not something that we could cover through a project like this, and anyway, the purpose of these projects that we want to identify is to fund the research and innovation component, not the wider construction works.

### **Question 3**

The topic is centered on governance models. Why is there a reference to TRLs when apparently no technological developments are expected?

### **Answer 3**

So indeed topic two is an innovation action, so it's about demonstrating and while the governance models themselves are not a technology we wanted to indicate at what level we want to arrive at and since it's an innovation action this is about demonstrating something and it's a solution essentially then which would be ready for take up after the project. That's why it has a very high TL level of 7 to 8. I think there's also reference made within the topic to some Technical Solutions which could be deployed like IT and so on. So, again, it makes it clear that we don't want to develop things as such during the project, but even the topics be first to existing models even, but it's to make sure that these existing methodologies can be applied in the

context of the NEB and that is something which has to be done during the project. Clearly we want to still make sure that at the end the solution will reach to level 7 or 8. When we run from TRL 1 to TRL 8, it's also between what is fundamental research so even governance participatory approaches and so on can be subject to core fundamental research and then going closer and closer to application as we go to higher TRL. So it's not necessarily that we mean only technology in the sense of industrial or technical issues, but it's in general the scientific fundamental research starting from there and going towards application. So anything, even social sciences and humanities are subject to that.

#### **Question 4**

What to include in neighbourhood? Is it about countries from neighbourhood of the EU?

#### **Answer 4**

There is no agreed definition of neighbourhood at least at EU level and we are aware of that because neighbourhoods can be defined in very different ways. You can look at them in terms of density of population, you can look at them in terms of cultural heritage, in terms of mix of functions, offer of services, spatial boundaries, so you can really approach the concept of neighbourhood from very different perspectives so we are keeping this concept/notion of neighbourhood deliberately open just to allow for more flexibility for proposals to really exploit their potential and also to show the diversity or to give a possibility to acknowledge also the diversity of concepts that could be applied to neighbourhoods. By neighbourhood we do not mean a whole town or a whole city, we do not mean a building itself as such. We are speaking about something in between that is not a full city, that is not only just a building and of course we're also aware that there is a precedent in policy implementation targeting neighbourhoods in the case

of the cohesion policy. But we will also be looking at how this policy has been implemented but again for these topics we are keeping the definition deliberately open so that proposals have more flexibility to look at this concept from the perspective of the realities they are addressing. We do not mean the geographical neighbourhood of the European Union, but we mean quarters, let's say organizational bits of cities, municipalities and it also applies in rural areas so the definition is quite broad.

### **Question 5**

Is it important to have three different places in three different countries, or in the same to be compared?

### **Answer 5**

Actually it specifically states that there should be demonstrated in at least three neighbourhoods so it has to be a minimum of three, it can be more and they should be different in terms of their local environmental social economic conditions and then on top of that we also want to see them in different member states or in associated countries. So if you have three neighbourhoods which is the minimum requirement and they're different in terms of their social-economic characteristics and they would be within one member state that wouldn't actually fulfil the condition and the idea behind this is that when these solutions are to be demonstrated to a very high TRL level, the importance that we see is that the testing is done in different environments to see that the tool is actually applicable, lessons can be learned from that and so within a member state you can have different conditions. The interesting part, that's why we specify the three member states as well or associated countries, is that you have a differing political system, planning system and so on which then also has to be reflected to the demonstration and hence the definition of that topic on that aspect.

## Question 6

Our organization is winner of the awards. We would like to join a consortium for HORIZON-MISS-2024-NEB-01-02, but don't know how. Can you recommend us to others?

## Answer 6

No we can't recommend you to others. What we have done: the NEB website, the funding and tender portal which has functionalities to allow you to get in contact with other Consortium Partners or potential Consortium Partners, so to some extent this is well clearly about networking and finding other interested partners with whom you can come together but we cannot get involved in proposals and therefore also not get involved in recommending one or the other to somebody else. I mean the commission as institution because we have to treat all of you fairly and equally we have to stay objective and there is a limit to our involvement. Those of you who aren't, become members of the NEB community as it's quite a broad community including universities, NGOs, institutes, companies so all sorts of potential partners that you can find yourself in order to develop projects together. Consequently, make use of this bottom up feature of this rich community of NEB and those of you who are not part of it please do join us, beyond these calls there is a lot of interesting things that you can be part of and do consider that.

## Question 7

What would be the recommended partnership structure for the communities call in terms of number and diversity of projects?

## Answer 7

There is as such no recommended structure for putting together a consortium. I think it always starts with an analysis of the topic itself, what are the requirements and then next to set out what is the specific idea, the kind of solutions that you actually want to develop and then based on that you can then for yourself define which are the important partners that we have to include. It's part of the evaluation as well, it's no secret that we're looking at what is the consortium composition and are they able to bring all the necessary requirements together in order to deliver the project and so far it makes sense as well for applicants to develop this topic accordingly starting with a topic description then developing the idea on the basis of this than to look at who would we need to get in involved in order to make this a really successful project and that's what we're looking at during the evaluation as well.

## **HORIZON-MISS-2024 NEB-01-03: Setting up a New European Bauhaus hub for results and impact**

### **Question 1**

Is the call setting up the new European Bauhaus hub for results and impact only dedicated to New European Bauhaus National contact points, or who can be part of the consortium?

### **Answer 1**

We are speaking about two different actions in this question. One topic is the New European Bauhaus hub for results and impact, and that's a topic that is open to any legal entity that is eligible for Horizon Europe. This is an open topic. Now, in the part of the work program that corresponds to the destination NEB, it is true that there is another part which is other actions which are not subject to call for proposals, and that's where we have included a topic or an action to support National contact points, but this action is not going to be open. It's restricted to National Contact Points from Horizon Europe and New European Bauhaus, but these are two separate actions. So, the hub is open for anyone eligible for Horizon Europe to apply, and the other action that is not subject to call for proposals is the action to support National contact points. I think I explained at least that first part of the question. Then, who should be part of the consortium? For the hub, you have requirements of a minimum of three entities. I know that was a CSA, so it's a minimum of one entity, but it could be more. That's up to the consortium to decide depending on the proposal and the content they are putting forward and the actions to decide who are the more relevant partners to join the consortium for the action on National Contact Points. It will only be for National Contact Points.



## Question 2

Since this is an IA action and no start TRL is mentioned. The engagement model suggested should already have been tested and in what context (experimental)?

## Answer 2

I think it's important they should have been already been tested, exactly that's what I mentioned just earlier when we're talking about these engagement models in topic two. These should be the ones which are actually already available and so they should be then applied in the context of developing public space and also reflecting those NEB values. So this is the particular aspect of that topic.

## Question 3

Will NEB also provide funding opportunities for local administrations as knowledge hubs for building culture, integrated urban development and public space?

## Answer 3

The destination NEB is a Horizon Europe to action and therefore it's focused on projects that do research and innovation. It is not for capacity building, it is not for anything else which is not research and innovation. The destination European Bauhaus includes one topic which is to set up a new European Bauhaus hub for results and impact. This hub will be a learning and knowledge platform, it will be shared with the public through an IT interface, so the hub, as project will be monitoring results of projects, will be providing analysis on research and innovation gaps, insights that could help us to also tailor policy measures along the implementation of the facility.

The destination is not for capacity building, the hub is not meant to provide financial support to third parties.

#### **Question 4**

Is the NEB funding going to be available to develop platforms or tools (frameworks) that can benefit the implementation of other NEB projects?

#### **Answer 4**

The Hub is not going to provide financial support to third parties, but the Hub is supposed to make all this knowledge available, collect the knowledge, analyse, compare provided in a tailor made approach, in a way that is user-friendly, in the right format for a range of stakeholders and therefore these knowledge, solutions, results will be made publicly available. One of the results of the Hub as is also learnings, trends, gaps so that would inform next projects for sure, but when it comes to tools, helping the implementation of the projects is not subject to the facility, but is subject to the work that we develop in the NEB unit. So there we have the NEB Compass which is one of the tools supporting you to understand what NEB is and do that kind of NEB projects. We are also going to publish in a few months' investment guidelines developed together with the European Investment Bank and also we will put together a self-assessment tool which should help you understand better

the NEB character of the project. There will be the kind of facilitating tools or frameworks which can help, benefit and facilitate if you want the implementation of NEB projects in general and that's in terms of framework and then in terms of knowledge, research needs and how to take the knowledge further then of course the Hub will be informative.

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

### Question 1

Will this destination be permanent? Post 2027 or only until the new MFF?  
Will it be a European commission priority to protect in the new framework?

### Answer 1

This destination is a transition towards the net facility so this destination is just for this year, as of 2025 until 2027, we will have the NEB facility with its own three destinations which will correspond to the three thematic R&I areas that Alina was outlining before for the R&I component. After the current MFF, that is to be seen because that depends on the discussion. So far we cannot give any more details for the time being.

### Question 2

Who can apply: individuals, NGO's, governments, companies, non-profits...?  
Is in this call room for a role for a city or municipality to apply?

### Answer 2

Basically, any legal entity can apply for these topics. There is a general Annex 13 where the general conditions are explained. Basically, any legal entity established in particular countries can apply. There's just a requirement in terms of how the consortium is composed of. We have an innovation action: that was topic number one and topic number three. There, we need to have at least three legal entities, one of which has to come from a member state; two others can come from a member state or an associated country. But then, what kind of legal entities they represent is up to the consortium to decide how to put that consortium together. When it comes to the CSA topic, that was topic number two: here it's slightly different. We need at least

one, or only one, minimum legal entity. But again, who that legal entity is, is up to the applicant in this case.

I think there was also another question related to the composition, which was about topic one. Topic one was about the secondary bio-based material and whether there's room for cities and local authorities. I mean, this is a topic which is a research and innovation action, so it has a relatively low technology readiness level. But principally, again, it's possible for a city or municipality to participate. It's as for any other proposal, up to the consortium to really define what is the specific role of each of the participants within that consortium. But in principle, they can apply in all three.

For research and innovation actions as well as for innovation actions, we always define what is the technology readiness level and that tries to indicate what the solution that is to be developed as part of a project, what level it's supposed to reach by the end of the project. So when it comes to new technologies or new solutions, clearly we can start from very first principles to actually having something at the end which can be put straight onto the market and so this is what these technology readiness levels try to explain. So whenever you look at these topics it's important to then clearly look at what is the specified technology readiness level and then to make sure that within the proposal you demonstrate that indeed you will be able to take the proposed solution to that level of technology readiness by the end of the project. If you want to understand a little bit more about technology readiness levels, again, within the general annexes, which are part of the work program, you will find one annex where you have the definition of each of these TRLs.

### Question 3

How the NEB Facility will operate? Will it be by an EU agency, or will it be externalised to a consortium or single organization?

### **Answer 3**

The facility will have two components, one R&I component focusing on research and innovation and that will be funded through Horizon Europe, that will be following the rules of Horizon Europe, meaning that there will be an executive agency doing the execution of those goals so the commission will be designing the calls and then the executive agency will execute those calls doing the evaluations, contracting the projects etc. That's for the R&I component. Then for the roll out component, here it gets a bit more complicated in the sense that it will be the roll out component that will be focusing on deployment and technical assistant for deployment. This roll out component will be funded through synergies across different EU programs so, of course, the funding that will be provided by each program will be subject to the roles of that program. We will have consultations on this matter, we will really extensively explain this, so you have now the chance to focus on the destination, there will not be another info session on this destination so I invite you to really make the most out of it.

### **Question 4**

Will there be more calls during the 2023/2024 period or are these three the only ones in this work program?

### **Answer 4**

So for the destination on the NEB these will be the only three topics we will have. The work program 23/24 has been amended and this is part of the new calls that have been added but there will be no more calls added to the work program as it's been already amended and these are the topics that we will include for the destination NEB. Destination NEB has one call with the three

topics that we presented today and those are open to anyone that is eligible to apply to Horizon Europe and this same destination NEB is another section representing other actions not subject to calls for proposals which includes additional actions to support an expert group for the net facility and as an action to support National contact points, but these two are not subject to open call to finance projects as the three topics we have been presenting today.

### **Question 5**

Why no topic on regeneration if regeneration is the highest level of ambition in the NEB Compass?

### **Answer 5**

The answer is pretty simple: for this destination we had a limited budget so we could not have that many topics but regeneration indeed is really at the core of the NEB facility. It's one of the main areas that is listed in the Horizon Europe strategic plan for 2025-2027, features circular and regenerative approaches so it's really at the core of the NEB facility. There will be topics on regenerative design coming up in the facility.

### **Question 6**

NEB-01-02&3 - would you expect the NEB EIT community and other related NEB projects to get involved?

### **Answer 6**

It's up to the applicants to decide how they compose the Consortium and what is the content of their project proposal so I would really not be able to give a clear answer to that, other than it depends on your proposals, what

do you intend to deliver within the framework set by each topic and who are the best actors placed to really contribute to the delivery of that project. We cannot give examples so it's really up to the applicant, but of course if you want to explore what could be done, in most cases you will have to or you would want to form consortia and it's probably just worth highlighting as well, there's a functionality on the funding and tender portal where you can search for partners and you can also in a way offer that you're looking for partners and that's of course is then a way of exchanging with other organizations, to take a decision, what kind of portrait you may want to do, how you want to compose the Consortium and then actually develop your idea based on the information provided within the call, but we cannot otherwise give a guidance on that. This funding and tenders portal is for all of the Horizon Europe topics, is not focusing specifically on the NEB Community. So for each topic you have a functionality to request, to show your interest that you are interested in the topic and looking for partners but this is not targeting specifically the NEB Community. If you are more interested in understanding who is part of this NEB Community you can look through the NEB dashboard which shows all the members of this community and it also includes um the the EU funded projects resulting from calls dedicated to the NEB. There are two sources that you can actually consult, one related to Horizon Europe portal and one related to the NEB specifically. So do consult both of the sources.

### **Question 7**

Can we apply for destination calls and then still apply for facility calls?

### **Answer 7**

Yes, in principle I don't see a reason why destination calls would be excluding from participation in the net facility if the destination is actually paving the way for the facility to be implemented, so you can apply to both

destination calls and still apply to net facility calls. It is to be mentioned that destination calls are this year, facility calls will be in the next work program, so the same rules apply for anyone, applying in calls into one work program and then the next one.

**Question 8**

Is the UK, and, in general, associated countries included in this call?

**Answer 8**

Yes, they are.



## HORIZON-MISS-2024-CANCER-01

### Question

**WHEN DOES THE QUALITY OF LIFE CLUSTER PLAN TO MEET ? IS THE MEETING OPEN TO EXTERNAL AUDIENCES ?**

### Answer.

The Quality of Life Cluster had the first meeting to start their agreement on the work programme but my colleague in HAD would know when they're going to have their kick-off meeting but they need to agree on what they put in the grant agreement in the work packages.

### Question

**WHERE AND WHEN CAN WE GET THE BLUEPRINTS FOR THE ECPDC AND UNCAN?**

### Answer

We intend and will publish both Blueprints soon, but we are still in the process of finalising and preparing this publication, so as soon as we are ready we will put them on our website, we have also received a question as to where more information can be found on the Mission Implementation Plan, as we have recently launched a new website, which I invite you to explore, which gives you a lot of information on how we are going about implementing the Cancer Mission, and we will also place and publish the two Blueprints there.

## Question

# HOW DOES THE CANCER MISSION RELATE TO THE EUROPE BEATING CANCER PLAN?

## Answer

That's an important question to understand the relationship between the two parallel initiatives, as we outlined at the beginning, both were developed in parallel and launched in the same year, so why is the Europe Beating Cancer Plan the policy initiative of the European Commission, which contains 42 policy actions, both legislative and non-legislative. It's a new instrument that focuses on research and development to improve cancer care, but not only that, it also has various different actions, for example, citizen engagement activities, which then inform both the research activities as well as the policy actions, so both instruments exist in parallel system, they are integrated through their actions, they are integrated through their joint governments. Their actions, they are integrated through their joint governments, which I presented earlier, to make sure that each time the scientific knowledge that we gain through the mission, through the projects and the activities, it informs the policy actions and that the policy discussions around cancer inform where the research gaps are, where the mission can act and identify and launch new issues, so it's a close relationship between the two, which is important to understand.

**Question**

**IS THERE A WEBSITE WITH MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CANCER MISSION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN?**

**Answer**

There is a new website dedicated to the implementation of the Cancer Mission and you'll find information on this new website.

**Question**

**WHEN WILL THE CANCER MISSION 2024 SPECIFIC CALLS OPEN AND WHEN WILL THEY CLOSE?**

**Answer**

8 April 24 is the opening day and 18 September is the closing day.

**Question**

**WE HAVE ANOTHER H2020 PROJECT IN THE CANCER SURVIVORSHIP: AI FOR WELLBEING CLUSTER. HOW DO WE SYNERGIZE WITH THE QOL CLUSTER?**

**Answer**

You will have to discuss this with the Hadea colleagues.

**Question**

## 01-03 COULD YOU EXPLAIN IN MORE DETAIL WHAT EXACTLY "WRITTEN COMMITMENT FROM REGIONS" MEANS?

### Answer

It's described in the text of this call topic, but essentially it means that if a region or regions are going to be targeted, because we're asking for three regions in each of these proposals, that there's evidence that those regions are really going to be involved, so we're asking for a written commitment, so it could be a simple letter signed by that region or the authority that you're going to work with in that region, but it's clearly described in the topic text, yes, and to emphasise that we've seen in the past that consortia have been able to work with regions. Yes, and to emphasise that we have seen in the past that consortia develop a very nice proposal and propose to implant in a particular region, but without really having discussed it with the regional authorities, so we want to make sure that the regional authorities are involved, aware and committed to participate, so that's why we're asking for that written commitment.

We're not asking for a budgetary commitment, we're just asking that the region agrees to participate in the research if the proposal is successful.

**Question**

**FOR CANCER-01-01, DOES THIS CALL EXPECT THE CONSORTIUM TO DEVELOP THE UNCAN PLATFORM FROM SCRATCH BASED ON THE BLUEPRINT TO BE PUBLISHED?**

**Answer**

UNCAN is a flagship, so there are several preparatory actions that have already been funded and on which applicants can build and the blueprint is just one of them, it was produced by a project that is now closed, that was called for UNCAN and of course it is not mandatory to follow the blueprint, that it should be treated and handled as just a suggestion for a solution and of course consortia. Applicants are free to propose their way forward, but keep in mind that when the blueprint was created, the European Health Data Space Regulation was not in place and now it is, so I strongly recommend interested applicants to take a close look at the Regulation and the infrastructures and the design of the infrastructures that are already in the Regulation.

**Question**

**FOR TOPIC 01-05 WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF “LATE” ? ARE WE TALKING ABOUT 2 YEARS? 5-10 YEARS?**

**Answer**

I think it's important to understand that this issue applies to patients both during treatment and after treatment. So having survived and as you know some of the treatments take one, two, three, four, five or more years to complete, some patients unfortunately have recurrent cancer so late there

is no precise definition for late but it's at least one to two years after the end of treatment but as this topic is also about cancer being treated it could be that they are being treated for recurrent cancer and at the same time they are suffering from you know what happened to them when they were two, three or ten years old. So it's at least one to two years but it's not exactly defined but the oncologist will know I think better but late effects of course we have described a lot and I think that's important to look at it some of them take years to come to the four so for example when we talk about infertility issues this will only you know when childhood cancer in the case of childhood cancer will only come to the four you know in the adolescent stage or later so it also depends on the symptoms that you're going to address.

## Question

### **CAN CHARITIES PARTICIPATE IN TOPIC 5 ON LATE AYA CANCER EFFECTS UNDERSTANDING ?**

## Answer

Absolutely, so charities can participate in all the themes that are open, as we said, Mission favours the interaction and the collaboration between disciplines and sectors, of course it has to be relevant, so charities can participate in this theme five on a cancer impact, it really depends on the consortium and how the consortium brings together the beneficiaries, the partners and what their role is, so it's really up to the consortium to decide, but of course they can participate.

**Question****HOW SHOULD POLICY MAKERS RECEIVE THE TEST PROGRAMMES FOR EARLY DETECTION OF HERITABLE CANCERS?****Answer**

The simplest answer is that of course the projects will report carefully what they are going to deliver in terms of deliverables but also as part of the final reports publications so I think that's how the test programme could be delivered to policy makers so and of course another option is to produce a policy paper white papers it could be done for example as part of a cluster activity which we actually strongly encourage in the classes that have started they have already started working on a joint policy paper on any topic that they think is important to address so that's another way of addressing this.

**Question****I SAW A REFERENCE TO THAT THE APPLICATION COULD BE 70 PAGES. IS IT THE SAME FOR ALL TOPICS?****Answer**

I think it refers to topic 01, which has this exception that the 70 page length is more than the usual length, the usual length is only for topic 01.

**Question**

**IN THE CSA FOR PRAGMATIC CLINICAL TRIALS FUNDED BY CHARITIES, WHAT IS THE MINIMUM EXPECTED BUDGET COMMITMENT PER CALL (TOTAL)?**

**Answer**

There is no minimum expected budget, it's really up to this consortium, which should be a number of charities coming together, it's really up to their commitments when it comes to the budget, what they think should be put in. should be put in, but of course there is, of course, the reality is that these trials cost a lot of money, so the money has to be There has to be enough money to do meaningful trials, multi-centre trials, and they cost money, so that's all we can say about it.

**Question**

**IT IS NECESSARY TO DEPLOY THE ECPDC INFORMATION PORTAL ALSO FOR THE VIRTUAL ASSISTANT TO SUPPORT QUALITY OF LIFE OF CANCER SURVIVORS?**

**Answer**

Thank you for these questions about the function of the virtual assistant, we thought that this is important when you are dealing with evidence-based information to post, let's say, translate this information in late terms and this can be uh efficiently done today with virtual assistant, therefore we uh ask applicants to come up with bright ideas on how this assistant can work in tailoring the way the information is given back to the users in a way that



they can understand and if it is necessary to test this virtual assistant. yes it is, we have put this requirement inside the text.

### Question

## 01-04 IS THERE A MINIMUM NUMBER OF CHARITIES THAT SHOULD BE INVOLVED? AND WHAT IS DEFINED AS ACROSS EUROPE?

### Answer

This of course relates to the rules for participation in the work programme which is clearly described so there should be a minimum of three member states and/or associated countries so the minimum number should be three from three different of those countries and please look at the general annex of the work programme. We hope there will be more but that is the minimum number and we actually mention across Europe again trying to take into account the issue of inequalities and disparities so across Europe means that we would like to see a consortium that has at least charities from Northern, Central, Eastern, Western and Southern Europe that's the only kind of definition that we would like to give it's completely open but at least show that you know there is participation from let's say all the main areas, parts of Europe that's the idea.

## Question

### WHERE CAN WE FIND INFORMATION ON OTHER UNCAN INITIATIVES APART FROM 4.UNCAN PROJECT?

## Answer

There have been several initiatives, they are listed in the text, I can, I have already mentioned the EOS for cancer, then there is conserve, both these projects have been funded 2021 to support the preparatory work for the infrastructure and then I suggest to have a close look at the results of the HDs, the European Health Data Space Preparatory Project Pilot in particular, where they have use cases on cancer and the Health Clouds is another initiative that is relevant to this topic.

## Question

### AS A SMALL CANCER CHARITY, HOW CAN WE BEST GET INVOLVED? BY APPLYING, BUT ALSO HOW CAN WE BEST SUPPORT RESEARCHERS IN OUR COUNTRY TO APPLY?

## Answer

I think this is a very interesting question again about the aspect of cancer charities. indeed it's not just to be part of a consort so for more information the NCPs but certainly here I think is what was mentioned before there is a very interesting brokerage event in May. I think that's where you should also attend but if you for example are thinking of supporting researchers in your country to apply. I think that's a great idea because I think that's what we would like to see these better connections with charities resource

institutions and I think this could be one way of doing that. institutions and I think this could be a way of doing that, so I think it's a great idea.

## Question

### MAY YOU PLEASE CLARIFY THE TARGETED AGE GROUP WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF AYA?

## Answer

The definition of the age group is given in the theme, uh, and the reason why we extended the age group from 15 to 39 is because if you look at the clinical guidelines in Europe for cancer patients, childhood cancer, adolescents and young adults, there's still no real agreement on what the age group should be, but in this case we thought it was important to at least extend it to what appears in one of these guidelines, which is 39 as the upper limit, because the very important aspects, the late effects, some late effects become only, you know, far beyond adolescence. In this case we thought it was important to at least extend it to what is in one of these guidelines, which is 39 as the upper limit, because of the very important aspects, the late effects, some of the late effects only come, you know, well beyond adolescence and we know that young adults have a different biology, the cancers have a different biology, so they should be part of the effects and should be treated as such, so we decided to extend the age group.

## Question

**01-03 REGARDING AYA, ONLY ONE EXCLUSIVE AYA SPECIFIC WILL BE FUNDED? WHAT ABOUT THE OTHERS ? INTERESTED IN MIXED POPULATION AGES OR NON-AYA AT ALL?**

## Answer

The idea is that it's clearly described in the topic that, uh, we're asking applicants to focus on one of three options, so that we're sure that we're going to have projects that are really fully complementary and address all the important issues that we think are important and are described in the topic, so it's not like there's only one exclusive, is one particular population going to be targeted. You can target more, it's really up to the consortium, it's really up to you to know what your main objective is and what you want to address in your proposal, so mixed populations, fine, it really depends on how you can justify that in a proposal and as we said there will be this peer review, so it's really up to the independent experts to judge it, so if you can justify that, that's all possible.

## Question

**IS THERE NO TOPIC DEDICATED TO EARLY TRL LEVELS 1-4 ?**

## Answer

In general, if you look at the health cluster within Horizon Europe and the mission on cancer, so we are very reluctant to use TRL levels, so we don't usually mention them, but when it comes to up-scaling, then it's important to mention.

**Question**

**01-04:SHOULD THE TWO CALLS BE ON BOTH RARE CANCER AND OS <50% OR CAN IT BE ONE ON RARE CANCER AND ONE ON OS <50%?**

**Answer**

In this case, charities can choose to focus only on rare cancers, they can choose to focus only on cancers with an overall survival of less than 50%, they can choose to focus on both, it's really up to the applicants to decide.

**Question**

**CAN INDIVIDUAL PIs APPLY FOR ANY OF THE TOPICS?**

**Answer**

We're talking about collaborative research where at least three institutions from different Member States or associated or associated countries must be part of the consortium, so this is not for a single PI.

**Question**

**IS THE AYA TOPIC FOCUS LIMITED TO POORLY UNDERSTOOD CANCERS?**

## Answer

I think it's really important to understand that this topic is addressing late effects at large so there is no focus on poorly understood cancers or whatever we know unfortunately after all the workshops that were organised and from all that is published there is an amazing number of side effects late effects that need to be addressed and we know that it doesn't really depend on being a poorly understood cancer or common or rare cancer it's the focus is really on late effects so any type of cancer any type of cancer subtype can be addressed.

## Question

### WHAT IS THE PAGE LIMIT FOR THE APPLICATIONS?

## Answer

For topic one, the page limit is 70 pages, the standard page limit is 45 pages, this has been reduced by Horizon 2020 to 45 pages for this particular section, but that's all described in the general annexes to the work programme.

## Question

### DO WE HAVE TO INTEGRATE EARLY DETECTION METHODS ALSO FOR LATE AYA EFFECTS IN TOPIC 4 ?

## Answer

In fact, one of the three options is that applicants are asked to look into developing some sort of screening approaches, screening methods for early detection of late effects, and so that's actually one of the three options that

you have, so the answer is yes, so your proposal should focus on those aspects for example.

### Question

## **01-04: HOW DETAILED SHOULD THE PRAGMATIC CALLS BE DEFINED ALREADY?**

### Answer

I think this is related to the issue of charities. That is, you know, at the time of submission there is, it's not necessary to have them fully defined, it would be good, but again, there are independent experts who are going to be the evaluators, so we have no idea what they're going to look at, but there should be some idea of what you think you want to address in these calls, but let's say the more information, the more convincing you can be to the group of independent experts, the more chance you have of success.

### Question

## **IS IT NECESSARY TO SUPPORT PRAGMATIC CLINICAL TRIALS WITH A NETWORK OF REGISTERED CHARITIES OR CAN OTHERS PARTICIPATE AS WELL?**

### Answer

The theme focuses on bringing together charities and we state in the theme that these charities and/or and/or foundations should be registered but of course any other charity can participate as long as they exist as long as they are really registered somewhere in a European country.

**Question****01-03 HOW LONG IS THE PROJECT PERIOD?****Answer**

From the Commission's side, and there's no limit on the duration of projects, except for certain themes where we've indicated it, but it's really important that you justify why your project is going to be three years or four years or five years, because that's what the experts, the independent experts who do the review, will be looking for.

**Question****HOW DOES 6 CALLS SYNERGIZE WITH CURRENT EU4HEALTH ACTIONS ?****Answer**

The Cancer Plan and the Cancer Mission are completely complementary, so any of the call topics you see in the Cancer Mission have already been discussed in some way with the Cancer Plan team and vice versa, so there is no overlap, only complementarity.

**Question****01-03 PILOTING PARTNERS (EG HOSPITALS) SUFFICE FOR REGIONAL COMMITMENT OR REGIONAL AUTHORITY TO APPLY TESTS TO GENERAL POPULATION NEEDED?**



**Answer**

Indeed, if such hospitals or cancer centres you know are responsible for regional health care for example, this could be it could be sufficient or any other relevant regional authority that is linked to the work of these hospitals could be sufficient commitment, but there should be some evidence of this in by you know a simple letter where this is briefly explained and signed.

**Question**

**IS THE DIALOGUE TOWARDS THE NATIONAL CANCER NODES LIMITED TO DIGITAL PLATFORMS OR CAN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURES BE INCLUDED?**

**Answer**

of course the national infrastructure, I mean the health and data infrastructure, should be involved in this dialogue and there will be differences, country by country and therefore we can't have a fixed list of actors involved there, however, in the text that are already proposed.

