


CZ General FAQs Horizon Europe








March 2024

This document is a comprehensive collection of frequently asked questions regarding financial issues in Horizon Europe (HE), compiled from inquiries submitted to the Research Enquiry Service of the European Commission by Czech National Contact Points on behalf of Czech beneficiaries from 2021 to March 2024. Additionally, it incorporates a selection of FAQs provided by our NCP colleagues from across the European Union.

The purpose of this document is to clarify areas of confusion and uncertainty; however, it does not hold any legal authority. This compilation excludes questions related to personnel costs in HE projects, as well as Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions and European Research Council projects. For these topics, please refer to the separate FAQ documents prepared by the Technology Centre Prague.

FAQs appended after March 2023 are distinguished with exclamation mark 

List of questions

CZ General FAQs Horizon Europe	1
Project proposals – Acronyms	2
Pre-financing amount	3
Beneficiary requesting zero funding	3
Budget table – Own resources vs Financial Contributon	4
 Conference extends past the project end	4
Cost of meal at university canteen and cost of the accommodation at the university dormitory	5
Office Supplies	6
Equipment – full cost option	7
 Exchange rate application when changing the currency of beneficiary's general accounts	8
Proposal template – Purchase costs	8
 Travel Costs – per-diems	9
 Travel Costs – Associated Partners	10
UK partners in the project proposal	10
UK Partners – Grant Agreement Preparation Phase	11
VAT – status change	12
CFS exempted beneficiaries	12
Exchange rate suspension	12
Visibility rules	13
 Partial CFS I	13
 Partial CFS II	14
 Partners with link on Russia	15

⚠	Periodic reporting: Associated Partners.....	16
⚠	Proposal missing administrative details.....	16
	LUMP SUM.....	17
⚠	LUMP SUM: How to include Affiliate entities in LS projects	17
⚠	LUMP SUM: Affiliated entities numbering.....	17
⚠	LUMP SUM: Associated partners, Summary of staff effort table.....	18
⚠	LUMP SUM: Declaration on days spent on the action.....	19
⚠	LUMP SUM: Depreciation justification.....	19
⚠	LUMP SUM: Personnel costs justification	19
⚠	LUMP SUM: PM Reporting.....	20
⚠	LUMP SUM: Two-stage	20
	WIDENING.....	21
	Era Talents – charging the equipment.....	21
	ERA Chairs.....	21
	Teaming	21
	Twinning	22
⚠	Twinning, Association membership	23
⚠	Excellence Hubs: Definitions of a “public authority” and an “authorized agency”	24
⚠	FAQ widening (continuously updated).....	24
⚠	List of questions from the WIDERA NCPs (8. November 2023)	25

Project proposals – Acronyms

I watched some time ago a webinar on FTO moderated by you, that is why I am profiting from this contact to ask you whether there is a list of symbols and special characters to be avoided by applicants when creating the acronyms of their projects. One of our potential applicants has found out that „+“ is not accepted in the online proposal form. I can see that in the general template the following characters < > " & are explicitly mentioned to be removed. I assume these are not the only ones.

E-mail communication, DG RTD, 7. September 2021

Proposal acronyms should be formed of letters of the **Latin alphabet and may also contain space, hyphen, underscore and full stop**, but must not contain any other special characters. The respective guidance in the forms will be updated accordingly.

Pre-financing amount

I have a doubt concerning the calculation of the pre-financing in Horizon Europe. One client is preparing a lump sum proposal and this point is critical to prepare the timeline of the project and number of reporting periods and work packages, ensuring funds during the lifetime of the project.

As I understood from AMGA-H2020 (art. 21 - page 198 v.5.2), the prefinancing is calculated as follows: "it will normally be (depending on the availability of EU budget credits) 100 % of the average EU funding per reporting period (i.e. maximum grant amount set out in Article 5.1 / number of periods)." However, different clients with Horizon Europe projects have informed that they have received a pre-financing of around 53% of the Maximum Grant Amount, even if their projects have three or more reporting periods. I would like to confirm what is the rule to calculate prefinancing in Horizon Europe and if there is any special calculation method for lump sum projects.

Case no 2032206, 17. October 2022

In Horizon Europe, after the grant has been signed, the consortium will normally receive a float to start working on the project (normally, pre-financing of **160% of the average EU funding per reporting period** (i.e. maximum grant amount/number of periods); exceptionally, less or no pre-financing). For **actions with only one reporting period, it will be less**, since 100% would mean the totality of the grant amount.

Note that payments will be automatically lowered if one of the consortium members has outstanding debts towards the EU (granting authority or other EU bodies). Such debts will be offset by the granting authority, in line with the conditions set out in the grant agreement (see Article 22). Also note that at the moment of the prefinancing payment, an amount ranging from 5% to 8% of the maximum grant amount will be deducted from the prefinancing payment and transferred to the mutual insurance mechanism. This mechanism covers the risks associated with non-recovery of sums due from the beneficiaries.

Beneficiary requesting zero funding

In H2020, the MGA art. 9 included some special references and provisions for "Beneficiaries not requesting EU funding", e.g., no obligation to submit financial statements, audit requirements etc. In HE such provisions are no longer included in the MGA. However, we assume it is still possible for a HE beneficiary to request 0.0€ in the Requested EU Contribution column in Annex 2.

In practice this means that it is still possible in HE to participate as "Beneficiary not requesting EU funding". Is this correctly understood? If so, will such a beneficiary in HE have to submit a financial statement requesting 0.0€? This seems like an unnecessary administrative procedure.

However, if it is a contractual obligation, the beneficiary should know before they sign the Grant Agreement.

Case no 1716161 10, 2. February 2022

As you have noticed, the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement does not include a provision equivalent to Article 9 of the H2020 Model Grant Agreement. Generally speaking, **participants that participate in the action without funding should by default chose the status of 'associated partners'** that cannot declare eligible cost and therefore are exempted from financial obligations of the grants. Yet, in HE it is still possible to participate as "Beneficiary requesting zero funding".

Where participants without funding exceptionally participate as beneficiaries, at reporting stage, beneficiaries that are eligible for funding but requesting zero funding must submit financial reports. The beneficiary would normally decide whether to report in the financial statement no costs, i.e. to indicate “0” in the appropriate columns, or to report, in full or in part, its actual eligible costs, i.e. costs that comply with the eligibility conditions. For eligible costs covered by own resources for which 0 contribution is requested, the conditions for costs eligibility would need to be fulfilled but these costs and conditions will not be checked during an audit.

According to Article 25.1.3 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement (available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/agr-contr/general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf), audits are not restricted to financial implementation of the action, they also concern the proper implementation of the action and compliance with the obligations under the Agreement. As a consequence, beneficiaries requesting zero funding are not exempt from audits. However, in the absence of funding, audits would focus on the records and supporting documentation that refer to the technical implementation of the action or compliance with other obligations under the Grant Agreement with no risk of financial errors involved.

Budget table – Own resources vs Financial Contribution

Could you provide us more information concerning the explanation/definition/difference of „own resources“ and „financial contribution“ in the Administrative forms (3 – Budget) of the Horizon Europe project proposal (for participants whose funding rate is not 100%)?

Case no 1640091, 20. August 2021

Please note for the type of actions where the funding rate is lower than 100%, participants are asked from which type of sources the rest of the funding needed to implement the action will come. Therefore, they need to fill in the columns “o” (income generated by the action), “q” (own resources) and/or “r” (financial contributions). Under “**own resources**”, applicants must enter the amount of **their own resources they expect to use** for the implementation of the action. Under “**financial contributions**”, applicants must enter the amount of **financial contributions they expect to receive from other sources**.



Conference extends past the project end

I have a following question concerning the travel costs in Horizon Europe: Project ends on 31st August 2023. The project leader intends to attend an international conference (necessary for the action) taking place from 29th August to 1st September. Is it possible to allocate the travel expenses and per diems proportionally and charge a portion to the project? How should we categorize the conference fee? Can it also be divided proportionally?

Case no 897932, 11. August 2023 As preliminary remark we would like to recall that the any cost must fulfil the general eligibility conditions set out in Article 6.1 of the Model Grant Agreement. In this regard and among others, the costs must be incurred in connection with the action and necessary for its implementation and be incurred during the action duration. In that regard, the AGA (see version 1.0 of 1 April 2023 page 38) stresses that 'i.e. the generating event that triggers the costs must take place during the action duration set out in the Data Sheet'.

From your question we understand that you refer to participation in an international conference that 'is necessary for the action' (assumably to present project-related results) and that takes place during the action implementation (i.e. 29 August till 31 August).

In that respect, the corresponding travel costs (including the costs for the return journey) **related to this period can be declared as eligible** but provided that the international conference is indeed necessary for the action and that other applicable general cost eligibility conditions set out in article 6.1 and 6.2 are also complied with (notably that travel costs must reflect the beneficiary's usual practice on travel).

Concerning the conference fee, and assuming that you refer to a fee associated with the participation in a scientific conference for presenting project-related results, such conference fees are mentioned in the Annotated Model Grant Agreement as an example of dissemination costs and they typically fall into the cost category for "other goods works and services" under Article 6.2.C.3. As regards the allocation of the costs, beneficiaries should follow their usual cost accounting practices.

Cost of meal at university canteen and cost of the accommodation at the university dormitory

Can you confirm that in Horizon Europe cost of the meal at the university canteen and the cost of the accommodation at the university dormitory can be considered as Purchase cost (D) not Internally invoiced goods and services (D2) – even though there is not an invoice from a third party (contractor)? These costs are necessary for the implementation of the action (project meeting) and in line with 3E principle (the price is significantly lower compared to the lunch at a restaurant and accommodation at a hotel). Use of the category D2 seems complicated to us because it is difficult for the university to identify the cost of the unit (one meal/room). During the H2020 EC communication camping in Prague, the auditor said these costs might be eligible as Other goods, works, and services. Is that correct for H2020?

Case no 2151656, 21. November, 2022

We understand from your query that you are referring to catering and accommodation services which would be provided by a beneficiary, i.e. the services would not be purchased to an external provider. So, they could not be declared under the budget category 6.2.C.3 for 'Other goods, works and services'.

As regards the possibility to declare these internal costs as direct costs under Article 6.2.D.2 for 'internally invoiced goods and services', please note that:

As a preliminary remark, please note that the costs incurred by a beneficiary for providing catering and accommodation services in the framework of project meetings can be charged to the Horizon Europe action if it is the beneficiary usual accounting practices to record such costs as direct costs, and provided

that they are incurred in connection with the action and necessary for its implementation.

In the event the costs for the goods and services the beneficiary provides or produces itself would be treated as direct costs by the beneficiary according to its usual accounting practices, in principle, as explained in the Annotated Grant Agreement (see version 0.2 of 30 November 2021 available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/guidance/aga_en.pdf), they can be declared under the Article 6.2.D.2 'Internally invoiced goods and services' provided that the costs comply with the general and specific eligibility conditions.

However, our understanding is that the beneficiary would not have costs methodology for valuating this type of internal costs. Therefore, we are afraid that it would not possible to declare those internal costs as direct costs under Article 6.2.D.2.

Finally, if the catering and accommodation services cannot be declared as direct costs by the beneficiary under the action, please note that they may be considered covered by the 25% flat-rate as part of the indirect costs. The same applies to H2020 mutatis mutandis.

Office Supplies

I have a question concerning the cost category C.3 Other goods, works and services for Horizon Europe. In the current AGA, pg. 70, it says that "office supplies" can be an eligible direct cost: "costs for consumables and supplies (e.g. raw materials, office supplies)". My understanding was that office supplies should be covered by the indirect costs. For costs to be covered by the direct costs categories, they need to fulfill the general eligibility conditions, including "they must be incurred in connection with the action as described in Annex 1 and necessary for its implementation" - with office supplies, which are usually bought in bulk, it is questionable whether it would be possible to establish the direct link between the costs and the items. Could you please comment on this? And what would be the case for standard laptops and mobile phones? In H2020, office supplies (including laptops and phones) were advised to be covered by the indirect cost category - we expected continuation for Horizon Europe. Is there any difference then?

Case no 222377, 10. June 2022

As also explained at the bottom of page 70 of the pre-draft AGA, costs of other goods, works and services must comply with the following eligibility conditions:

- fulfil the general conditions for actual costs to be eligible (i.e. in particular necessary and in connection with the action; recorded following the beneficiary's usual cost accounting practices etc; see Article 6.1(a))

and

- be purchased specifically for the action and in accordance with Article 6.2.C.

The above will apply to office supplies costs, hence they can be declared as direct costs for goods and services but only provided that they comply fully with these conditions. Against this background, **office supplies that are purchased in bulk as per the beneficiary's usual cost accounting practices, and that could not be connected to a specific action, would not fulfil all the above mentioned eligibility conditions for direct actual costs.** Yet, they could be typically indeed considered as

indirect costs (and covered by the 25% flat-rate in Horizon Europe).

The same logic would apply for costs of laptops and mobile phones, i.e.: if it is the beneficiary's usual accounting practice to consider the costs of laptops and mobile phones as indirect costs, then these costs cannot be declared as direct costs.

On the contrary, the costs of a laptop used to carry out the action may be declared as a direct actual costs, if it corresponds to the beneficiary's usual accounting practices. Now, depending notably on the beneficiary's usual cost accounting practices and whether or not the laptop or the mobile phone is used exclusively for the action in the year of the purchase, the related direct actual costs can be declared either as depreciation equipment costs or as full purchase costs for low-value asset.

Equipment – full cost option

Can you clarify in what cases and situations beneficiaries may use other Options than the default OPTION 1 – depreciation only? Namely OPTION 2 – full cost only, OPTION 3 – depreciation and full cost for listed equipment and OPTION 4 – full cost and depreciation for listed equipment?

RES reply shared by GERMAN NCP in November 2022

Your question concerns equipment costs eligibility under Article 6.2.C.2 of the Horizon Europe General Model Grant Agreement (HE General MGA), and in particular eligibility of costs for prototypes.

As you correctly pointed out, the **option 1 (i.e. depreciation costs only) is a standard obligation for all EU grants**. The **three other options** (option 2 full cost only, option 3 depreciation and full cost for listed equipment, and option 4 full cost and depreciation for listed equipment) will thus be used as an exception (see HE General MGA pages 28-29, footnotes 21, 22 and 23), **only if justified by the nature of the actions and the context of the use of the equipment or assets. In Horizon Europe, the intention would be to use these three other options for a limited number of calls**, notably for calls for which the purpose is generally to have beneficiaries developing prototypes.

Against that background, a full cost option can only be activated in a specific grant if it was selected for the call by the granting authority; i.e. if the call for proposals explicitly authorises its use in grants awarded under such call. If not included in the call, beneficiaries will not be able to charge the full purchase costs of the equipment used for a prototype. In practice, you can check if the call and topic includes any conditions for equipment costs eligibility in the topic conditions table that can be found at the beginning of each call and at the beginning of each topic. As an example, option 3 (depreciation costs and full cost for listed equipment) can be found in [Cluster 4 Work Programme](#) under the Specific conditions applying to *HORIZON-CL4-SSA-SST-MS*, *HORIZON-CL4-SSA-SST-STM-AE*, *HORIZON-CL4-SSA-SST-SB*, *HORIZON-CL4-SSA-SST-SP*, *HORIZON-CL4-SSA-SST-SD* (see page 435-437).

The call CLIMATE NEUTRAL, CIRCULAR AND DIGITISED PRODUCTION 2022 (HORIZON-CL4-2022-TWIN-TRANSITION-01) you refer to has not authorised the use of a full cost option and,

consequently, only depreciation costs (i.e. option 1 by default) would be eligible for funding, including for a prototype. e no 242802, 13. June, 2022



Exchange rate application when changing the currency of beneficiary's general accounts

My client is a participant in a Horizon Europe project with the first reporting period spanning from November 1, 2022, to April 30, 2024. The client's general accounts were established in CZK until December 31, 2022, after which they transitioned to EUR from January 1, 2023.

To determine the appropriate exchange rate for costs incurred in November and December 2022, is it accurate to assume that the average of daily exchange rates will be calculated over the entire reporting period, encompassing November 1, 2022, to April 30, 2024?

Case no 3180266, 29. December 2023

We understand that you have a query about the exchange rate to be used in case a Beneficiary changes his accounting currency during a reporting period of a Horizon Europe project.

You refer to a project with the first reporting period running from 1 November 2022 to 30 April 2024. Till 31 December 2022 the Beneficiary's general accounts were established in CZK; from 1 January 2023 the Beneficiary used the EUR.

We hereby confirm that Article 21.3 of the General model grant agreement - general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf (europa.eu) should be applied: "Beneficiaries with general accounts established in a currency other than the euro must convert the costs recorded in their accounts into euro, at the average of the daily exchange rates published in the C series of the Official Journal of the European Union (ECB website), calculated over the corresponding reporting period."

This means that **the average daily rate calculated over the whole reporting period should be used for the costs incurred in November-December 2022**. For the rest of the reporting period no conversion is needed since the costs are already established in EUR.

Proposal template – Purchase costs

I have a question concerning Horizon Europe and Proposal Template (RIA, IA). How to fill in the table Table 3.1h: 'Purchase costs' items? Compared to the H2020 there is newly the requirement "The record must list cost items in order of costs and starting with the largest cost item, up to the level that the remaining, costs are below 15% of personnel costs." and column „Remaining purchase costs (< 15 % of pers. Costs)". What should be filled in which column in the following case (especially in the column "Remaining purchase costs")?

Personnel costs (280 000 € → 15 % is 42 000 €)
Travel and subsistence (8000 €) - Travel and subsistence costs of personnel related to 5 project meetings (4000 €) + Travel costs of an external expert for 4 travels (4000 €)
Equipment (200 000 €) - Depreciation costs of laser equipment

Other goods, works and services (12 000 €) - Logistic support for 2 project meetings (organisation of rooms, catering - 7 000 €) + CFS (5 000 €)

Remaining purchase costs (< 15 % of pers. Costs)- ???

Total purchase costs (220 000 €)

Case no 169521, 9. April 2021

The intention is that applicants give details of major costs items under the category of Purchase costs. We do not ask details of minor costs for which travel and subsistence normally belongs. In your example

- Personnel costs (280 000 € → 15 % is 42 000 €)
- Total purchase costs (220 000 €)

Purchase costs exceed EUR 42.000, so applicants will have to give details of purchase costs, starting with the most expensive items up to the level that the remaining costs are below EUR 42.000, so applicants need to give details up to (220.000 – 42.0000 = 178.000). They will start with the most expensive one:

Equipment: EUR 200.000

With only this they are already above EUR 178.000, so they will not need to give more details. So the applicants will fill in the table as follow:

Participant Number/Short Name	Cost (€)	Justification
Travel and subsistence		
Equipment	200.000	Depreciation costs for laser equipment used in tasks XY
Other goods, works and services		
Remaining purchase costs (<15% of pers. Costs)	20.000	
Total	220.000	

The main message is that **we are only interested in checking the justification of major costs items.**

Travel Costs – per-diems

I would like to ask for your confirmation concerning travel costs in Horizon Europe programme. The current pre-draft of the annotated model grant agreement does not mention that the so-called "per-diems" for employees as well as external experts as travel costs are eligible (as they were eligible in H2020). Could you please confirm that per-diems are an eligible cost in HE?

Case no 609916, 20. August 2021

Travel costs must comply with the general cost eligibility conditions set out in Article 6.1 (e.g. incurred in connection with the action and necessary for its implementation, etc.) and with the

specific cost eligibility conditions set out in Article 6.2.C.1 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement. The latter provides that travel costs are eligible provided that they are based on costs actually incurred and in line with the beneficiary's usual practices on travel. This means that **if it is the beneficiary's usual practice to reimburse travel costs on the basis of a 'per diem', this will be considered as the actual cost** incurred by this beneficiary (in line with its usual practices on travel).



Travel Costs – Associated Partners

I refer to AGA, specifically page 12, where you discuss potential role combinations, such as the conditions under which an associated partner may act as a subcontractor, etc. I have a specific question: Is it permissible for a beneficiary to cover travel costs (e.g., plane tickets and accommodation) from its budget for an employee of an associated partner and subsequently allocate these expenses to the project?

Case no 3678171, 8. March 2024

We understand you would like to know if beneficiaries are allowed to cover from their own budget travel costs for an employee of an associated partner and consequently allocate these expenses to the project.

Associated partners are entities which implement action tasks but without receiving EU funding and without becoming party to the Grant Agreement (i.e. they do not sign the Grant Agreement). In fact, according to Article 9.1 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement, they may not charge costs or contributions to the action and the costs for their tasks are not eligible.

Therefore, **costs for the travels undertaken by personnel of associated partners in the context of the performance of their action tasks are not eligible under Horizon Europe, regardless whether the costs are incurred by the beneficiaries or by the associated partners themselves.** Otherwise, it could be seen as a way of circumventing the rules.

For additional information on the rules applicable to associated partners, you may consult the annotations to Article 9.1 in the Annotated Grant Agreement ('AGA' see version 1.0 of 1 April 2023, available here: [aga_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)).

UK partners in the project proposal

We received diverging information on the inclusion of UK participants. According to RES reply no 1640091: "The coordinator must indeed be a beneficiary and beneficiaries must not only be eligible to participate but also be eligible to receive EU funding. If in a multi-beneficiary project at **the time of signature the UK entity cannot be a beneficiary, another beneficiary will have to take over the role of coordinator.**"

Q1: Does this mean that all third countries not eligible for EU-funding can ONLY participate as associated partner or is it also possible to include them as beneficiaries without EU-funding (as it was possible in H2020)?

Q2 : In case organisations from third countries not eligible for funding can also participate as beneficiaries without EU-funding would it be possible for them to be coordinator (as in H2020)?

Q3 : For projects that are currently replacing an UK coordinator because they only participate as associated partner would it be possible to change their status to beneficiary / coordinator during the

course of the project via an amendment once the association of the UK is in place (even if they will be funded by the UK for this project)?

Case no 1640091, 10. February 2022

Q1: Under HE the 'beneficiary' status refers to entities eligible for participation and funding. The legal status 'beneficiaries not (eligible) to receiving EU funding' is no longer foreseen in the Model Grant Agreement under Horizon Europe. Participants from non-associated third countries which are not eligible for funding may participate 'associated partners'. To note that UK entities will be treated as entities from an associated country, as long as the association agreement with the United Kingdom applies at the time of signature of the grant agreement.

Q2: They cannot be coordinators. In order to be coordinator of a project, a legal entity must be a beneficiary in accordance with Article 7 of the Horizon Europe Model grant agreement. Only entities eligible for funding can sign the grant agreement and become a beneficiary.

Q3: If requested by the consortium, an amendment of the grant agreement would be necessary to change the status of the UK entity from an associated partner to a beneficiary when the association is in place, is applicable.

UK Partners – Grant Agreement Preparation Phase

I have a question concerning UK partners which are involved in consortia that are currently at the stage of the GAP (HE). UK partners may be involved as associated partners and may apply for national funding but this national funding is not possible for all calls. In cases where national funding will be lacking, there is a danger that UK partners will leave the consortium. How will the EC react? Will the consortium have to find other partners? Will there be room for negotiation with the EC so that partners are found to be necessary for the implementation of the project and funded by the EC? Will the deadlines for signing the GA be extended? Are there any other instructions NCPs can provide to the clients in these cases?

Case no 1720881, 2. March 2022

We take that this is about the possible participation of a non Associated third country entity as an associated partner (AP) in a given project. If the AP would not be able to perform its tasks under the project in view of a lack of funding (e.g. own resources /national funding), the respective entity should not participate in the project .

In this case the consortium will need to either redistribute the tasks among the existing members of the consortium or find a replacement for the tasks assigned to the AP. In principle, the consortium will be offered a reasonable time to rearrange their proposal. The granting authority reserves the right to assess if the redistribution of budget and tasks puts into question the results of the evaluation.

VAT – status change

I have a question concerning Horizon 2020/Horizon Europe projects and the eligibility of VAT. Could you please confirm that the following steps are correct? An institution charges VAT to the project. Then, after three years, they change their VAT status for the project (which is fully in line with Czech legislation), they correct their own accounting and then with the next financial report, they make adjustments to the previous financial reports. Is this OK? Are there any other additional steps which should be taken because of the change? I.e. informing the PO or uploading any documents into the portal?

Case no 1038026, 8. October 2021

A beneficiary can declare VAT on eligible costs when it is not deductible. In this regard, please keep in mind that according to Article 6.5(ix) of the H2020 Model Grant Agreement, deductible VAT is not ineligible, and according to Article 6.3(viii) of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement, deductible or refundable VAT is not eligible. If the VAT status of a beneficiary modifies with a retroactive effect the amount of eligible VAT declared in previous reporting periods, the beneficiary may declare the differences as adjustments in the next reporting period. You may add an explanation in the next reporting and/or contact the project officer to explain this.

CFS exempted beneficiaries

During Grant Agreement Preparation beneficiaries must declare whether they are exempted from CFS. Are there any cases where partners are exempt from CFS even though they receive more funding than the threshold? There are any rules regarding this exemptions? Please, could you provide us with the exemption rules if they exist?

Case no 1786376, 1. March, 2022

In Horizon Europe, a CFS must be submitted by all kind of legal entities (acting as beneficiary or as affiliated entities in a given Horizon Europe action) if they reach the threshold indicated in point 4.3 of the data sheet (i.e. EUR 430 000 of requested EU contribution to costs, as the general rule in Horizon Europe). Therefore, **it is not intended to activate the option for 'exempted beneficiaries' under Horizon Europe actions.**

Exchange rate suspension

I have a follow up question to 101000461517, i.e. calculation of correct exchange rate at the end of a reporting period when the reporting period was suspended for 12 months. According to the reply, in this case we should calculate the rates as if there were two reporting periods: from beginning of the project until beginning of suspension and from end of suspension until end of the project. Is this reply relevant for both the MSCA and the RIA/IA/CSA?

Case no 2473611, 16. December 2022

The logic applies also to other types of grants, i.e. RIA, IA, etc. There will be a calculation from the beginning of the reporting period until the date of suspension and then another from the resumption day until the end of the reporting period.

Visibility rules

Could you please confirm that the rules concerning visibility in HE projects changed slightly compared to H2020? In H2020, according to Art. 38, outputs needed to display the EU emblem and state: "“This project has received funding from the [European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme] [Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018] under grant agreement No [number]”. In HE, according to Art. 17, outputs need to display the EU emblem with the "(co)funded by the EU" statement. Additionally, the outputs should also carry a disclaimer: "Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or [name of the granting authority]. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. „Is this correct? In other words, the project number/acronym does not have to be visible for outputs in HE projects?

Case no 381807, 11. July 2022

Please find below the updated reply to your question. Kindly disregard the previous one that we sent you. Note that the Research Enquiry service provides general guidance only and cannot comment on the specificities of your particular case.

As you rightly point out, the **visibility rules applicable to Horizon Europe projects have changed compared to H2020.**

According to Article 17(2) of the HE Model Grant Agreement (MGA), unless otherwise agreed with the granting authority, **only the emblem** (i.e. the European flag) and the funding statement (translated into local languages, where needed) **must be displayed** in order to acknowledge the EU support to the project.

This is due to the fact that the HE MGA, including its HE visibility rules, are now based on the so-called ‘corporate MGA’, i.e. the **grant agreement that will be used across different EU programmes** and must be applied consistently. In this regard, the visibility rules for EU grants based on the corporate MGA have been streamlined and harmonised.

Partial CFS I

I am following up on a question raised during our recent Legal and Financial NCP meeting last week (via SLIDO FAQs), which unfortunately did not receive a clear response. The specific query pertains to the following:

In H2020, it is possible for the beneficiary either to do one CFS per reporting period or a single CFS for the whole duration of the action. However:

- 1) The certificate(s) may be submitted only with the FINAL financial report.
- 2) Costs for partial CFS (i.e., one certificate per reporting period) are accepted only in the LAST REPORTING PERIOD if CFS is mandatory (threshold is reached at the end of the action), and
- 3) the total costs of the partial certificates are similar to the costs that would have been incurred for a single certificate.“

See H2020 AGA, Version 5.2, p. 190.

QUESTION: Do the abovementioned rules/principles also apply to Horizon Europe projects (only threshold changed)?

We foresee continuity in this respect, but confirmation will be welcomed. Your prompt clarification on this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Case no 3036916, 16. November 2023

Please kindly note that the Research Enquiry service provides general guidance only and cannot comment on the specificities of your particular case.

From your question we understand that you would like to know whether the H2020 AGA-explained approach on having possibly interim CFS done but submitted at final stage altogether (upon the condition that their costs would be similar to the costs for a single CFS) could also apply in the context of Horizon Europe.

As explained during the last NCP meeting, this exceptional approach of multiple CFS has been discussed internally at technical level with central services. However, considering the upcoming revision of the CFS template, we are not in the position to give a formal and conclusive answer for the moment. It may be considered in the future but **for the time-being, we will only require and cover the costs for a single CFS at final payment.** However, beneficiaries are free to audit themselves whenever they find it necessary and can use the CFS template if they want.

Partial CFS II

In project where beneficiaries have to deliver an interim CFS, how are the thresholds calculated?

If they reach the first threshold and deliver a CFS with the first periodic report, do they then have to deliver a new one if they don't reach the threshold for the next report?

And if they haven't reached the final threshold by the end of the project will they still to deliver a new CFS with the final report covering the whole project period, including the periods covered by an interim CFS?

Case 3601541, 20. March 2024

As a preliminary remark it is not clear to us whether your question refers to H2020 or to Horizon Europe Framework. In this context, we note that the CFS in both Framework Programmes is only due at the final report, but **the approach of having partial CFS per reporting period (but submitted at final stage altogether) is only foreseen in the context of H2020.** Therefore, we have to distinguish:

H2020: For H2020 actions, Article 20.4 of the H2020 Grant Agreement provides that a certificate on the financial statement (CFS) is needed if the beneficiary requests a total financial contribution for the whole project of EUR 325.000 (or more) as reimbursement for actual costs and personnel costs declared on the basis of unit costs calculated according to its usual accounting practices. As such, please note that the EUR 325.000 threshold is counted for the whole project and not per reporting period. Therefore, beneficiaries have to issue CFS ONLY in the last reporting period and DO NOT have to deliver interim CFS.

However, for H2020 there is certain flexibility for the submission of the CFS. As indicated in H2020 AMGA p.190, Beneficiaries/linked third parties MAY submit either one certificate per reporting period or a single CFS for the whole action.

The certificate(s) may be submitted ONLY with the final financial report. Certificates submitted at any other moment will NOT be accepted (and costs incurred for them will be considered ineligible, because not necessary).

Costs for partial certificates (i.e. one certificate per reporting period) will be accepted ONLY in the last reporting period and ONLY if:

- a CFS is mandatory (i.e. the threshold is reached at the end of the action) and
- the total costs of the partial certificates is similar to the cost that would have been incurred for a single certificate.

Horizon Europe: According to the Article 24.2 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement (MGA p. 65), "If required by the granting authority (see Data Sheet, Point 4.3), the beneficiaries must provide certificates on their financial statements (CFS), in accordance with the schedule, threshold and conditions set out in the Data Sheet".

The CFS threshold is to be calculated separately per beneficiary or affiliated entity for whom financial statements are submitted.

As indicated in the data sheet (section "4.3 Certificates" of the HE MGA Version 1.1. 15 April 2022 page 16), for HE actions, the CFS is scheduled **only** at the final payment, if the threshold is reached.

The standard threshold for issuing a CFS in the HE is when the requested EU contribution to costs is equal or higher than the amount of EUR 430 000 (or EUR 725 000 for the specific case of beneficiary with a low risk SPA beneficiaries see art. 24.4 of the MGA)



Partners with link on Russia

Dear RES, we have a client who would like to include the Saami Council in an application. This is an NGO that represents the indigenous Saami people in the north of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Russian federation. The question is; can the Saami council which is a Norwegian legal entity participate in a project when the organization has members from Russia? Can they participate if they have a firewall in place to make sure that they only involve the Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish part of the organisation and not the Russian?

Case 2682416, 10. February 2023

The [General Annexes of the 2023-2024 HE WP](#) at p. 13 provide that legal entities established in Russia, even if not subjected to EU restrictive measures, are not eligible to participate in any capacity to the HE programme.

For entities established outside Russia, EU funding will not be allocated to them if a Russian public entity controls them or owns more than 50% of their shares.

In practical terms, this means that the Saami Council, i.e. a Norwegian NGO, which includes nine members from Norway, Finland, Sweden and Russia, can participate in activities and receive funding

under HE, provided that its two Russian members do not control it nor own more than 50% of that entity. Accordingly we would advise not to involve the Russian members of the Saami Council in the activities of the project as this could pose questions on appropriateness of reimbursement of their costs.

Periodic reporting: Associated Partners

Dear RES, I have a few questions concerning the periodic reporting in projects with Associated Partners (AP). As stipulated in Art. 9.1 of the MGA.: “Beneficiaries must ensure that their contractual obligations under Articles ... 20 (record-keeping) also apply to AP.”

Furthermore, Article 20 of the MGA indicates that AP are required to maintain their own records to validate the proper implementation of the project. In light of this, I have two inquiries:

Q1: Could you please provide a detailed explanation of the specific information that AP are expected to retain in their records?

Q2: To clarify my understanding, is it correct to presume that, given the linkage of person-months (PM) reporting to financial statements, AP are not obligated to report on person-months in the periodic reports?

I appreciate your time and assistance in providing clarity on these matters. Thank you for your attention to this inquiry.

Case 1323762, 3. November 2023

Please note that according to Article 9.1, the beneficiary responsible for an associated partner must ensure that the record-keeping obligations outlined in Article 20 also apply to the associated partner.

Since associated partners are not required to report costs, the record-keeping obligation is limited to maintaining records that validate the proper implementation of the project. Specific records kept by associated partners may vary depending on the project's unique requirements. The records validating proper implementation of the project do not differ from those required from beneficiaries (except financial related records).

Concerning your question on person-months, we understand that you are referring to the specific table on person-month which follows the declaration of personnel costs. We can confirm that **associated partners are not obliged to report person months in this table**. However more generally, the periodic reports should reflect the work carried out by Associated Partners. In this regard, deviations in the work and efforts of an Associated Partner compared to what is provided in Annex 1 should be indicated in the technical report.

Proposal missing administrative details

One of our clients has submitted the project proposal with the missing information in administrative forms (namely in the “Participants” section, e.g., “Researchers involved in the proposal,” “List of

publications,” and “relevant projects and activities”). Can this affect the evaluation of the proposal? How?

Case 2863046, 26. April 2023

In relation to your question, the external evaluators will notice the missing information and most probably will penalise the applicant under Sub-Criterion 3.2: Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

Please note that the EU Financial Regulation 2018/1046 Article 188 on the general principles applicable to grants lays down that grants shall be subject to the principles of equal treatment. Consequently, no additional data or significant changes can be allowed after the call deadline.

LUMP SUM

LUMP SUM: How to include Affiliate entities in LS projects

I have two questions concerning affiliates entities and HE lum sum projects.

Q1: Do affiliated entities in HE lump sum projects have to fill in the number of person months in the Table “3.1f: Summary of staff effort” in own separate row or in the row of the beneficiary (i.e. one row will include sum of person months of beneficiary and its affiliated entity the same way as it is in the Excel sheet tab „Total person-months“)?

Q2: Table 3.1h should be filled in separately for affiliated entity and beneficiary or only one table summing up all purchase cost of both entities should be provided?

Case no 2921716 , 20. August 2023

First, please note that affiliated entities have to fill in the table 3.1f “Summary of staff effort” in a separate row.

Then, please note affiliated entities have to fill in the table 3.1h “Purchase costs’ items” in a separate table, and not together with the beneficiary.

LUMP SUM: Affiliated entities numbering

I have a question concerning numbering of participants and affiliated entities in lump sum proposals in Horizon Europe. In Budget Excel sheets, affiliated entities do not have own participant number (e.g., 1 - TC PRAHA, AE – VSCHT, 2 – FFG). In Administrative forms (2- Participants and 3-Budget), affiliated entities have own number (e.g., 1 - TC PRAHA, 2 – VSCHT, 3 – FFG). This results in different numbering in Excel sheets and in Administrative forms. Is it correct? Isn't that confusing for the evaluators?

We assume that in Part B (Participant number and name, Table 3.1 f – Number of person-months required, Participants profile) the numbering should reflect the Budget Excel sheets (i.e., 1 - TC PRAHA, AE – VSCHT, 2 – FFG). Correct?

Case no 1149602, 13. September 2023

Currently, the numbering in the Excel template for the detailed lump sum budget does not match the numbering in Part A and Part B of the proposal. The reason is, indeed, that affiliated entities, which appear on the same sheet as the main beneficiary, do not have their own number in this template. This will be corrected in a new version of the template as soon as possible.

Until the new version becomes available, applicants should ensure that all participants appear in the same order in all tables throughout the proposal. This means the numbering will be the same in Part A and Part B, while the numbering will be different in the Excel table in case there are affiliated entities. However, despite the difference in numbering, the order should be the same in all relevant tables.



LUMP SUM: Associated partners, Summary of staff effort table

Do associated partners in HE lump sum projects have to fill in the number of person months in the Table “3.1f: Summary of staff effort” or not?

Case no 2914301, 20 April 2023

Please that like in actual cost grants, **associated partners in HE lump sum proposals must fill in the table “3.1f: Summary of staff effort”**. For more information, please see the FAQ 18452 on the Funding and Tender Portal

Associated partners are entities which participate in the action without signing the grant agreement, and without the right to charge costs or claim contributions. They need to be registered in the Participant Register since the participant identification code (PIC) is mandatory for the submission of the application form, but they do not need to be validated.

Associated partners do not have edit rights in the submission forms; the coordinator must encode all their information for them, including the information on role of participating organisation, researchers table and the information on participants’ previous activities related to the call. They also must include their budget under the columns ‘Income generated by the action’, ‘Own resources’ or ‘Financial contributions’ in the proposal budget table, as applicable. In addition, the tasks to be performed by associated partners must be described in the proposal part B, including their planned effort per WP.

If the proposal is funded, associated partners do not sign the grant agreement and their budget is therefore not included in the annex 2 of the grant agreement. We keep for reference the budget included in the proposal. Periodic reports and deliverables must include information on the activities carried out by associated partners, however they do not have edit rights to use the grant management tool. Their contributions are not appearing in the use of resources section as part of the periodic reporting.

Associated partners can become work package leaders, milestone leaders and lead beneficiaries in work packages in Horizon Europe projects. If this is the case, the AP can be selected from the list of available project partners.

 **LUMP SUM: Declaration on days spent on the action**

In lump sum projects „beneficiaries do not need to keep records of their actual costs (e.g. timesheets or invoices). There is no financial reporting, and no checks or audits of the costs incurred“ (see FAQ on the FTOP). To make it fully clear – in lump sum projects neither timesheets nor monthly declaration on days spent for the action are needed (unless required under national law or under internal procedures). Correct?

Case no 706442, 27. June 2023

This is correct. **Neither timesheets nor monthly declaration on days spent for the action, are requested under lump sum grants.** In lump sum grants, there is no reporting of resources, and beneficiaries do not need to keep records of the actual cost incurred (those records may still have to be kept to comply with national requirements or internal procedures).

 **LUMP SUM: Depreciation justification**

I have a question concerning HE lump sum projects - the Excel sheet – Depreciation cost list. What information is expected in the column „Justification – Needed info for depreciation “? Is it mandatory to fill in this column?

Case no 2912736, 20. April 2023

The column „**Justification – Needed info for depreciation** “ **is not mandatory**. Applicants can use it if they want to give more information about the equipment and its use for the project.

 **LUMP SUM: Personnel costs justification**

I have a question concerning personnel cost and lump sum proposals in Horizon Europe.

According to the Commission instructions applicants should justify particularly high personnel costs (compared to data in Dashboard) e.g., by the need for senior or specialized staff, extreme inflation etc. What is the most appropriate place to provide this information? In the Budget Excel table under the "Any Comments" tab or elsewhere? Is it also necessary to explain somewhere in Part B?

Case no 1150027, 13. September 2023

The explanation should be **under “Any comments”**. Additional information may be needed in the narrative part of the proposal.

Provide a concise justification in the “Any comments” tab. If applicable, this should point out the part in the proposal where more information is available.

The circumstances that lead to particularly high personnel costs should be clear in the proposal (e.g., the need for senior staff should be justified in and by the work plan).



LUMP SUM: PM Reporting

I have a question concerning Horizon Europe lump sum projects and the number of person-months (PMs). According to the LS MGA (Ar. 6): „Lump sum contributions are eligible, if: ... (b) the work packages are completed and the work is properly implemented by the beneficiaries and/or the results are achieved, in accordance with Annex 1“. The Annex 1 includes a Staff effort table (including number of PMs per beneficiary and per work package).

Can you confirm the staff effort table in annex 1 of the lump sum GA is not binding for the beneficiaries? The other option would be that since the number of PMs is binding in the GA, the beneficiaries that implement the activities with significantly different real staff effort breach the Grant agreement and related lump sum contributions are ineligible under art. 6 of the MGA.

Case no 3113496, 23. November 2023

At proposal stage, the information on staff effort (table 3.1f in Part B of the proposal) must correspond to the information provided in the detailed budget table.

At grant preparation, this information is transferred automatically into Part A of Annex I Description of the Action (DoA) of the grant agreement (GA), taking into account any change done to this table as a result of the evaluation.

Once the lump sum grant is signed, the proper implementation of the work as described in Annex I is the only thing we will assess (not the person-month actual number). It is certainly in the interest of the beneficiaries to not deviate too much from what was planned behind person-month efforts and distribution over work packages, to be able to implement properly the work. At the same time, **the staff effort table in Annex I will not be checked**, because for lump sums, there is no specific report on the use of resources, including no explanations for person-months per work package.

However, at reporting stage, the technical report should still detail who did what (at the level of the participating organisations, not at the level of individual staff), indicating the contributions from beneficiaries, affiliated entities, associated partners, and subcontractors (if any).



LUMP SUM: Two-stage

I have been trying to find information on how the detailed Lump sum budget is handled in the two-stage blind evaluation calls. Is the detailed budget only requested in stage two? If so what is the level of budget detail expected in stage one?

Case no 854597, 2023

We confirm that the [Detailed budget table \(HE LS\)](#) is not required for STAGE-1 submission. When submitting Stage-1 proposals, in general, applicants are not required to provide a detailed budget, but a TOTAL Requested EU contribution to eligible costs (Requested grant amount) – EUR.

The [Standard application form \(HE RIA IA Stage 1\)](#) published in the [Funding and Tenders Portal](#) provides a clear indication of how Part of A of the proposal is structured, including the budget.

WIDENING

Era Talents – charging the equipment

Under topic HORIZON-WIDERA-2022-TALENTS-03-01, can costs of equipment (depreciation) be funded? E.g., depreciation of the laboratory equipment used during training/secondment?

Case no 2084091, 25. October 2022

No, equipment, including its depreciation, is not reimbursed under this call.

ERA Chairs

Dear RES, I have a few questions concerning the Era Chairs scheme in Horizon Europe (see below). Unlike in Twinning/Teaming, research costs (up to 10% of the EU grant) are separated from expenses related to the ERA Chair holder and team members (e.g., their salaries, recruitment costs, administrative costs, travel, and subsistence costs) and can be spread across different WP.

Q1: Is that correct?

Q2: How do the evaluators check whether the ceiling is respected in the project proposal? What exactly is checked at this point?

Q3: How will the ceiling be controlled during/at the end of project implementation?

Case no 2015691, 7. October 2022

Q1: Grants have an expected duration of up to 5 years and cover expenses related to the ERA Chair holder and a number of team members (e.g. their salaries, recruitment costs, administrative costs, travel and subsistence costs). They also cover research costs up to 10% of the EU contribution.

Q2: The evaluators can only assess the information presented in the proposal. If not enough clear, this might be fixed at the Grant Agreement Preparation phase.

Q3: During project implementation the coordinators will be asked to report on the research component work/budget at the end of each reporting period and so this aspect will be controlled.

Teaming

I have a few questions concerning Teaming scheme in Horizon Europe (see below). In Teaming projects, a minor research component can be accepted, not exceeding 10% of the total Horizon

Europe grant. Such a small research project embedded in the Teaming action should be aligned with the project's objectives.

Q1: Do we understand correctly that a dedicated work package should be used for the research component? If yes, why is it not mentioned in the work programme?

Q2: How do the evaluators check whether the ceiling is respected in the project proposal? What exactly is checked at this point?

Q3: How will the ceiling be controlled during/at the end of the project implementation?

Q4: Do evaluators assess the effectiveness/relevance of the complementary funding budget? Do they evaluate whether it is viable, sufficient, etc.?

Case no 2015686, 7. October 2022

Q1: WP 21-22 specifies for the Teaming action that *“A minor research component can be accepted not exceeding 10% of the total Horizon Europe grant that may include a preparatory research project. Such small research project embedded in the Teaming action should be aligned with the objectives of the project and e.g. serve the purpose of developing and testing new methodologies and instruments and/or the integration of new scientific personnel. If preparatory research activity is planned to carry out, the outline of a respective work plan at an appropriate level of detail should be presented”*, so it **might be easier for applicants to handle the research component in a separate Work package**, however, this is not a requirement.

Q2: The evaluators can only assess the information presented in the proposal. If not enough clear, this might be fixed at the Grant Agreement Preparation phase.

Q3: During project implementation the coordinators will be asked to report on the research component work/budget at the end of each reporting period and so this aspect will be controlled.

Q4: Yes, if you mean the relevance of complementary funding to the project. The Annex on complementary funding provides detailed information on these aspects.

Twining

I have a few questions concerning the Twining scheme in Horizon Europe (see below). The research part of the project should be presented through a dedicated work package. This means that: Total costs of this work package (personnel costs, purchases, subcontracting, ...) may not exceed 30% of the total grant; furthermore, at least 70% of the budget for research activities must be allocated to the coordinator).

Q1: Is that correct? **Q2:** How do the evaluators check whether these ceilings are respected in the project proposal? What exactly is checked at this point? The number of person-months dedicated to the "research" work package? Something else (e.g., cost amount of Euros)? Since the standard project proposal for CSA is used, it is not clear how to comply with the ceilings in the project proposal.

Q3: How will both ceilings (30 and 70%) be controlled during the project implementation, and by whom? Do we understand correctly that financial audits will not check these ceilings? Does the project officer control them during the project or only at the end?



Twining, Association membership

How is the cost of association membership considered in Horizon Europe? Can the costs of membership of national or international (European) associations be considered eligible? Does it matter whether it would be individual and institutional membership? E.g. our client, which has a Twining project, would like to pay for membership of the Czech Nuclear Association (said to be related to the project topic) and another client, again in a Twining project, membership of the International Union of Laboratories and Experts in Construction Materials, Systems and Structures.

Case no 3474336, 23. February 2024

We understand that your question is whether costs related to the beneficiary's membership to an association are eligible under a Horizon Europe Twining project.

Generally speaking, costs must comply with the general eligibility conditions set out in Article 6.1 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement. Notably, they must be incurred in connection with the action as described in Annex 1 and necessary for its implementation.

In this regard, it is unclear from your question whether indeed such association membership is indeed necessary for the implementation of the project and it has been included as such in the Description of the action in Annex 1.

We note that normally, Twining actions are 'Coordination and Support Actions' (CSAs) which aim to enhance networking activities between the research institutions of the Widening countries and other institutions. However, we are afraid we do not have sufficient information in your query to assess whether this type of costs has been foreseen in the call conditions and described in Annex 1. **It is therefore recommended to contact the responsible Project Officer to assess on a case-by-case the particularities of the case.**

Q4: FAQ mentions that only consumables and small equipment may be charged as a part of research costs. It is not clear what is meant by "small" equipment costs. Does it mean equipment (as defined in Article 6.2.C.2 of the MGA) is not allowed? Please, clarify.

Case no 2015681, 7. October 2022 Q1: Is that correct?

Q1: This is correct for projects funded under the HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ACCESS-03 TWINNING call

Q2: The Evaluators checked this roughly during the evaluations for the HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ACCESS-03 TWINNING call according to the PMs allocated to the WP and the costs described in the Use of Resources section of the proposal. This was then further checked during the Grant Agreement Preparation with the applicants confirming the research costs of the project in a dedicated table which was included in the grant agreement Annex I.

Q3: During project implementation there will be a mid-term check and a final project review in which these aspects will be checked. A financial check by the auditors can include the compliance with any of the rules set in the Grant Agreement, so also the 30% - 70% rule.

Q4: Art. 6.2.C.2 of the AGA refers to how costs of equipment/infrastructure can be claimed i.e. depreciation/full cost etc. but does not identify the kind of equipment that can be bought. There is no definition of what 'small' implies but it should not constitute a significant part of the research budget. If there are doubts about an equipment cost, the project coordinator should check with his/her project officer.

 **Excellence Hubs: Definitions of a “public authority” and an “authorized agency”**

I have trouble advising applicants forming consortia for the call HORIZON-WIDERA-2023-ACCESS-07-01: Excellence Hubs. What are the definitions of a "public authority" and an "authorised agency"?

Case no 3496151, 5. February 2024

A public authority is a body of the state (e.g. ministry, city council, municipality) and an authorised agency can also be a legal entity of private law (but non-profit) that has been entrusted to carry out task for the state, notably in regional development, standardisation, environmental protection, mobility etc.

 **FAQ widening (continuously updated)**

FAQ on widening are continuously updated [here](#)

 List of questions from the WIDERA NCPs (8. November 2023)

No .	WP Topic	Question to the EC	Have you sent this question to the Research Enquiry Service?	Have you received the answer to your question?	Are you satisfied with the answer to your question?	Answer RTD / REA
1.	Teaming	Co-financing in the Teaming actions: why in-kind contributions are not considered eligible as complementary funding for the project? It is extremely difficult to get additional resources (private, national, or regional) as monetary contribution.	Yes	No	Not satisfied	This question has not been recorded into RES. Therefore, we have not seen it. Please, provide a reference number for this question. However, in-kind contributions are not considered eligible to strengthen synergetic activities within a country/region, to activate involvement of national partners, to increase attention to this particularly important project, also to avoid double funding concerns.
2.	Excellence Hubs	The submission systems allows to	Not yet			This is fine; issue is now resolved

		upload 2 annexes: Part B and FSTP. Where can the balance sheets of the business entities be uploaded? Merged with FSTP?				
3.	Excellence Hubs	FSTP under the mentoring scheme is especially meant for the support of start-ups and SMEs in the form of grants – could you give an example of how they can use this grant? For some expert trainings? Business coaching?	Not yet			It is up to the consortium to identify appropriate FSTP actions in the context of the project's objectives. Indeed training and coaching are relevant examples
4.	Excellence Hubs	The geographical coverage of FSTP: solely SMEs and start-ups from countries of the consortium partners?	Not yet			YES
5.	Excellence Hubs	Could FSTP target other groups of stakeholders as well?	Not yet			NO unless duly justified

6.	Excellence Hubs	The provider of FSTP must be the coordinator or it can be provided by partners to the entities in their respective countries?	Not yet			Partners can do so as well for entities of their countries
7.	Excellence Hubs	Will it be helpful to document Letters of support from institutions who want to cooperate with our Excellence hubs? If yes, where should we put these annexes?	Not yet			If they are really relevant, this might be helpful without anticipating the judgement of the expert evaluators, to be annexed to part B .
8.	ERA Chairs	When planning training stays of students and postdocs into other labs - should they be primarily European, or other countries too?	Not yet			The objective of ERA Chairs action is not to recruit PhD Students. Participation of PhD students is possible. Costs of PhD students that work for the coordinator can be accepted if the agreement is work-oriented rather than training-oriented. PhD agreements will be considered work-oriented. However, time for training, if any, may not be charged to the action.

						<p>Fellowships/scholarships/stipends can be charged to the action (as personnel costs in the Lump Sums), if they fulfil the conditions set out in Article 6.1 and 6.2.A.2 of the Annotated Grant Agreement, and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the remuneration complies with the application national law on taxes, labour and social security - the assignment of tasks respects the laws in force in the country of the beneficiary - the students have the necessary qualifications to carry out the tasks allocated to them under the action. <p>Training of staff for implementing the institutional/structural change of the research institution are pertinent to the specificity of the action and are therefore eligible.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

9.	ERA Chairs	Can 2 different institutions host an ERA Chair in a joint centre?	Not yet			NO
10.	Lump Sum	Could you elaborate on the Lump Sum personnel costs and the briefing for the evaluators? We have heard about cuts from the personnel costs based on the dashboard data. Since there are many calls under WIDERA with Lump Sum, this is important for our stakeholders.	No			See presentation on lump sum during the Widening Info day
11.	HOP-ON Facility call	I would like to ask you if it is possible to provide me: List of funded projects under Horizon Europe pillar 2 and the EIC Pathfinder for Hop-on Facility in xls format. Now it is available only in the	I sent this question to: Europe Direct Contact Centre/ Europe Direct Contact Centre <EuropeDirectContactCentre@edcc.ec.europa.eu>	I received an answer that it is not possible to send me this data in xls format. For future they will ask IT department	It took 2 weeks to receive this feedback to my question.	It can be now downloaded in xls from the portal

		readable format, not possible to download it.		t to prepare it in the format that can be downloaded.		
12	ERA Chairs	<p>The Work Program demonstrates a high degree of flexibility regarding the involvement of ERA Chairs, explicitly recognizing secondments as a valid and legally supported arrangement.</p> <p>1. Please clarify the following points: Is it correct to assume that the ERA Chair can participate based on a Secondment Contract established between the beneficiary and the</p>	No			<p>a) Yes, the WP gives flexibility on the contractual arrangements between the ERA chair holder and the host organisation including also secondment contract.</p> <p>b) This depends on the secondment agreement, if the host organisation pays directly the seconding organisation, this must be declared as such under cost category A3 seconded person.</p> <p>c) Yes, the letters of commitment from both the ERA chair holder (jointly undesignated with the seconding</p>

		<p>ERA Chair's home organization?</p> <p>2. Are the personnel costs for ERA Chairs allowed to be budgeted as "A3 Seconded Persons" in the Excel lump sum table?</p> <p>3. In the case of secondment, will evaluators require a Letter of Intent from the ERA Chair's home organization at the proposal stage?</p>				<p>organisation) and the host organisation MUST be provided as annexes to the proposal.</p> <p>d) d) The work programme does not set a minimum duration of stay from the ERA Chair at the host organisation, however in line with the tasks indicated in the WP, the working arrangements should allow the ERA Chair to commit and execute his duties.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---

		<p>4. Is there a minimum or recommended duration that the seconded ERA Chair should spend at the beneficiary's premises?</p> <p>We would greatly appreciate any additional information or specifics regarding this option.</p>				
13	Excellence Hubs	I wonder if students can be involved in a Excellence Hubs project, and if so, is it eligible to create some sort of student network?	Not yet			YES but not as part of their regular study curricula
14	ERA Chairs	How many reporting periods are and what is the pre-financing rate (as it is a lump	Not yet			For a duration of 5 years, the reporting period are three: at month 15, month 36 and month 60 and the pre-

		sum instrument, this is important for the preparation)?				financing rate of 53% of the grant requested amount
15	ERA Chairs	A professor from Israel on a sabbatical leave has during this stay abroad a 30% employment contract with the institution that wants to apply together with him for an ERA Chairs grant – is this possible if on the date of application he is still employed by the mentioned institution?	Not yet			Yes
16	ERA part/General question	Are there any special/additional requirements/conditions regarding composition of the consortium in case of the project proposal coordinated by an entity coming from an Associated Widening country (How many partners	No			No special conditions are applicable for the ERA part as such. The general conditions apply, and any specific ones relevant for the individual call topics.

		can participate in minimum and in maximum and from which countries : MS, AS, TC)?				
17	General comment	We would be glad if the FAQ of the open calls are more consistent and up to date.				FAQ are up to date at each call
18	General comment	FAQs for each call (even closed ones) should remain active and visible – this helps also in the implementation of projects. Furthermore, those FAQs which remain valid from one call to another such as the case of most Widening calls, these should be transferred at a very early stage to the next calls – so Teaming 2021 relevant FAQs should be transferred to				For Twinning and ERA chair they are up to date. The applicant should remember to click out the obsolete questions from the search REA to be checked

		Teaming 2023 call and same with Twinning, Excellence Hubs, etc				
19	HOP-ON/ General comment	We need a workshop on Hop-on Facility to re-design it in a more functional way. Many emails are being sent to coordinators and most of the time not responded to.				Will be discussed first with PC after presentation of survey results
20	General comment	The Work Programme is designed heavily for Universities and Research Organisations – in the next WP we should think more broadly to allow other entities such as Public entities and research intensive private entities the chance to participate in Twinning for instance – we should create a balance on				Well noted

		who can participate in Widening actions.				
21	General comment	We would like to see that published FAQs are up to date with call for proposals.				Well noted
22	Twinning/ General comment	We got really late the information on reporting periods, even the applicants were very confused, therefore we would urge to have these kind of information published at the time of the publication of the call.				Number of reporting periods for Twinning (and ERA Chairs) should indeed be mentioned in the FAQ
23	Twinning and Teaming/ General comment	Could you provide further clarification on PhD fees for Twinning and Teaming? The guidance isn't clear. In general, it would be really nice if deviations from the eligible costs under the corporate model grant agreement				These costs are not eligible in no way since they are educational

		could be better highlighted.				
--	--	------------------------------	--	--	--	--