Project: 101197332 — AgData
HORIZON-CL6-2024-GOVERNANCE-02-01

EU-wide data-driven solutions to real problems

First co-funded call of the Agriculture of Data partnership

Version 5.0

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-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 the European Research Executive Agency (REA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

KEY DATA

Version	5.0: 20 May 2026
Call launch	5 November 2025
Submission Deadline short proposals	21 January 2026
Submission deadline full proposals	21 July 2026

VERSIONS

Version	Date	changes
V0.1	June 25 2025	
V0.2	18 July 2025	Revisions by funders
V0.3	1 September 2025	1st comments by REA
V0.4	5 September 2025	2nd revision by funders (final)
V0.5	30 October 2025	2nd comments by REA
V1.0	5 November 2025	Published
V2.0	19 November 2025	• BMFTR participation confirmed • TUBITAK funding limit per project increased to 200.000€
V3.0	24 November 2025	Funding LAAFS (LV) corrected to 50k€
V4.0	8 January 2026	FCT (Fundacao para a Ciencia e a Tecnologia) will not participate in the call as a funding organisation.
V5.0	20 May 2026	BMLEH (Bundesminsterium für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat) will not participate in the call as a funding organisation.

CONTENT

The 1st call of the Agriculture of Data Partnership, *EU-wide data-driven solutions to real problems*, welcomes the submission of proposal responding to one of the following topics:

- **Topic 1 - Data technologies and data management** focused on identification, access, storage, integration and processing of FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data, tackling the diversity of relevant data to achieve i) interoperability, ii)data sharing in data marketplaces and data cooperatives and iii) enable application of AI techniques to develop robust AI models for the sector.
- **Topic 2 - Data-based solutions for sustainable agriculture** intended to strengthen capacities to adapt to climate change, enhancing functionality, performance assessment and decision making.
- **Topic 3 - Data-based solutions for policy-making** to provide reliable indicators that reflect effects of policies, in particular the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and development of tools to strengthen policy performance assessment, by means of data gathering and analytical capabilities. The current national assessment approach will be improved by an EU approach. Benefits for end users like the reduction of administrative burden and support to their own decision-making tools should be explored.

DEFINITIONS

Associated Partner	An Associated Partner in a proposal and transnational project is an entity or person performing tasks and accordingly having costs budgeted while not requesting any funding from any Funder participating in this call. In particular, entities not eligible for funding by one of the Funders and willing to participate in a proposal are Associated Partners. Associated Partners must provide a "Letter of financial commitment" for proposal submission to delineate their own contribution (see Annex IX).
Call Office	The Call Office is responsible for administrative support in relation to the call, all related call documents, submission platform, and all related procedures including submission of the funded transnational projects. The Call Office is not responsible for scientific support, i.e. regarding questions on the call scope. In general, the Call Office operates on weekdays between 09:00 and 15:00 CE(S)T and is managed by Project Management Juelich (Projektträger Jülich, PtJ, Germany).
Call Evaluation Secretariat (CES)	The Call Evaluation Secretariat (CES) is responsible for the evaluation procedure and is managed by the Spanish State Research Agency (Agencia Estatal de Investigación, AEI, Spain).
Co-funded call	The 1st Agriculture of Data co-funded call, also referred to as "the call".
Coordinator	The Coordinator coordinates and manages the research consortium at short proposal and full proposal stage, and over the entire lifetime of the transnational project. Details on the role, responsibilities and tasks of a Coordinator are described in section 3.3.
Core Research & Innovation Activities (C-R&I-A)	The C-R&I-As are listed and described in the SRIA of the AgData Partnership. They are organised along the three main themes and reflect the main objectives of the partnership. There are a total of 65 relevant C-R&I-As for this call that cover the three major topics of the call (see section 3.4 of this document).
Ethics Advisory Board (EAB)	The EAB will evaluate the full proposals on its ethical aspects.
Evaluation summary report (ESR)	The Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) of a proposal is the final reached consensus report obtained during the IEP meeting. It is the result of the individual reports of the three IEP members evaluating the proposal and the discussions during the IEP meeting. The ESR will be shared with the Coordinator and Funder Board.
Funder	Funders are organisations providing funding to the call according to their specific Funder regulations.
Funder Board (FB)	The FB consists of all Funders providing funding to the call. The FB will make the final decision on the selection of proposals based on the ranking lists provided by the IEP and on the availability of funds.
Funder Contact Point (FCP)	Each Funder appoints at least one Funder Contact Point (FCP) who provides support to potential applicants regarding eligibility rules and funding procedures of the appointing Funder (see section 4.4).
International Evaluation Panel (IEP)	The IEP consists of international experts in the remit of the call. Members of the IEP will evaluate each proposal according to the evaluation guidelines (see also sections 5.2 and 5.3). During the IEP meeting, the IEP will rank the proposals.

Partner	A Partner in a proposal and transnational project is an entity or person performing tasks and requesting funding from one of the Funders. Accordingly, a Partner must be eligible for funding from a Funder participating in this call.
Principal Investigator (PI)	In a proposal and transnational project, the Coordinator as well as each Partner and Associated Partner appoints each one Principal Investigator (PI). The PI is the person having access and login to the submission platform and the contact point for the Call Office and the Funders. Accordingly, the PI of the Coordinator is the person initiating and submitting the proposal.
Proposal	In the present document, the term "proposal" refers to both short proposal and full proposal. Where the text refers specifically to either the short proposal or the full proposal, this will be written explicitly.
Research and Innovation (R&I)	Internal and external R&I actions and initiatives.
Stakeholder	A Stakeholder in a proposal, Use Case, and/or transnational project is an entity or a person/group of persons not performing particular tasks and not budgeting any project costs. A Stakeholder is often used as advising entity e.g. for co-creation processes.
Science Policy Interface	Science Policy Interface aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policymaking process. Science for Policy Handbook | Knowledge for policy (europa.eu).
Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA)	The SRIA is the strategy document summarising the scientific research, development, and innovation needs within the scope of the Agriculture of Data partnership. See also AgData SRIA.
Use Case (UC)	Use Cases describe how projects or data that are developed/anaysed within the funded proposals are used for a specific outcome or output -**a concrete real-world task to be solved using the available data -** linked to AgData objectives and priorities, which are outlined in the SRIA. For further details please see also section 2 and Annex VI.

ABBREVIATIONS

AgData	Agriculture of Data, Horizon Europe Partnership
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AKIS	Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems
AMS	Area Monitoring System
API	Application Programming Interface
B2B	Business-to-Business
B2G	Business-to-Government
C	Carbon
CAP	Common Agricultural Polic
CES	Call Evaluation Secretariat
CEST	Central European Summer Time
CET	Central European Time
CoI	Conflict of Interest
C-R&I-A	Core Research & Innovation Activity
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DESCA	Development of a Simplified Consortium Agreement
DMP	Data Management Plan
DSS	Decision Support Systems
EAB	Ethics Advisory Board
EC	European Commission
EO	Earth Observation
ERIC	European Research Infrastructure Consortium
ESR	Evaluation Summary Report
ETR	End-term Report
EU	European Union
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable
FaST	Farm Sustainability Tool
FB	Funder Board
FCP	Funder Contact Point
FMIS	Farm Management Information Systems
G2B	Government-to-Business
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
ID	Identifyer
IEP	International Evaluation Panel
IoT	Internet of Things
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
k€	Kilo Euro
MCDA	Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis
ML	Machine Learning
MTR	Mid-term Report
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NDWI	Normalized Difference Water Index
PI	Principle Investigator
PM	Person Month
px	Pixel
R&I	Research & Innovation
REA	Research Executive Agency

REST	Representational State Transfer
ROI	Return on Invest
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SRIA	Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda
UC	Use Case
VHR	Very-High-Resolution
WP	Work Package

1 Introduction

The aim of the EU Partnership Agriculture of Data (AgData) is to "enhance climate, environmental and socio-economic **sustainability** and productivity of agriculture, and increase the capacity for policy monitoring and evaluation through exploiting the potential offered by Earth Observation (EO), other environmental and agricultural **data**, and using newly developed digital & data technologies in Europe to support the **parallel digital and green transitions**, with emphasis on utilising the **umbrella effect**", consolidating and linking the efforts of existing initiatives.

Data-based solutions are key assets to boost the resilience of the sector in terms of economic performance, attractiveness and sustainability and strengthen its competitiveness in the short-, medium- and long-term on local and global scales. They are also key enablers for implementing and assessing the performance of European and national policies smartly and efficiently. The further development of sustainable and competitive agricultural practices will require the sector to simultaneously reduce its environmental footprint, respond to the decline in biodiversity, while ensuring food security and adapting to climate change. The partnership Agriculture of Data will enable the sector to meet those challenges and cope with trade-offs, in particular through providing a foundation for decision support, for e.g. producers and policy-makers.

The overall scope of the scientific research, development and innovation needs targeted in the Agriculture of Data partnership are comprehensively described in the Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA).

The European regulation framework is evolving quickly in aspects deeply connected to AgData purposes. In the design of data-based solutions, the applicants in the call should take into account and demonstrate awareness of the applicable EU legislative measures on data governance, fair access and reuse. The applicants should also consider the requirements introduced by the AI Act, parts of which are already applicable.

2 Expected outcomes

The first call is an open call for transnational research projects with call topics based on the SRIA. It is expected that projects provide clear **added value** regarding the objectives of the AgData partnership. The projects should **address one of the following three main topics:** data technologies and data management, data-based solutions for economic, social and environmentally sustainable agriculture, or data-based solutions for policy-making and thereby contributing significantly and clearly to at least one of their respective SRIA Core Research & Innovation Activities (C-R&I-A) as indicated below.

Use Cases (UCs) - The partnership model is centered on the concept of so-called **Use Cases** in which C-R&I-As of the partnership are embedded. The Use Cases will serve as operational implementation of the actual developments of AgData, where the concepts and methods will be developed and tested in real-life application(s) or will result in real-life applications. In addition, the Use Cases will have the objective to implement and execute the C-R&I-As described in the SRIA. UCs should be an integral part of the project proposals for the first AgData Call. UCs should address a specific situation in which a product or service could potentially be developed, validated or even be used, including information on what the problem is and the expected result[1]. UCs will be requested to be identified and described in the project proposals.

[1] Information and examples of use cases with a focus on agricultural you can find here: Open agriculture data on the European Data Portal | data.europa.eu, Large-scale pilots in the digitisation of agriculture | Shaping Europe's digital future

The first call should provide a first group of **EU-wide data-driven solutions to real problems**. Projects that seek to capitalize on 1) EO data, environmental data, agricultural production data, sensor data, etc. 2) data spaces and 3) digitalization (e.g. AI) capabilities put into place at EU and national level though solutions to one or more C-R&I-A of those proposed in this call. The solutions will provide stakeholders and end users with tools to tackle daily challenges regarding 1) CAP application from public administration up to end users point of view, 2) climate change adaptation and mitigation and production cost vs benefits improvements.

Data and users are at the core of the call. Accessibility to reference data sets, data sharing schemes (including the necessary agreements) or the compatibility of common data spaces should be part of the solutions. The values embedded in the European Strategy for data, the provisions included in the Data act and the developments around the Common European Data Spaces – including the Common European Agricultural Data Space - is of course paramount .

A multiactor- and user-centric approach is key in AgData. Therefore, involvement of representatives of the targeted end-user groups and intermediaries, including farmers, advisors, and the administration as well as machinery providers should be considered. The interests in play must be carefully evaluated and balanced, and the value created for all the actors in the ecosystem must be clear and measurable.

In addition, projects should take advantage of the Research Infrastructures in place (e.g. AnaEE, ERIC, LifeWatch-ERIC, etc) and of **Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) deployed at national and regional levels** by exploiting the opportunities stemming from the creation of knowledge and innovation flows. Around AKIS the complete R&I ecosystem can be reached to engage as many relevant actors from the field as possible.

3 Call topics and scope

This call addresses three topics reflecting the main objectives of the partnership. For each topic specific C-R&I-As are envisaged by the partnership and described in the Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA). The three topics are:

Topic 1 - Data technologies and data management focused on identification, access, storage, integration and processing of FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data, tackling the diversity of relevant data to achieve i) interoperability, ii) data sharing in data marketplaces and data cooperatives and iii) enable application of AI techniques to develop robust AI models for the sector.

Topic 2 - Data-based solutions for sustainable agriculture intended to strengthen capacities to adapt to climate change, enhancing functionality, performance assessment and decision making.

Topic 3 - Data-based solutions for policy-making to provide reliable indicators that reflect effects of policies, in particular the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and development of tools to strengthen policy performance assessment, by means of data gathering and analytical capabilities. The current national assessment approach will be improved by an EU approach. Benefits for end users like the reduction of administrative burden and support to their own decision-making tools should be explored.

Applicants shall choose one topic (the topic their proposal addresses most) amongst these three and respond in their proposal to the corresponding scope description outlined below. In addition, the proposals should select one or more C-R&I-As of the SRIA (see section 3.4) that closely relate to their proposed project. A scientific justification for this selection is required in the proposal form.

Regardless of which topic is selected, all proposals must consider the EU policies on cybersecurity.

3.1 Topic 1 Data technologies and data management (full topic description)

See section 3.1 in SRIA

Research and innovation, data and computing infrastructures are essential in AgData. The diversity of data sources and formats is huge. Data technologies can be classified as being part of a system of record, insight, or engagement. The "system of record" allows data storage and management; it is the system used to maintain datasets. The basic agricultural plot management system is one such system. The "system of insight" provides analytical tools used to make better decisions, such as monitoring crops for growth, pests and diseases with imagery analysis to improve production. It can be divided into analyses carried out in the cloud and those carried out on edge devices. While in cloud computing large amounts of data can be considered in the analyses, in edge computing within a distributed information technology architecture, analyses are carried out with a limited amount of data directly at the source of data and/or the device where analytical result should induce action avoiding the transfer of huge amounts of data. The "system of engagement" allows data and information to be shared with other stakeholders and is used to gather field data with mobile devices or to share nationwide statistics at national level. Furthermore, especially in agriculture, most data have a spatial component (location is a key feature), so Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are widely used.

One of the major challenges with respect to **data Integration and data quality** required to unlock the potential of agricultural data is their enormous diversity in terms of format and content, their fragmentation, varying metadata description, standards, and semantics. Different services and technologies in a smart farming ecosystem have limited capability to work together due to the lack of standardized practices for data and system integration. Projects are expected to provide tools and frameworks to handle the diversity of agricultural data in terms of format and content, fragmentation, metadata description, standards and semantics in a comprehensive way, thereby contributing to unlocking their potential. Solutions need to tackle technical and semantic interoperability aiming at standardization, rich metadata collection, and connecting each data variable to a common language in the form of taxonomies and ontologies. Projects are expected to contribute to the development and testing of advanced frameworks, procedures, services and tools for data integration, data analysis and the presentation of results, and data quality procedures, including application and further development of innovative data technologies and data management approaches.

Data marketplaces and cooperatives in agriculture have the potential to be a real game changer in the development and adoption of data-based solutions by the agricultural sector. By developing data-based solutions based on the inputs from marketplaces and cooperatives across Europe, a new quality of products and services can be provided at European level. A key issue includes access to, and sharing of, data that are generated by farmers, i.e. farmers have to be enabled to access the data from the machines and need to have rights to save it in a data marketplace or within a data cooperative and then to share it for R&I and other purposes. Gaps include data fragmentation, due to, for example, incompatible formats of data generated through precision farming equipment developed by different manufactures; non-disclosure; and misappropriated ownership by banks, insurance companies, agribusinesses, hardware suppliers, etc. Projects will need to address the challenges related to data marketplaces and cooperatives in the data acquisition strategy and the testing of data-based solutions. The conditions for access to and use of data developed by the projects shall take into account the applicable EU regulations on data (e.g., GDPR, Data Act, and Data Governance Act).

Applications of AI techniques are crucial. The conventional data processing techniques are incapable of meeting the constantly growing demands in the new era of smart farming. Instead, AI, especially Machine Learning (ML) techniques, are particularly suitable for processing the large amount of data collected by heterogeneous sources such as sensors, robots, drones, autonomous tractors and harvesters by taking advantage of the exponential increase in computational power

achieved in recent decades. This implies the incorporation of sensing at different spatial and temporal scales, big data analysis, model development, digital twins as an advanced generation of interactive models and decision support, and implementation of advanced supercomputing techniques. Projects should address two main categories of challenges for the inclusion of AI-based solutions in agriculture, namely technical and governance: **1) Technical challenges** leveraging AI techniques, tailoring them to agricultural applications and 2) **Governance challenges** making the use of AI in agriculture part of a sustainable and reliable process involving all the relevant stakeholders, in particular farmers and their advisors. As a result, responsible development and deployment of artificial intelligence, in line with the newly introduced European rules on AI (AI Act) will be included in the solutions.

3.2 Topic 2 Data-based solutions for sustainable agriculture (full topic description)

See section 3.2 in SRIA

Two key ambitions of the AgData are to support sustainable agricultural production through data-based solutions and to strengthen the capacity of the sector to adapt to climate change. R&I activities to achieve these goals focus in particular on enhancing the functionality and generating input for decision support and Farm management Information Systems (FMIS), farm modelling systems, farm performance assessment and the development of data-based solutions in support of sustainable production (including climate change mitigation) and climate change adaptation.

Better decision support systems achieved through the use of data, data technologies, and digital technologies will result in a more environmentally, socially and economically sustainable and climate resilient agriculture combined with a strong capacity for policy monitoring capacity and subsequently, better informed policy-making. The challenge will be extracting the right information from the vast quantity of data that technologies will supply. Decision support systems help farmers to solve complex issues related to efficiency, emissions, production costs, adaptation of production to weather predictions and competitiveness. Projects should focus on enhancing the functionality of and generating input for decision support systems including FMIS. Projects should aim to make these systems easier to access and more user-friendly. AI applications, such as machine learning (ML), that digitally drive a series of agricultural operational services can be tested. Different levels of human operator engagement in smart data-driven decision-making should be considered.

Assessment of farm performance is paramount. Benchmarking can help farmers to improve their productivity and sustainability along various indicators and compare their farm's performance with that of others, to learn from others and to identify which actions to take. Improving the technical capacity to collect, exchange and share data at farm level in a transparent way with the help of systems will encourage greater participation in benchmarking, increase data set availability and thus improve the accuracy and usefulness of benchmarking. To develop KPI's or parameters for benchmarking there is a need to identify what to monitor, based on which, it be possible to define what parameters need to be measured. Projects should aim to develop models and tools for aggregating and expressing compiled data and look for gaps in data collection. There is a need to clarify which identified targets can be transferred into parameters and how the data sources can be translated into datasets and where gaps exist.

Farm modelling systems are instrumental to link the different temporal dimensions under consideration of various parameters and to provide inputs to support decision-making by farmers and the support provided by advisory services. Farm modelling also facilitates the testing of policy scenarios. While farm modelling is an established means, there is a large and untapped potential in developing (precision) agriculture with new tools and means of forecasting. Projects are expected to contribute to the improvement of modelling capacities and subsequently of decision-making algorithms or decision support systems by using machine learning or combined process-based and

data-driven approaches. It may also be achieved through building/developing on digital twins. Novel approaches towards modelling, such as hybrid and multi-scale modelling, that take into account local characteristics and local/"traditional" knowledge, could be considered. Projects should seek to link different temporal dimensions under consideration of various parameters and provide inputs to support decision-making to farmers and the support provided by advisory services. Projects might also facilitate the testing of policy scenarios using farm modelling systems.

Data-based solutions addressing environmental challenges, including climate change mitigation and threats to biodiversity, water, and soil are a major objective of AgData. Strategic research goal of AgData is the creation and application of tools for environmental protection and climate change mitigation in agriculture that include the integration of digital monitoring technologies. A particular objective is to enhance the integration of data from embedded and non-embedded agricultural technologies to effectively address the sustainable management of water, carbon and nitrogen cycles in agri-ecosystems. Projects are expected to contribute to the development of effective climate change adaptation capacities including the ability of stakeholders to learn to perceive ongoing and future changes, and to design effective actions enabling them to keep their business within the boundaries of an adaptive pathway. The forecast and the assessment of the expected impact through the quantification of local vulnerabilities, risks, uncertainties and risk mitigation actions is a necessary pre-condition the development of resilient farming systems.

Strategies and technologies for climate change adaptation in the agricultural sector are crucial and urgent requirements for if the sector is to meet the growing demand for food in spite of changing climate conditions with a direct impact on crop growth, the spread of pests and disease and hence agricultural productivity. The impact of climate pressures is highly variable and depends on the interaction of site-specific biophysical conditions and the typology of farming systems. Projects are expected to contribute to the development of effective climate change adaptation capacities.

3.3 Topic 3 Data-based solutions for policy-making (full topic description)

See section 3.3 in SRIA

European and national policies have become more sustainability-oriented, e.g. fostering ambitions set out under the European Green Deal and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). At the same time, policies, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in particular, have become more performance oriented, in the sense that the contribution of policies, programs, and subsidies to sustainability ambitions have to be demonstrated more consistently. The ability to utilize farming data at a larger scale and in a more systematic way, combining it with satellite data and data technologies to scale it up, has the potential to be a game changer. It can increase the information power of performance assessment approaches compared with the status quo. Improvements in data quality and the availability of quantifiable measures of policy-effects, especially in the fields of Carbon dioxide, nitrogen and phosphorus emissions, and biodiversity monitoring are essential to adequately designed agricultural policies that produce cost-effective environmental and climate improvements.

A key challenge in performance assessment is the development of indicators that reflect the effects of policies on the one hand, but do not entail a significant increase in administrative burdens for the administration and beneficiaries on the other. Projects are expected to contribute to strengthening policy monitoring capacities by better using the potential of data technologies to facilitate the implementation of the CAP; to generate evidence for the CAP post 2027; and to develop proposals for smart and burdenless monitoring and implementation approaches for the future CAP and other policies benefitting from "big data" and the synergetic use of public and private data. Projects are expected to provide innovative data-based solutions for policy monitoring and evaluation, to generate information, knowledge and services to be used throughout the policy

cycle in agricultural and other policies following a multi-actor approach, considering the overall ambitions related to simplification and "better regulation".

Data-based solutions to monitor farm sustainability performance on the basis of existing policy objectives will provide data and tools that can then be used by: farmers, to be rewarded more fairly for their ecological and social efforts; implementation bodies, for benchmarking and Agro-food businesses, to label products based on sustainability performance, to link payments to certain performance, to obtain credits.

3.4 Description of C-R&I-As within the call topics

Consortia shall select one main topic that their proposal addresses and they shall then identify one or more C-R&I-As of the SRIA that in one way or another are considered. If the proposal also partly addresses an additional topic, further C-R&I-As can be selected under this additional topic.

Proposals addressing topic 1 (Data technologies and data management) shall select one or more of the following C-R&I-As:

Data Integration and data quality

1.1 Develop a data acquisition and a re-use framework supported by semantic interoperability and integration. This should have the capacity to receive and manage data and information from multiple data sources and on different scales.

1.2 Define innovative approaches to link existing (and new) databases and computing capacities to carry out data technological analyses and the development of data-based solutions in an efficient way, in terms of both energy and time.

1.3 Elaborate schemes to enhance data interoperability (e.g. across countries as well as in B2B, B2G and G2B settings) especially to achieve/generate Europe-wide reference and training data sets, taking due account of, and ensuring complementarity with, ongoing and planned initiatives.

1.4 Develop and provide reference data sets of high quality for different scales to enable agricultural data capitalization and to adopt nondiscriminatory algorithms and techniques especially as basis for the elaboration of reliable AI-based solutions in the long-term that permit autonomous decisions at different temporal and spatial scales.

1.5 Develop and use a standardized metadata scheme, and ontologies and meta-language for data querying taking into consideration existing and evolving systems as well as tool(s) for (semi-)automated quality checks, e.g. statistics, gap analyses, outliers, plausibility checks.

1.6 Boost data re-usability by agricultural stakeholders through the development and establishment of domain-specific measures of data quality control, the creation of customized data quality dimensions, such as integrity, completeness, consistency, and accuracy, and defining requirements for different levels of "data fitness for use".

1.7 Develop a multi-layer geospatial data tool compatible with geo network-based systems and providing a powerful Application Programming Interface (API) for data users compatible with commonly used open-source graph query language, such as REST, GraphQL and SparqQL systems.

1.8 Develop innovative approaches towards context-based data curation standards and empower curated small data.

1.9 Improve data granularity and precision by the combination of existing agricultural and farming systems with innovative smart systems and devices, including newer sensor and sensor networks and edge computing to tackle operational decisions in near real-time.

1.10 Develop error processing and quantifying methods incorporated into predictions, projections and in-situ computations (edge analytics) to minimize the cascading error transference across systems and computations and to avoid unintended large impacts on the end decisions.

1.11 Develop innovative models or transfer functions to increase data granularity (e.g., from field to sub-field levels, or higher temporal resolutions) to increase the data fitness-for-use.
1.12 Develop data-based solutions serving private/commercial and public interests using data of high quality and high information value.
1.13 Develop innovative procedures to aggregate sensitive data (e.g. farming data) with minimal loss of quality while withholding sensitive information as much as possible.
1.14 Establish a system to monitor the functionality and the product evolution of the implemented and described tools and systems.

Data marketplaces and cooperatives in agriculture

1.15 Design and deploy a Service Cloud to develop and test basic, standardized services.
1.16 Develop an innovative "pay as you go" system, where services or data published in addition to free data-based solutions of the partnership can be offered as free or paid versions.
1.17 Develop and probe reward mechanisms for data sharing to encourage an increase in data sharing
1.18 Develop innovative solutions to increase the discoverability and composability of services to be easily found and used by end-users or third-party companies.
1.19 Develop innovative approaches to data payment services adapted to the users' needs, so that the end-user only pays for what they are really using.

Applications of AI techniques

1.20 Identify key (reference/ training) data sets to strengthen AI capabilities in agriculture, including data from existing and planned satellites, VHR imagery as well as sensor data generated in the context of precision farming.
1.21 Capitalize historical satellite data to extract useful features such as vegetation- and water-related indices, e.g. the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) and Normalized Difference Water Index (NDWI), to train AI models e.g. for yield prediction, disease and stress identification in farms.
1.22 Develop innovative solutions to overcome challenges inherent to privacy laws by using satellite imagery data.
1.23 Develop innovative AI-based approaches handling heterogeneous data, fuzzy and ambiguous information e.g. in the context of sensors, search algorithms, as well as in the generation of relevant indicators.
1.24 Develop data governance procedures, tools, and instruments for clarifying and guaranteeing data ownership and privacy in sharing farming data.
1.25 Develop or contribute to the development of digital twins of farms and of relevant natural environments for agricultural applications.
1.26 Develop innovative approaches to strengthen the use and uptake of AI applications in agriculture considering an assessment of the practical barriers that hamper the transformation of this sector compared to other sectors, e.g. trust in AI.

Proposals addressing topic 2 (Data-based solutions for sustainable agriculture) shall select one or more of the following C-R&I-As:

Enhancing functionality of and generating input for decision support systems including FMIS

2.1 Develop data layers, algorithms and data-based solutions founded on multiple sources, including private and public ones, allowing for innovative FMIS services.
2.2 Extrapolate farm-generated sensor data, capitalizing it for a wider farming community through combination with satellite (and other) data and the application of data technologies.

2.3 Explore the opportunities from new satellite imagery and new ground sensors (including substrate analysis) for data-based solutions as input to DSS and FMIS.
2.4 Take stock of existing FMIS and their uptake by farmers and analyse their strengths and weaknesses in supporting sustainable agricultural production and compliance and performance documentation (in B2G settings) as well as of gaps in service provision (including low-cost solutions) to augment the sustainability of agricultural production, enhance competitiveness and working conditions under consideration of G2B data sharing opportunities.
2.5 Enhance interoperability and switchability options for FMIS users.
2.6 Develop innovative multi-criteria simulation modules for transparent decision-making support, allowing for priority and objective setting by the end-user (e.g. farmer) under consideration of the existing FMIS landscape. Results should allow e.g. testing of different scenarios and different parameters (e.g. economic, environmental and social impacts) and include innovative approaches to overcome the complexity barrier of data platforms and enhance trust in data analytics by fostering user-friendliness.
2.7 Develop innovative ways (e.g. public incentives, open-data-services, research infrastructures) to increase the profit of using data technologies for DSS and FMIS applications.
2.8 Develop business models which clearly demonstrate the value of services in ROI terms e.g. through apps that easily calculate savings in operating costs (e.g. water, fertilizer, pesticide) and environmental impacts on short-, medium- and long-term. The added value of farm data sharing is to be reflected.

Farm modelling systems

2.9 Take stock of existing modelling approaches and assess their strengths and weaknesses and suitability for the work of the partnership.
2.10 Enhance existing and develop novel forecasting and prediction approaches/methodologies (e.g. on extreme weather events, pest, yield) suitable for cross-border usages under consideration of strengthened data capacities.
2.11 Enhance existing and develop novel modelling approaches to estimate the environmental impacts of agricultural production following “whole farm” and “landscape” approaches to account e.g. for the effects of agro-ecological approaches and farm structures.
2.12 Develop novel farm modelling approaches extending, where possible, existing ones (e.g. phenology, pest, yield, protein content, water, nutritional status) for the farmer to use for an optimal farming practice based on real-life testing and trial farms, eventually in cooperation with existing and evolving living labs.
2.13 Based on the novel data-based solutions available, enhance capacities to use farm modelling in support of designing agri-environmental measures, responding to current and predicted policy needs.

Assessment of farm performance

2.14 Identify thematic areas where farm metrics are needed and which can be well addressed through novel data-based solutions on both farm/production level, considering the environmental and socio-economic parameters for monitoring transformation towards increased resilience.
2.15 Develop ambitious farm performance targets, taking into account economic, environmental and social aspects, including creating a baseline and selecting parameters to assess and monitor. An example could be the assessment of farm performance in terms of sustainability, including carbon emissions and storage, accounting for the diversity of farm types across Europe and for different policy objectives.

2.16 Develop approaches for displaying farm performance and discussing trade-offs, following a Multi-Criteria Decision analysis (MCDA)-based approach and presenting the underlying data in a transparent way in order to foster the use of data-technology based farm-level KPI's.
2.17 Identify technical and social obstacles in data collection and data exchange on-farms and issues that hamper benchmarking between farms.
2.18 Identify and possibly develop a long-term funding and maintenance strategy for the indicators to ensure sustainability.

Data-based solutions for addressing environmental challenges, incl. climate change mitigation, biodiversity, water, and soil

2.19 Based on the mapping of existing decision-making support portfolio available to farmers and the extent to which environmental concerns are taken into consideration, assess the particular needs in the provision of data-based solutions for decision-making support to increase farms' environmental performance.
2.20 Develop innovative data-based solutions to support the design (e.g. through prescription maps) and the management (e.g. irrigation, fertilization) of precision cropping systems (including grassland) by taking into consideration short- and long-term production approaches and effects, leaching and GHG emission forecast maps and field variability in terms of productivity and product quality, by integrating high-resolution remotely sensed data, proximal smart sensors and crop models, as well as market data for inputs, such as energy and fertilisers, and outputs.
2.21 Develop innovative, data-based solutions and software to support precision farming techniques to bridge crop and pasture site-specific yield gaps (e.g. based on e.g. high-resolution satellite data, novel satellite and sensor data); this could be achieved e.g. through precision integrated weed, pest and disease management or grazing management contributing to stabilize crop and pasture yields across years.
2.22 Develop innovative, integrated (e.g. satellite + IoT) data-based solutions to support the identification of agricultural areas (at farm and field scale) most suitable to biodiversity conservation and/or pollinators' feeding with respect to productive areas.
2.23 Develop novel data-based solutions and software to couple sensors for the continuous monitoring of soil, soil moisture, and soil water parameters (e.g. nitrate concentration, salinity) to support water, fertilization and pest and disease management at sub-parcel level under consideration of overall farm-structures, using the potential of such solutions to also serve reporting and control purposes in B2G settings.
2.24 Develop data-based services based on data from robot, autonomous vehicles and IoT technologies equipped with sensors and AI-based applications to support the geo-referenced 24/7 early detection of plant pests and diseases or weeds to minimize the use of agro-chemicals, while increasing their effectiveness either for crops and the open fields.
2.25 Enhance research infrastructures based on long-term observations and long-term agronomic experiments for the assessment of the impact of cropping systems on soil heath and soil carbon dynamics and the improvement of soil C model forecast capacity, including the design and recording of carbon farming schemes.

Strategies and technologies for climate change adaptation in the agricultural sector

2.26 Develop data-based solutions for livestock and cropping systems to adjust production to become more resilient towards climate change on the long-, medium-, and short term under consideration of the overall sustainability performance and competitiveness of farms, climate change adaptation, mitigation and sustainable development.
2.27 Building on lessons from effects of climate change in other biogeographic regions, taking into account the concept of zonation, long-term time series agri-environmental data (including yield data, phenology data), and climate prediction models, develop decision support tools

supporting farmers to adjust production to prevent negative effects of climate change on agricultural production.

2.28 Enhance high-throughput phenotyping technologies and research infrastructures for climate change adaptation of crop systems (e.g. drought resistance, salinity, waterlogging).

2.29 Develop innovative transformational strategic approaches for tailored data-based decision support systems for resilient agriculture for short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons. These should go beyond resource use efficiency, and address biodiversity conservation, soil protection and climate change adaptation, building on (novel) approaches to assess the short-, medium-, and long-term impacts of climate change.

Proposals addressing topic 3 (Data-based solutions for policy-making) shall select one or more of the following C-R&I-As:

3.1 Identify data needs for the monitoring and evaluation for the implementation and development of current and future agricultural policies, considering a wide range of (indicative) agri-environmental parameters. Where applicable, data needs of related policy fields, such as environmental and climate policies, might be considered.

3.2 Take stock and compare existing indicators and approaches to monitor policy implementation and impacts and of the (practical) experiences gained with their application.

3.3 Develop innovative data-based solutions through the application of data technologies and supply and/or develop indicators that facilitate a common approach across Member States (and candidate countries) in assessing the performance of agricultural policies. This may include the generation of homogenous EU-/Europe-wide reference data sets, e.g. IACS-based reference data-sets and data-based solutions.

3.4 Develop innovative approaches to monitor agri-environmental conditions and the implementation of policy measures (including "good agri-environmental conditions" as part of conditionality under the CAP), and production patterns following a consistent approach in the medium- and long-term.

3.5 Develop approaches to extend the application of the Area Monitoring System (AMS) including for the assessment of more eligibility conditions through the use of new input data sources, the use of novel satellites and sensors and data analysis techniques, while acknowledging the opportunities of privately operated sensors and B2G data sharing.

3.6 Develop new methodologies to monitor policy performance and compliance building on public and private data and with the ambition to reduce or minimize administrative burdens.

3.7 Develop proposals for data-based solutions supporting design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the future CAP, ensuring "baseline data" availability including MCDA (Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis) based applications.

3.8 Develop innovative data-based solutions supplementing Member States' efforts in the provision of FasT services to farmers.

3.9 Explore the opportunities from new satellite imagery and other sources, such as new ground sensors, drones and substrate analysis, for policy monitoring and implementation.

3.10 Generate Europe-wide data-based solutions through the upscaling of (precision) farming data generated on farms. This could be done by combining it with other sources of data, e.g. satellite data, and will allow the data to be utilized at a much larger scale in a more systemic way.

4 Funding modalities and who can apply

The Funders of the call (also referred to as "the Funders" in the present document) are listed in Table 1. The funding for transnational projects will be based on a virtual common pot mechanism. This means that, although this call is co-funded by the EU, Partners (applicants) of projects that are selected for funding will receive the grant directly and only from their corresponding

national/regional Funder, according to their legal terms and conditions for project funding ("Funder regulation", see Annex XIII). The EU contribution is managed by the Funders following agreement among them. It is not possible to apply for the EU contribution directly but only to apply for funding from Funders listed in Table 1.

4.1 Who can apply

Universities and other higher education institutions, public research institutions, profit and non-profit organisations, consumers/citizens, civil society representatives and private companies can apply, subject to the Funders regulations (see Annex XIII) and eligibility criteria (section 4.2). Research consortia must consist of a minimum of three Partners requesting funding from at least three different Members States or Horizon Europe associated countries and Funders of this call. Associated Partners, not requesting funding from any Funder, are welcome to participate in consortia as well. However, Associated Partners cannot be Coordinator, their contribution should not be essential for the project's successful implementation and they will not count towards the minimum number of Partners.

Contributors to one proposal which do not perform any tasks but play a role as e.g. advisory body, can be listed as Stakeholder.

4.2 Eligibility

The following eligibility criteria apply for this call:

- The proposed research project must be consistent with the scope of this call and with the thematic priorities of the Funders involved in the proposed project which are described in the Funder regulations (see Annex XIII). The proposed project must address one of the three Topics (see section 3) and at least one C-R&I-A under the selected Topic. The scope or scale of the proposed research project should exceed a single country. The proposal should not overlap, but rather be complementary with ongoing or completed projects funded by other instruments, programmes or projects, in particular past/ongoing Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe projects.
- Proposals must be written in English.
- Proposals must be complete and meet all formal eligibility criteria in accordance with the procedure and must be submitted via the online submission platform. Incomplete proposals will be rejected (see 4.2).
- Short proposals must be submitted by **21 January 2026 12h (noon) CET** via the online submission platform (see section 5.1 and Annex II for short proposal details). Short proposals not submitted in time will be not considered and rejected.
- Full proposals must be submitted by **21 July 2026 12h (noon) CEST** via the submission platform (see section 5.3 and Annex III for full proposal submission details). Full proposals not submitted in time will be not considered and rejected.
- The submission of a short proposal is compulsory. A full proposal submission is only possible following the invitation to submit a full proposal. Applicants cannot submit a full proposal if no short proposal was submitted.
- Consortia must include at least three eligible Partners requesting funding from at least three different Members States or Horizon Europe Associated Countries and from Funders who provide funds to the call. Associated Partners do not count towards this limit. It is recommended not to exceed a consortium size of 10 Partners requesting funding. In any case, applicants should be aware that a higher number of represented countries or of Partners in a consortium will not automatically result in a positive evaluation of the proposal.

- Associated Partners are welcome to participate at their own expense or if make use of a separate source of funding. In order to participate they must provide a "financial commitment letter" (see Annex IX). Associated Partners must follow all rules and obligations for Partners as outlined in this call announcement.
- In order to achieve balanced consortia, the combined proportion of the overall effort that is planned by all the Partners from a single country may not exceed 60% of the total number of person months allocated to the transnational project.
- An individual researcher affiliated to several organisations cannot request funding from more than one Funder in this call. If affiliated to more than one organisation, an individual researcher may represent only one organisation in a proposal and that person cannot represent two or more different Partners within the consortium.
- Each consortium applying for funding must be led by a Coordinator which must be an organisation eligible for funding from a Funder of this call and requesting funding. In consequence an Associated Partner cannot be Coordinator.
- The same person cannot act as Principal Investigator of a Coordinator for more than one proposal. Some Funders do not allow the same person to participate in more than one proposal per call: please check the relevant Funder regulations (Annex XIII).
- The minimum project duration is 24 months and the maximum is 36 months (please check Annex XIII for exceptions). The earliest possible start date for projects recommended for funding is Jan 2027.
- Applicants must complete an ethics self-assessment as part of the full proposal, but is not mandatory at the short proposal stage (see 10.5).
- The information given in the short proposal is binding. No substantial change to the scope and objectives outlined in a proposal is allowed. A limited number of changes with respect to the administrative details may be allowed upon approval by the Call Office and the Funders concerned. A list of permissible changes is provided in section 5.2.
- The total project costs and requested funding in a proposal is by default not restricted; the costs must be appropriate to meet the project goals. Nonetheless, individual Funders may have regulations and/or restrictions concerning the funding they can award within research projects that must be respected. It is, therefore, essential that each Partner carefully reads their Funders regulations (see Annex XIII). If in doubt, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult their FCPs who can inform them of the relevant regulations.

Note that the inclusion of Associated Partners is permitted ONLY upon submission of a letter of financial commitment (see Annex IX). If a proposal includes Associated Partners, **the absence of a letter of financial commitment may result in the rejection of the entire proposal**.

Funders' eligibility criteria must be respected and the proposed research project must be consistent with the thematic priorities of the Funder. These requirements are described in the document "Funders regulations" (see Annex XIII). Funders may require additional documents according to their own regulations (see Annex XIII). It has to be also noted that the requested funding may be adapted between short and full proposal step and later during the bilateral grant negotiation process between one Partner and its respective Funder. The final decision on the total grant per Partner is decided by the respective Funder.

Failure of one Partner to meet any of the eligibility criteria, including the individual Funders eligibility criteria, may result in the rejection of the entire proposal, subject to a decision of the Funder Board. **It is therefore essential that proposals meet all eligibility criteria.**

Partners must carefully read the Funders regulations and, if necessary, contact their FCPs before submitting a proposal to make sure that they respect all the Funders eligibility criteria and rules.

After the submission deadlines of proposals, the Call Office will carry out the general eligibility check of the proposals submitted with respect to the criteria cited in this section. Proposals not meeting the minimum requirements may be rejected by the Call Office, following consultation with the Funder Board (FB). Each member of the FB will check the proposals against their specific Funder eligibility criteria as described in the Funders regulations.

Proposals complying with both sets of criteria (general and Funders eligibility criteria) will advance to the evaluation procedure.

4.3 Coordinator

Each research project consortium must appoint a Coordinator which has to be a Partner of a consortium. The Coordinator has the following roles and responsibilities:

- Lead the consortium throughout the application procedure and be responsible for the correct proposal submission. The PI of the Coordinator creates an account for the proposal in the online submission platform and then invites all Partners and Associated Partners to the proposal. Partners and Associated Partners can download the current state of the proposal, but cannot adapt the proposal and have only access to their own partner profile.
- Make sure that the Funders regulations and funding modalities of all Partners involved are met – confirmation of compliance provided to the Coordinator by the Partners themselves – to ensure the eligibility of the entire proposal.
- Be responsible for the overall project coordination and act as the central contact point for the consortium during the full lifespan of the research project.
- Make sure that the Partners and Associated Partners mark all Declaration boxes (National funding regulations, Privacy Policy) in their Partner Profiles. Without this approval the project cannot be submitted.
- Act as central contact point for the Call Office during submission phase and the entire duration of the project.
- Inform the Call Office about any situation or event that might affect the implementation of the project.
- Ensure that all work is carried out to a high standard and meets contractually bound deliverables and milestones presented in the proposal.
- Be responsible for sharing all information within the research consortium.
- Be responsible for monitoring data and for the punctual delivery of project reports.

The Coordinator will not be responsible for the financial management of project funding, which shall be handled directly between the Partners and their corresponding Funders.

4.4 Funder Board

The following Funders provide funds to this call and altogether form the Funder Board.

Table 1: Funder Board.

Country	Funder
BE	The Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO)
BE	Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FRS-FNRS)
BE	Service public de Wallonie (SPW)

DE	Forschungszentrum Jülich (Fz-Juelich) / Bundesministerium für Forschung, Technologie und Raumfahrt (BMFTR)
DK	Innovationsfonden (IFD)
EE	Sihtasutus Eesti Teadusagentuur (ETAG)
ES	Agencia Estatal de Investigacion (AEI)
ES	Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnologico y la Innovacion E.P.E (CDTI)
FI	Maa- ja metsätalousministeriö/Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland (MMM)
FR	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Sovereignty/Ministère de l'Agriculture, de la souveraineté alimentaire et de la Forêt (MASAF)
HU	Nemzeti Kutatasi Fejlesztesi es Innovacios Hivatal (NKFIH)
IE	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM)
IE	Taighde Éireann/ Research Ireland (TAIGHDE)
IL	Isreal Innovation Authority (IIA)/ Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MOAG)
IT	Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e delle foreste (MASAF)
LV	Latvijas Lauksaimniecibas Un Meza Zinatnu Akademija Biedriba (LAAFS)
NL	Ministerie van Landbouw, Visserij, Voedselzekerheid en Natuur (LVVN)
RO	Unitatea Executiva Pentru Finantarea Invatamantului superior a Cercetarii Dezvoltarii si Inovarii (UEFISCDI)
SK	Centrum Vedecko Technickych Informacii Slovenskej Republiky (CVTI SR)
TR	Turkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Arastirma Kurumu (TUBITAK)

5 Call procedure

The call is conducted as a two-step-procedure. As a first step, a short proposal has to be submitted. If this short proposal is successful, the Coordinator receives an invitation to submit a full proposal. Only following such an invitation, a full proposal can be submitted.

Deadline for short proposal submission is 21 January 2026, 12h (noon) CET.

Deadline for full proposal submission is 21 July 2026, 12h (noon) CEST.

Proposals that are not submitted on time within the submission platform will not be considered and rejected.

Details on each step are explained in the following sections.

5.1 Step 1 Short proposal phase

5.1.1 Submission

The objective of a short proposal is to present the project idea and the consortium without providing a detailed work plan. A template for the short proposal with explanations is provided in Annex II and an example is also available within the call document section of the submission platform: https://agdata.ptj.de. The template of the short proposal is provided for general guidance, however, it is strongly recommended to start working directly in the submission tool from the beginning. The coordinator will be responsible to enter, upload and collect the necessary information and to submit the proposal. A validation function in the tool will allow to check, if all mandatory information has been completely collected.

Following submission, short proposals will be checked against the general and applicable Funders eligibility criteria as defined in the respective Funder Regulations (see Annex XIII). Short proposals that do not pass the eligibility check may be rejected, subject to the decision of the Funder Board.

Only eligible short proposals will be evaluated.

5.1.2 Evaluation

Eligible short proposals will be evaluated against the two equally weighted evaluation criteria *Excellence* and *Impact* as described in section 6.2. The evaluation procedure will be conducted as described in section 6.4.

5.1.3 Selection

The selection of short proposals will be decided by the Funder Board (FB) based on a common ranking list, evaluation summary reports, and the availability of funds (see section 6.4 and Annex I). The Coordinators of the selected short proposals will be invited via email to submit a full proposal; the invitation letter may include requirements to be respected for the submission of the full proposal. The Coordinators of short proposals that are not selected will also be also informed accordingly by the Call Office. All letters will include the evaluation summary report prepared in response to the short proposal.

5.2 Changes from short to full proposal

Short proposals will be sorted as either fully eligible, not eligible, or provisionally eligible. The Coordinator of not eligible and provisionally eligible short proposals will receive a written explanation. Especially for provisionally eligible short proposals a detailed description of mandatory requirements will be provided to be fulfilled with full proposal submission. In case of failure to fulfil the mandatory requirements the provisionally eligible short proposals will be declared not eligible and not be evaluated.

All petition for change(s) must be formally submitted via E-mail to the Call Office and to the involved Funder. The following changes between the short and full proposal stage are possible, but always require prior endorsement by the respective concerned Funder(s) and the Call Office, as described below for each case.

Since petitions for changes may take time to be processed, they should be made as early as possible in the full proposal submission phase.

5.2.1 Changes of budget

The deadline for changes in the budget is 30 calendar days prior to full proposal submission.

All changes of a Partners' budget are managed directly between each Partner of one consortium and its respective Funder. After FCP and Partner came to an agreement the call office needs to be informed and the changes will be implemented in the submission platform by the Coordinator.

The amount of requested funding of each Partner in a full proposal may be lower, but not higher than in the short proposal. Requesting more funding at the full proposal stage is allowed only in very exceptional cases and requires the written consent of the concerned Funder.

5.2.2 Change of project Coordinator

No change of the Coordinator (PI and organisation) will be allowed. Only in exceptional cases the Funder Board may approve such a change. In this case, a request to change the Coordinator must be submitted to the Call Office. The Call Office will forward the request to the FB for a decision.

5.2.3 Changes to the consortium composition - Partners

Changes to the consortium (addition, removal, and substitution of a Partner) are in general not allowed. Only in exceptional and justified cases, changes to the consortium can be accepted. Changes to the consortium composition can be only organized by the Call Office in the submission platform at the full proposal stage.

All types of requests to change Partners in the consortium must be formally submitted via E-mail to the Call Office and to the involved Funder(s), e.g. in the case of new Partners joining the consortium, to the Funder from whom the new Partner plans to request funds from. The deadline for any such request is 30 calendar days prior to full proposal submission deadline. Any changes must be formally submitted and need to contain following minimal information:

- Reason for the adaption, e.g. request from the invitation letter
- Contact data of the Partner who needs to be deleted or/and the new Partner
- For new Partners: Budget figures of requested Funding
- If applicable, description of the tasks to be performed by the new Partner

Regardless of the type of changes, the eligibility criteria (section 4.2) must be respected. The final decision will be taken by the Funder concerned taking into account the oversubscription factor of this Funder.

Changes to the consortium may also be part of the detailed description of mandatory requirements of the invitation letter for full proposal submission.

All new Partners must comply with the applicable Funder regulations. If a new Partner is declared ineligible at step 2 (full proposal phase), the entire consortium may be declared ineligible and the proposal may not be evaluated.

It is the responsibility of the Coordinator to ensure that a new Partner is eligible to receive funding from the respective Funder. This includes checking whether the proposal is compatible with the Funder funding programme.

Exception for adding a new partner under the widening principle:

As an exception to the above-mentioned conditions, the following change, referred to as “widening”, is allowed upon invitation of the FB, **and stated explicitly in the invitation letter to submit a full-proposal**.

“Widening” is defined as adding an eligible partner to the consortium from undersubscribed members of the FB that are participating in this call. Funders are considered undersubscribed if their available budget is significantly higher than the requested budget by successful applicants in the short proposal step. The FB will make the decision on which countries are considered undersubscribed and the Call Office will communicate this to the applicants invited to the full-proposal step. This change will only be allowed under recommendation by the FB and under the following conditions:

1. The principal investigator must inform the Call Office in case the consortium would like to add an eligible partner from an undersubscribed country. Please note that only one additional partner requesting funding is allowed.
2. The total number and composition of partners including the newly added one from undersubscribed countries in the consortium must fulfil all eligibility criteria stated in section 4.2.

3. The applicants must clearly explain the added value of this additional partner in the full-proposal.

The eligibility for funding of the new partner must be confirmed by the national Funder. Therefore, it is mandatory to contact the respective national FCP of the new partner prior to submission of the full-proposal, comply with the Funder's eligibility requirements and receive approval. If a new Partner is declared ineligible, the entire consortium may be declared ineligible and the full proposal may not be evaluated.

5.2.4 Changes to the consortium composition – Associated Partners

Adding and/or removing an Associated Partner does not necessitate the approval of a Funder but only be submitted to the Call Office. The deadline for any such request is also 30 calendar days prior to the full proposal submission deadline. Requests can be submitted via E-mail to the Call Office using the minimal necessary information (see changes of partners). Please note that it is obligatory to submit a **Letter of financial Commitment** for any Associated Partner.

Any new Partner or Associated Partner, once added to the consortium, will have to complete the **Partner profile** in the submission platform. It is therefore essential that this Partner/Associated Partner is able to perform this on time for proposal submission.

5.3 Step 2 Full proposal phase

5.3.1 Submission

Following the invitation to submit a full proposal, the Coordinator can submit a full proposal via the submission platform: https://agdata.ptj.de. At this stage, Coordinators might be invited to add Partners requesting funding from undersubscribed Funders under the widening principle (see section 5.2.3). Any proposed change must first be communicated to the Call Office and the respective Funder; for more details see section 5.2. The new Partner must meet all eligibility criteria to receive funding from its Funder.

The detailed template for full proposals with explanations is provided in Annex III and an example is also available in the document section of the submission platform.

It is reminded that the inclusion of Associated Partners has to be requested to the Call Office (see section 5.2.4) and is permitted ONLY upon submission of a letter of financial commitment (see Annex IX). The absence of the letter may result in the rejection of the entire proposal.

Funders eligibility criteria, as defined in the respective Funder regulation (see Annex XIII), must be respected and the proposed research project must be consistent with the Funders thematic priorities. The Funders may require additional documents according to their own regulations.

Failure of one Partner or Associated Partner to meet any of the eligibility criteria, including the Funders eligibility criteria, may result in rejection of the entire proposal.

If stated in the Funder regulations, Partners are advised to consult their FCP to clarify any uncertainties or doubts regarding compliance with the applicable Funder regulation before submitting a proposal (see Annex I).

After the submission deadline, the Call Office will carry out the general eligibility check of the proposals with respect to the criteria listed in section 4.2. Proposals not meeting the requirements may be rejected by the Call Office, following consultation with the Funder Board. The members of

the Funder Board will check the proposals against their Funders eligibility criteria as described in the Funder regulations.

Full proposals complying with both sets of criteria (general eligibility criteria and Funders eligibility criteria) will advance to the evaluation procedure.

5.3.2 Evaluation

Full proposals will be evaluated by the IEP against the following three equally weighted evaluation criteria *Excellence*, *Impact,* and *Quality and efficiency of the implementation*, as described in section 6.2. The procedure will be conducted as described in section 6.4.

5.3.3 Selection

The selection of full proposals is the sole responsibility of the Funder Board and will be conducted strictly following the common ranking list and based on the availability of funds. Skipping proposals or entire groups of equally ranked proposals is not allowed. This is in accordance with the Horizon Europe regulations and restrictions for calls in co-funded partnerships.

In case two or more proposals have the same ranking (final score), the FB shall aim to select all equally ranked proposals. If this is not possible, the FB shall decide on the selection of those proposals based on the criteria below with the following order of priority:

1. Overall funding should be maximised.
2. Funder balance, if possible, each funding organisation should fund at least one project.
3. Reasonable balance of topics addressed by the selected proposals. The success rates (i.e. the overall number of funded projects relative to the overall number of full proposals) of the three Call topics should be as close as possible to each other.

5.4 Submission platform

The submission of proposals will be carried out using an online submission platform, where applicants will find all of the information necessary for the preparation and submission of proposals. The submission platform is available at https://agdata.ptj.de.

A **webinar will be hosted** for interested applicants. The date and time of the webinar will be announced on the submission platform upon call launch. The webinar will provide an overview of relevant aspects of the call and a short introduction to the submission platform. The relevant link and agenda will be made available on the submission platform in due course.

5.5 Partnering tool

A partnering tool is available in the submission platform, where interested parties can submit and search profiles.

5.6 Management of the call

The Call Office will be operated by Project Management Jülich (Projektträger Jülich, PtJ, Germany). In general, the Call Office operates on weekdays between 09:00 and 15:00 CE(S)T.

Name	Contact
Call Office	ptj-agdata-calls@fz-juelich.de
Christian Breuer	+49 2461 61 96929
Josefine Kant	+49 2461 61 84689

Petra E. Schulte	+49 2461 61 9031

All technical issues with the submission platform shall be addressed to the Call Office.

5.7 Schedule

The call will follow a two-step procedure. A full proposal can be submitted only if the short proposal has been selected and the respective invitation to submit a full proposal has been sent to the Coordinator by the Call Office.

Item	Date
Call pre-announcement	Oct 2025
Call launch	5th Nov 2025
Webinar & workshop for applicants	26th Nov 2025
Deadline for short proposal submission	21st Jan 2026
Eligibility check and evaluation of short proposals	Jan 2026 - Mar 2026
Redress	Apr/May 2026
Selection and Decision letters sent to coordinators	May 2026
Start full proposal submission	May 2026
Deadline for any exceptional changes in the full proposal (see 4.2)	June 2026
Deadline for full proposal submission	21st July 2026
Eligibility check and evaluation of full proposals	July-Aug 2026
Redress and ethical evaluation	September 2026
Selection and Decision letters sent to Coordinators	Oct 2026
Earliest starts of projects (tentative)	Jan 2027

6 Evaluation

6.1 International Evaluation Panel (IEP)

The Call Evaluation Secretariat (CES) will organize the entire evaluation procedure and is managed by the Spanish State Research Agency (Agencia Estatal de Investigación, AEI, Spain). The CES will establish an International Evaluation Panel (IEP) which will be endorsed by the Funder Board (FB). The IEP has the following mandate:

- Provide a peer review of proposals, based on the evaluation criteria outlined in section 6.2.
- Provide a written Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) of each proposal to explain the evaluation result to the Funder Board. The ESR will be provided to the Coordinator of each proposal by the Call Office.
- Provide a ranking list per Topic of proposals based on the evaluation scores.

A chair and a vice-chair of the IEP will coordinate the work of the IEP with support of the CES. The IEP members will be independent of FB and applicants involved in this call. The CES will ensure that no conflict of interest (CoI) exists concerning the IEP members and the proposals evaluated by them. The IEP members will be required to sign a declaration stating the lack of any conflict of interest and a declaration of confidentiality (see Annex XII). The online evaluation tool will include a feature that will prevent access to a proposal where a conflict of interest is declared by an IEP member.

Throughout the entire procedure, strict confidentiality will be ensured with respect to the identities of the applicants and the contents of the proposals. Proposals will be accessible to the FB, the IEP members involved, the Call Office, and the CES. The full proposals will also be screened by the Agriculture of Data Ethics Advisory Board (EAB) in order to fulfil the obligations outlined in section 10.5. The members of the EAB have signed a declaration of confidentiality. All collected data will be handled in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), see also section 9.

Each eligible proposal will be evaluated online by three IEP members. The IEP members will then discuss and agree on consensus scores for each proposal during the IEP meeting.

An independent observer will monitor the entire evaluation process and report to the EC, see also section 6.4.

6.2 Evaluation criteria

Eligible proposals will be evaluated following the procedure described in section 6.4. A detailed description of each criterion is provided in Table 2. Scoring for each criterion and the thresholds applied are defined in section 6.3.

Table 2: Description of the evaluation criteria. Short proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the evaluation criteria Excellence and Impact described hereunder. In addition, evaluators will have the possibility at the short proposal stage to state any concerns regarding ethical issues or thematic relevance of short proposals towards the scope or topics of the call. Full proposals will be evaluated according to the hereunder described criteria Excellence, Impact, and Quality and efficiency of the implementation.

Evaluation criteria "short proposal stage"		
Excellence	**Impact**	**Quality and efficiency of the implementation**
▪ Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art. ▪ Soundness of the proposed overall methodology (also including the integration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content as well as open science practices).	▪ Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the Call Announcement, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from the project.	Not a criterion in short proposal stage.

Evaluation criteria "full proposal stage"		
Excellence	**Impact**	**Quality and efficiency of the implementation**
▪ Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art.	▪ Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the Call Announcement, and the likely scale and significance of the	▪ Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to

▪ Soundness of the proposed overall methodology including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, interdisciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end-users where appropriate.	contributions from the project. ▪ Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.	work packages, and of the resources overall. ▪ Capacity and role of each partner, and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

6.3 Scoring

Scores will be awarded for each criterion mentioned in section 5.2. Each criterion will be scored out of 5 (half scores are only allowed at short proposal stage, only full scores will be allowed at full proposal stage) and equally weighted. The 0-5 scoring system for each criterion indicates the following assessment:

- 0: Null. **The proposal fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1: Poor. **The criterion is inadequately addressed**, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2: Fair. **The proposal broadly addresses the criterion,** but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3: Good. **The proposal addresses the criterion well,** but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4: Very Good. **The proposal addresses the criterion very well,** but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5: Excellent. **The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion**. Any shortcomings are minor.

A consensus score is agreed upon for each criterion by the IEP members who evaluated the proposal. The consensus score will be obtained during the IEP meeting. A **threshold of 4/5** will be applied for each criterion in the short proposal stage, and **a threshold of 3/5** for each criterion will be applied for full proposals; i.e., full proposals with a consensus score < 3 for any criterion will not be recommended for funding and short proposals with a consensus score < 4 for any criterion will not be recommended for invitation to submit a full proposal. A second **threshold of 8/10[2] for short proposals** and **of 10/15 for full proposals** will be applied with respect to the total score (sum of the three consensus scores per criterion); i.e., full proposals with a total score **under 10** will not be selected for funding. Short proposals with a total score **under 8** will not be recommended for invitation to submit a full proposal. All proposals will be ranked according to the final consensus scores agreed during the evaluation meeting. **The outcome of the evaluation is irrevocable.**

[2] The level of the overall threshold at short proposal stage, applying to the sum of these two individual scores, is dynamic and will depend on the volume of proposals received. It will be set at a level that ensures the total requested budget of proposals admitted to stage 2 is as close as possible to three times the available budget, and not less than two and a half times the available budget. The threshold is expected to be set at 8 or 8.5.

6.4 Evaluation procedure

Each proposal will be evaluated individually by at least three IEP members. They will, independently from each other, apply evaluation criteria and score the proposals as described in sections 6.2 and 6.3, respectively. Following the individual evaluation, a rapporteur will summarise the individual evaluations and write a draft summary report, which will be used to present the proposal at the IEP meeting. During the IEP meeting, all proposals will be introduced and evaluations presented. The IEP members will discuss each proposal and will agree on consensus scores for each proposal. Based on the scores, three ranking lists of proposals will be compiled, one ranking list per Topic. Rapporteurs will, based on the discussions, consolidate and finalise the ESR. The ranking lists and the ESRs will be shared with the FB.

An independent observer will oversee the entire evaluation procedure in terms of compliance with the Horizon Europe regulations for calls, will report to the Agriculture of Data coordination team, and document the process in an independent observer report for submission to the European Commission.

7 Selection

7.1 Funding decision

The selection of proposals is the sole responsibility of the Funder Board, which is the decision-making body of the call. Details on the selection procedures for proposals are provided in sections 5.1.3 and 5.3.3.

The outcome of the evaluation process and the funding decision will be communicated to the Coordinators by the Call Office. Evaluation summary reports will be provided to the Coordinators. The Coordinators are responsible for forwarding all of the information to their Partners and Associated Partners. Following receipt of the communication, the Coordinator and all the Partners and Associated Partners involved in a successful proposal must initiate all necessary steps for the project start as described in section 10.1.

7.2 Publication of the selection results for full proposals

A list of the funded projects (project title and project acronym) will be published in a dedicated section on the website of the Agriculture of Data partnership with a mention that this decision is subject to final approval by the Funders concerned. Upon completion of all contract negotiations, the following information will be added:

- Duration of the project
- Project summary
- Total requested funding of the project
- Country, Coordinator organisation, as well as name and contact information of the Principal Investigator (PI) of the Coordinator
- Country, organisation and principal investigator name of each Partner and Associated Partner

The project summary submitted at full proposal stage should therefore not disclose any confidential information.

8 Redress procedure

A mechanism for redress is established according to Article 30 of the REGULATION (EU) 2021/695 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 28 April 2021 to ensure the independent and fair treatment of complaints related to this call.

Applicants can challenge the eligibility check and evaluation outcome only, if they suspect a breach in the application of the procedures. **This redress procedure only covers the procedural aspects of the evaluation and/or eligibility checks, including the national eligibility checks. The redress will not question the scientific or technical judgement of appropriately qualified experts.**

In this case, applicants shall submit their request for redress to the Call Office via email (ptj-agdata-calls@fz-juelich.de) using a template which will be provided for download via the Call Document section of the submission tool, up to 30 calendar days after the date of dispatch of the email containing the evaluation and eligibility outcome by the Call Office at the end of each step (first and second step). The proposal outcome email containing the results of the evaluation will give information on the redress procedure, which is described below.

- **Admissibility of requests for redress**

For a request for redress to be admissible the following conditions must be met:

- it must be submitted by the coordinator of the proposal to which the request for redress relates,
- only one request for redress per proposal will be considered,
- it must be submitted via email within the 30 calendar days deadline.

The request for redress must contain the following minimum information (given in the template):

- the name of the call for proposals,
- the proposal ID and acronym,
- the title of the proposal,
- a description of the alleged shortcomings of the evaluation or eligibility check procedure.

The request for redress must demonstrate **a procedural irregularity, factual error, manifest error of assessment, misuse of power, or a conflict of interest**. Requests for redress that do not meet the above conditions, do not deal with the evaluation of a specific proposal or express mere disagreement with the result or the reasoning of the evaluation will be judged as not suitable for redress.

- **Procedure**

Upon receipt of a request for redress, an acknowledgement of receipt will be sent by the Call Office within 7 calendar days.

All requests for redress received by the 30-calendar-days deadline will be processed together and the decision will be communicated to the coordinator of the proposal within 14 calendar days of the deadline for submitting the requests for redress.

The Call Office will establish a Redress Committee for each redress complaint consisting of at least three people (the Chair of IEP, a member of the Call Office and the CES, potentially funders responsible for the redress request). The Independent Observer has the right to observe the

meetings of the redress committee. The role of the redress committee is to evaluate the requests for redress according to the procedure, ensuring fair and equal treatment of applicants. The Redress Committee will make its decision based on the implementation of the evaluation procedure and on the available information related to the proposal and its evaluation. The Redress Committee cannot overrule a negative national eligibility check of a Funder. Requests for redress on national eligibility decisions will be assessed by the funder responsible for the national eligibility check, which will justify its decision to the Redress Committee, to prove that national funding rules listed under the call documents have been applied correctly.

- Step 1: Short proposals which were originally considered ineligible or not invited to submit a full proposal, but which the Redress Committee found to be eligible will be evaluated and allowed to participate in Step 2, if ranked high enough according to its final score. The deadline for the full proposal submission will remain the same.
- Step 2: The redress procedure may lead to a re-evaluation of all or part of the proposal by independent experts not involved in the previous evaluation or to the confirmation of the initial evaluation.

A re-evaluation will only be carried out if the request for redress shows that the selection procedure was flawed by a breach affecting the evaluation outcome and the final decision on whether to fund a proposal. This means, for example, that a problem relating to one evaluation criterion will not lead to a re-evaluation if the proposal has failed anyway on another criterion or if even by adding the maximum points for this criterion, the total score remains below the necessary threshold.

The total score of the proposal following any re-evaluation will be regarded as definitive. It may be lower than the original score.

9 General data protection issues

All personal data provided to the Agriculture of Data partnership in the execution of the call (e.g., proposals, reviewers and expert assessments, mailing lists, tracking websites, registration for activities and events) will be collected, stored and processed in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (Regulation EU 679/2016). For more information, please consult the privacy policy on the submission platform.

10 Obligations of the funded projects

10.1 Contract negotiation

Once the Coordinators have been informed of the funding decision, all Partners of the proposals selected for funding will be contacted by the Funders or will need to contact their Funders themselves, according to the applicable regulations, in order to start the grant negotiation process and accomplish the remaining steps until the research project can start. Within the grant negotiation process a final decision on the individual budget of each Partner will be taken subject to the Funder specific regulations. Please be aware that applicable European regulations on all aspects of funding must also be respected, e.g., state aid regulations[3].

Each Funder will fund their respective applicant(s) within the research project. Formal funding decisions are made by the Funders and funding will be provided according to applicable Funders

[3] https://competition-policy.ec.europa.eu/state-aid/overview_en

regulations and subject to clarification of any specific ethical issues raised by the evaluation or the Agriculture of Data Ethic Advisory Board.

For some Funders, a signed consortium agreement might be required for release of the funds. It is strongly recommended that successful consortia check this requirement with their Funders and negotiate and sign a consortium agreement before start of the project to satisfy applicable Funders regulations if required. The consortium agreement should address at least the following issues:

- Internal organisation and management of the consortium
- Intellectual property arrangements
- Settlement of internal disputes

Support for the preparation of a Consortium Agreement can be found on the DESCA webpage (https://www.desca-agreement.eu/desca-model-consortium-agreement/).

10.2 Communication and dissemination

10.2.1 Agriculture of Data partnership level

A list of the funded projects will be published on the website of the Agriculture of Data partnership and all communication channels the partnership is contributing to upon selection of proposals for funding. Applicants must be aware that, upon completion of all contract negotiations, the information from the proposals, as listed under section 7.2, will be published for promotional purposes.

10.2.2 Acknowledgement of Agriculture of Data

Communication and dissemination of project-related information and results (e.g., oral/poster presentations during workshops or conferences, a webpage, scientific publications or public articles) must provide a clear reference to the Agriculture of Data partnership**.** Agriculture of Data logos will be provided on the submission platform and the Agriculture of Data website. In addition, the EU emblem and the statement "Agriculture of Data is co-funded by the European Union" must also be displayed in all the communication and dissemination activities. The EU emblem can be downloaded here: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information-sources/logo-download-center_en.

Funders regulations in terms of acknowledgement of national/regional grants must also be respected.

10.2.3 Project level

All projects are requested to include at least one Use Case. The Use Case(s) will have to be entered and registered at the central Agriculture of Data Use Case platform. The Projects are also not only required to follow a multiactor- and user-centric approach involving stakeholders, but also a clear dissemination, exploitation, and communication plan that outlines the relevant channels for each activity and the target audiences. Each full proposal must include a two-page plan about the main aspects of dissemination, exploitation, and communication plan which evolves during the project duration (see Annex VIII). This plan is part of the evaluation criterion *Impact* (see section 6.2).

Communication tools, e.g. the Agriculture of Data corporate design including the Agriculture of Data logo will be provided to all selected projects.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to make sure that any peer-reviewed journal article they publish is openly accessible, free of charge. Open access is the practice of providing online access to

scientific information that is free of charge to the user and is reusable[4]. Please note that the respective Funder may also have specific requirements in terms of open access to data.

10.3 Collaboration with partnership Agriculture of Data

10.3.1 Meetings and workshops

In order to enhance knowledge sharing amongst the projects and the dissemination of the project results, kick-off, mid-term, and end-term meetings will be organised by Agriculture of Data. The Coordinators shall present their projects at these network meetings. **Coordinators must include accordingly budget for attendance of the three mandatory joint network meetings (kick-off, mid-term and end-term meeting) in their finance plan during proposal submission.** In addition, Agriculture of Data will also arrange additional partnership meetings and workshops focusing on specific aspects, such as the science-policy dialogue, knowledge transfer, dissemination of results, etc. Coordinators must include accordingly budget for attendance of two further meetings to be able to attend (some of) these meetings. These meetings will take place in Europe. For budgeting purposes, it is suggested to assume these meetings will take place in central Europe in or around Brussels.

10.3.2 Project monitoring

In addition to the reporting required by the Funders regulations, reporting will be required half-way through the project in the form of a mid-term report (MTR; M12 - M18, depending on the project duration) and after/at the end of each project (end-term report, ETR). Reporting will consist of a project status report and an in-depth monitoring survey to measure project progress and the contribution made to the overall aims of the call and Agriculture of Data's general objectives. All Partners and Associated Partners will have to deliver input for these reports. However, it is the responsibility of the Coordinator to submit the complete MTR and ETR via the submission platform on time (see section 4.3). The MTR and ETR will include an update on the ethics self-assessment and documentation on how potential ethical issues are addressed. These reports will feed into the monitoring of the implementation of the Agriculture of Data partnership.

Detailed information on the reporting and monitoring procedures, as well as templates, will be provided to the Coordinators of the funded projects in due course by the Call Office.

10.4 Data management issues

As relevant, applicants must include information on how the Partners will manage the research data generated and/or collected during the project. Each proposal must include a maximum two page describing their plans to develop a Data Management Plan (DMP). Advice for preparing the Data Management Plan is provided in Annex VII.

Further information on DMP can be gained here: https://www.openaire.eu/how-to-comply-with-horizon-europe-mandate-for-rdm.

In addition, applicants must include a Data Management Plan as a distinct deliverable within the first six months of the project. This deliverable will evolve during the lifetime of the project in order to present the status of the project's reflections on data management.

[4] https://rea.ec.europa.eu/open-science_en

10.5 Ethics assessment

Any work involving the use of animals or humans should be carried out with the appropriate authorisation, taking into account the European Union and national ethics requirements. In order to identify any potential ethical issues, applicants are required to complete an ethics self-assessment and provide support documentation referred to in the ethics issues checklist. Please consult the available Horizon Europe programme guidance: How to complete your ethics self-assessment. If any ethical issues are expected to arise during the proposed project, these must be addressed in the full proposal.

The Horizon Europe guidelines address ethical issues in relation to the following: human embryos & foetuses, human beings, human cells or tissues, personal data, animals, non-EU countries, environment, health & safety, dual use and exclusive focus on civil applications. Applicants can also consult the European Commission's Guidance Note – Ethics and Food-Related Research[5] on core issues of ethical concern in the field of food-related research, including an appendix that addresses broader concerns in the field of food ethics.

This self-assessment, as well as any additional ethical issues that are raised by the evaluation committee and the Ethics Advisory Board of Agriculture of Data, will be shared with Funders who may stipulate specific ethics requirements, which in turn must be met by successful applicants as part of the funding contract.

Any proposal deemed to violate fundamental ethical principles shall not be selected. Assessment of the significance of ethics issues will be made applying the criteria published by the European Commission in its guidelines for the Horizon Europe Framework Programme.

Where activities undertaken in non-EU countries raise ethics issues, the applicants must ensure that the research conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State.

[5] Guidance Note – Ethics and Food-Related Research: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/fp7/89847/research-food_en.pdf

Annex I Overview of the funding regulations per Funder

Table 3: Overview of the individual funding regulations of each Funder. The information presented here is provided without guarantee and serves as an indicative overview only. For more details, please refer to the document Annex XIII.

Country	Funder	Eligible Partners							Budget limit per project (k€)	Total initial budget (k€)
		Univer-sities	Research institutes	Non-profit organisations	Consumers / citizens	Civil society representatives	Private companies	Other		
Belgium	FWO	X	X						350	1,000
Belgium	FNRS	X	X						300	300
Belgium	SPW	X	X						-	650
Denmark	IFD	X	X	X		X	X	Public entities and institutions (municipalities, regions and government agencies) RTO. All Danish organisations directly involved in activities in the projects are eligible as applicants to IFD.	300 per partner, 500 (if several danish partners)	1,300
Estonia	ETAg	X	X	X	X	X	X	All partners who meet the national eligibility requirements	150 (partner), 300 (coordinator)	300
Finland	MMM	X	X	X			X		250 (partner) or max. 300 (coordinator)	600
France	MASA	X	X	X		X	X		400	1,000
Germany	BMFTR	X	X	X			X		400 (partner) – 500 (coordinator)	2,000
Hungary	NKFIH	X	X	X		X	X		140	140
Ireland	DAFM	X	X						325	650
Ireland	TAIGHDE	X	X						330	600

Israel	IIA/ MOAG	X X	X X				X (only IIA)		500 50	500 50
Italy	MASAF	X	X	X				To be eligible all listed entities must be NO profit and have research in the main tasks of their institutional duties.	300	600
Latvia	LLMZA	X	X				X		50	50
Netherlands	LVVN	X	X	X			X		250 (partner) - 330 (if several dutch partners)	1,000
Romania	UEFISCDI	X	X	X			X		250	500
Slovakia	CVTI SR	X	X	X	X	X	X		400 or 800 (if two partners)	1,200
Spain	AEI	X	X	X					175 (one AEI applicant)	1,000
Spain	CDTI						X		500	500
Türkyie	TUBITAK	X	X				X	Higher education institutions, training and research hospitals, public institutions and organizations (including public research centers, metropolitan/city municipalities), SMEs and large companies established in Turkey are eligible to be supported.	200 The size of the grant may vary depending of the needs of each project and must be fully justified.	500

Annex II Short proposal template

The list below, for information only, indicates menu items within the submission platform, including explanations. Please be aware that the character counts might differ between Word template and the submission platform. This is due to the submission platform using a HTML code for text transcription. Figures can be only inserted where indicated within the explanations.

PROJECT COORDINATOR/PARTNER INFORMATION

- Contact data
- CV of Principal Investigator of the Coordinator/Partner with the following structure (see also template submission platform)
  - Name and surname
  - Current and previous position(s)
  - Up to 5 publications, most relevant to the proposed work
  - Research grants awarded for the same or related Topic within last 5 years

  CV must be uploaded as pdf file max. 1 page, Arial 11pt, line spacing 1.15, max. 1 MB
- Tasks within the project

  Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces
- 5 references/publications
- Team members' descriptions and their relevant qualifications

  Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces

PROJECT DATA

- Project title
- Acronym
- Expected project start date and end date (max. 36 months)
- Topic addressed/ C-R&I-As addressed

JUSTIFICATION FOR C-R&I-A SELECTION FROM THE SRIA

Please briefly justify your selection of the C-R&I-As from the SRIA under PROJECT DATA.

Max. 3,000 characters incl. spaces, figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURE for details

PROJECT SUMMARY

Please provide your project summary. This summary might be used for communication and dissemination activities should your project be selected for funding. Please make sure that it is publishable.

Max. 3,000 characters incl. spaces, figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURE for details

KEYWORDS

Max. 5 keywords related to your project, separated by comma

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please provide your project plan for involvement and/or engagement of stakeholders within the proposed project. This section should describe the multiactor- and user-centric approach.

Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces

STATE OF THE ART

Please provide a section on state of the art for the research area(s) in which your project is planned.

Max. 4,000 characters incl. spaces. Figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURE for details

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please provide your project description using the following structure. The project description is separated into the following 2 **main sections:**

- **Excellence:** this part shall reflect the scientific excellence of the project. The following subheadings are not mandatory but recommended: Objectives, Concept and approach, Ambition, Added value for transnational research and innovations
- **Impact:** specify the expected project outputs and potential impacts (short-, mid- and/or long-term) of your proposed research project, relevance to the call scope/topics and to the C-R&I-As of the SRIA. The following subheadings are not mandatory but recommended: Relevance to the call and the C-R&I-As of the Agriculture of Data SRIA, Expected outputs and impacts, Measures to maximise impact, Dissemination and communication activities and exploitation of results
- In addition, please provide a brief description of the planned work packages and how they are connected (inserting a figure to depict the workflow might be useful).

The project should be in line with the requirements stated in the Call Announcement.

Max. 10,000 characters in total, including spaces. Figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURES for details

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED USE CASE(S)

Please describe how your project or part(s) of your proposed project will be used as a Use Case. Use Cases need to fit into the Agriculture of Data SRIA, a minimum of one Use Case needs to be described.

Max. 2 pages, pdf upload

ESTIMATION OF WORK EFFORTS IN PERSON MONTHS FOR ALL PARTNERS

Please provide a description of the estimated work efforts per project partner for the proposed project.

Max. 1 page, pdf upload

FINANCIAL PLAN

Please insert the requested budget for all Partners in the consortium into in the appropriate columns on the submission platform. Also add your own (in-kind) contribution, if applicable. Please be aware that only the PI of the Coordinator can fill in the financial plan on behalf of the whole consortium. The units used are [k€].

Figure 1: Figure of the financial table as shown in the submission platform.

Organisation name	Personnel	Travel	Consumables / Equipment	Subcontracts	Requested Funding * required for pre-registration	Total Own Contribution	Total Costs
Institute of Agrobiodiversity	250	5	10	2	292	5	297
Overhead	25	0	0	0			
Institute of Agriculture	200	2	10	0	212	2	214
Overhead	0	0	0	0			
Institute of Farming	100	2	5	10	140	7	147
Overhead	20	0	1	2			
TOTAL	595	9	26	14	644	14	658

1 k€ = 1000 €

FINANCE COMMENTS

Please provide justification of the planned project costs in each category.

LETTER OF FINANCIAL COMMITMENT(S)

Associated Partners may join the project at their own expense or funded by another agency not contributing to the call. For each of them, a letter of financial commitment must be uploaded via the upload field of the submission platform, using the template provided (Annex IX and in the Call Documents). All letters of financial commitment must be compiled into one pdf file.

Please do not upload any other letter type unless required by Funder regulations. Additional uploaded documents will not be considered.

Upload one pdf file, max. 5 MB

FIGURES (OPTIONAL)

You can upload up to three figures in total. Please make sure you use the correct format (jpg, png or gif) and adhere to the maximum size that is supported by the online submission platform (max. 2MB and 1800px x 1200px). Detailed instructions on how to upload figures in the text fields is provided in the submission platform menu FIGURES. Please check in advance the acceptance of your figures by the submission platform.

Upload up to 3 images (each up to 2 MB, 1800px x 1200px) as jpg, png or gif

LITERATURE REFERENCES (OPTIONAL)

You can collect the literature references that you refer to in your proposal in a list and upload the list here.

Max. 1 page, pdf upload

EVALUATORS (OPTIONAL)

You can name up to two potential experts that you would like to exclude for the review of your proposal. Please provide the name and institution of those experts.

Max. 500 characters incl. spaces. The names of the evaluators will only be visible for the Call Office and the CES.

Annex III Full proposal template[6]

The list below indicates all of the menu items within the submission platform including explanations. Please be aware that the character counts might differ between Word template and the submission platform. This is due to the submission platform using a HTML code for text transcription. Figures can be only inserted where indicated within the explanations.

PROJECT COORDINATOR/PARTNER INFORMATION

- Contact details
- CV of PI of the Coordinator/partner with the following structure
  - Name and surname
  - Current and previous position(s)
  - Up to 5 publications, most relevant to the proposed work
  - Research grants awarded for the same or related Topic within last 5 years

  CV must be uploaded as pdf file max. 1 page, Arial 11pt, line spacing 1.15, max. 1 MB
- Tasks within the project

  Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces
- 5 references/publications
- Team members' descriptions and their relevant qualifications

  Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces

PROJECT DATA

- Project title
- Acronym
- Expected project start date and end date (max 36 months)
- Topic addressed/ C-R&I-As addressed and short justification statement

PROJECT SUMMARY

Please provide your project summary. This summary might be used for communication and dissemination activities should your project be selected for funding. Please make sure that it is publishable.

Max. 3,000 characters incl. spaces, figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURE for details

KEYWORDS

Max. 5 keywords related to your project, separated by comma

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please provide your project plan for involvement and/or engagement of stakeholders within the proposed project. This section should describe the multiactor- and user-centric approach.

Max. 2,000 characters incl. spaces

STATE OF THE ART

Please provide a section on state of the art for the research area(s) in which your project is planned.

Max. 4,000 characters incl. spaces, 1 page. Figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURE for details

[6] Content of the full proposal might be slightly adapted

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Please provide your project description using the following structure. The project description is separated into the following **3 sections:**

- **Excellence:** this part shall reflect the scientific excellence of the project. The following subheadings are not mandatory but recommended: Objectives, Concept and approach, Ambition, Added value for transnational research and innovations
- **Impact:** specify the expected project outputs and potential impacts (short-, mid- and/or long-term) of your proposed research project, relevance to the call scope/topics and to the C-R&IAs of the SRIA. The following subheadings are not mandatory but recommended: Relevance to the call and the C-R&I-As of the Agriculture of Data SRIA, Expected outputs and impacts, Measures to maximise impact, Dissemination and communication activities and exploitation of results
- **Implementation:** provide information on the workflow and connections between work packages (avoid a repetition of a work package description as this is provided as a separate upload under Work plan (see below).

The project should be in line with the requirements stated in the Call Announcement.

Max. 20,000 characters in total, including spaces, max 6 pages. Figure(s) can be included here, see menu FIGURES for details

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED USE CASES

Please describe how your project or part(s) of your proposed project will be used as a Use Case. Use Cases need to fit into the Agriculture of Data SRIA, a minimum of one Use Case needs to be described.

Max. 2 pages, pdf upload

WORK PLAN

Here the work plan shall be uploaded as a .pdf document. The work plan should clearly describe the individual work packages, tasks, deliverables and milestones of the project including the assigned partners and their resources. Potential risks and their mitigation must be listed for each work package (WP). The work plan must also include a Gantt chart. We recommend using the template provided in the document section, although this is not an obligation. If using your own Gantt chart, please ensure that all of the information contained in the template provided is included.

Upload pdf file, max. 12 pages, Arial 11pt, line pitch 1.15, max. 5 MB

DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN

Here you can upload your Data Management Plan (DMP). Please consider the recommendations and checklist of questions provided in Annex VII when preparing your plan.

Upload pdf file, max. 2 pages, Arial 11pt, line pitch 1.15

COMMUNICATION, EXPLOITATION AND DISSEMINATION PLAN

Here the Communication, Exploitation and Dissemination Plan shall be uploaded as a .pdf document. Please consider the recommendations and guiding information provided in Annex VIII when preparing your plan.

Upload pdf file, max. 2 pages, Arial 11pt, line pitch 1.15, max. 1 MB

ETHICS SELF-ASSESSMENT

Please fill in the Ethics Self-Assessment and address potential concerns/issues. Proposals may be rejected on ethical grounds, if they do not comply with European and/or national/regional legislation.

Please also visit https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/guidance/how-to-complete-your-ethics-self-assessment_en.pdf for more information on the ethics self-assessment.

FINANCIAL PLAN

Please insert the requested budget for all of the Partners in the consortium into the appropriate columns on the submission platform. Add your own (in-kind) contribution, if applicable. Please be aware that only the PI of the Coordinator can fill in the financial plan on behalf of the whole consortium. The units used are 0.0 k€.

Figure 2: Figure of the financial table as shown within the submission platform.

Organisation name	Personnel	Travel	Consumables / Equipment	Subcontracts	Requested Funding * required for pre-registration	Total Own Contribution	Total Costs
Institute of Agrobiodiversity	250	5	10	2	292	5	297
Overhead	25	0	0	0			
Institute of Agriculture	200	2	10	0	212	2	214
Overhead	0	0	0	0			
Institute of Farming	100	2	5	10	140	7	147
Overhead	20	0	1	2			
TOTAL	595	9	26	14	644	14	658

1 k€ = 1000 €

FINANCE COMMENTS

Please provide a brief justification for each cost item per Partner. Please be aware that only the PI of the Coordinator can fill in the financial plan on behalf of the whole consortium.

Max. 2,000 characters per partner

LETTER OF FINANCIAL COMMITMENT(S)

Associated Partners may join the project at their own expense or funded by another agency not contributing to the Call. For each of them, a letter of financial commitment must be uploaded via the upload field of the submission platform, using the template provided (Annex IX and in the Call Documents). All letters of financial commitment must be compiled into one pdf file.

Please do not upload any other letter types unless required by the respective Funder regulations. Additional uploaded documents will not be considered.

Upload one pdf file, max.5 MB

FIGURES (OPTIONAL)

You can upload up to six figures. Please make sure you use the correct format (jpg, png or gif) and adhere to the maximum size that is supported by the online submission platform (max. 2MB and 1800px x 1280px). Detailed instructions on how to upload and implement figures within the text fields is provided in the submission platform menu FIGURES. Please check that your figures have been accepted by the submission platform.

Upload up to 6 images (each up to 2 MB, 1800px x 1280px) as jpg, png or gif

LITERATURE REFERENCES (OPTIONAL)

You can collect the literature references that you refer to in your proposal in a list and upload the list here.

Max. 1 page, pdf upload

EVALUATORS (OPTIONAL)

You can name up to two potential experts that you would like to exclude for the review of your proposal. Please provide the name and institution of those experts.

Max. 500 characters incl. spaces. The names of the evaluators will only be visible for the Call Office and the CES.

Annex IV Checklist for proposal submission

The proposal must be submitted via the online submission platform. In addition to the data that has to be provided on the submission platform, the following documents must be uploaded as separate files (see also Annex II and Annex III). Unless specified, all uploaded documents shall have the font Arial and size 11pt, with line spacing of 1.15, and must be uploaded as .pdf. In addition to the documents, figures can be uploaded (three in short proposals/ six in full proposals; please pay attention to format and size – see Annex II and Annex III).

Table 4 Checklist for short proposal preparation

Document	Comment	Done
PI Coordinator CV	Max. 1 page each (incl. name & surname, current and previous position(s), up 10 relevant publications, relevant research grants awarded in the last 5 years)	☐
PI Partner and Associated Partner CVs		☐
Estimation of work efforts in PM	Max 1 page	☐
Description of Use Cases	Max. 2 pages, see Annex VI	☐
Estimation of work efforts in person months for all partners	Max. 1 page	
Letter of financial commitment(s) (only applicable for Associated Partners)	Please compile one pdf file for all commitment letters; a template is also provided in the documents section	☐
Figures (optional)	Ensure all figures are displayed correctly	☐
Literature references (optional)	Max. 1 page	☐

Table 5 Checklist for full proposal preparation

Document	Comment	Done
PI Coordinator CV	Max. 1 page each (incl. name & surname, current and previous position(s), up 10 relevant publications, relevant research grants awarded in the last 5 years)	☐
PI Partner and Associated Partner CVs		☐
Work plan	Max. 12 pages, please use the template available in the document section	☐
Estimation of work efforts in PM	Max 1 page	☐
Description of Use Cases	Max. 2 pages, see Annex VI	☐
Data Management Plan	Max. 2 pages, see Annex VII	☐
Communication, Exploitation, and Dissemination plan	Max. 2 pages, see Annex VIII	☐
Letter of financial commitment(s) (only applicable for Associated Partners)	Please compile one pdf file for all commitment letters; a template is also provided in the documents section	☐
Figures (optional)	Ensure all figures are displayed correctly	☐
Literature references (optional)	Max. 2 pages	☐

Annex V Work plan template

Once the submission system is opened for full proposal submission, the template will be available in the CALL DOCUMENTS section of the submission platform at the full proposal stage. It is not compulsory to use the provided template.

A work plan shall include the following

- Information on each WP: name, duration, WP lead and contributors, objective and description, list of deliverables and milestones, description of risks and measures to mitigate risks
- Gantt chart: overview WP incl. deliverables and milestones over the entire project duration

Annex VI Description of Use Cases

Use Cases are an essential part of the project proposals submitted to the 1st call of the Agriculture of Data partnership. Upon submission, applicants are required to identify at least one Use Case that will derive from the proposed project. Duration of the Use Case(s) is not bound to the proposed projects life time.

Information that need to be provided include:

- Type of Use Case (for example development of a smartphone application, creation of a database; see also the EU use case observatory)
- Duration
- Involved partners/Stakeholders
- Short description

Annex VII Data Management Plan template

Data management is an essential component of the success of a research and innovation project. Correspondingly, all projects require a good Data Management Plan.

Representatives of academia, industry, funding agencies, and scholarly publishers designed and jointly endorsed a concise and measurable set of principles referred to as **FAIR data principles** with the intention to provide a guideline for reusability of data holdings. Four foundational principles – findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability – are a necessity of data management. The EC published Guidelines on FAIR Data Management in Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf.

All applicants must include a maximum two page Data Management Plan during the full proposal stage. This plan should mainly detail how the consortium will manage the research data generated and/or collected during the project, in particular addressing the following issues:

- What types of data will the project generate/collect?
- What standards will be used?
- How will this data be exploited and/or shared/made accessible for verification and reuse?
- If data cannot be made available, explain why.
- How will this data be curated and preserved?
- How will the costs for data curation and preservation be covered?

Annex VIII Communication, Exploitation, and Dissemination Plan template

Plans for communication, exploitation, and dissemination of the project and its results have to be described and will be taken into account in the evaluation with the aim to increase the quality of the implementation and to achieve greater impact (see section 5.2). The plan should be organised in the form of various communication routes (both national and international) such as scientific papers, posters, presentations, course or training materials, web-based tools, workshops as well as explicit plans for stakeholder involvement or direct intervention directed towards end users. The plans for communication, exploitation, and dissemination should describe the main communication and dissemination channels as well as the respective target audience and exploitation plans for project outcomes and how they will contribute to project impact.

Appropriate resources should be dedicated to the dissemination, communication and exploitation activities and the involvement of stakeholders. A focus should be set on how to communicate and interact with relevant stakeholders to ensure their involvement.

To enhance dissemination of the project results, all project Coordinators should calculate the costs for their participation in three mandatory joint network meetings (kick-off, mid-term and end-term meetings) – in addition to or in parallel to their own project meetings – in their project plan.

Please consider that all Partners must give proper reference to the Agriculture of Data partnership in any documentation published (in written, oral or electronic form).

There are possibilities to get support and advice for your plan for communication, exploitation, and dissemination, for example: https://rea.ec.europa.eu/dissemination-and-exploitation_en.

Annex IX Financial commitments template

A template is provided as a word document in the section CALL DOCUMENTS of the submission platform.

This template should be used as evidence of the availability of funds by Associated Partners, who are:

- ineligible to receive funding from any of the Funders participating in the call or
- eligible to receive funding from a Funder, but not seeking funding from a Funder.

This document must be signed by an authorised representative of the organisation. This letter should be submitted electronically with the proposal through the submission platform.

Failure to provide such a commitment at the time of proposal submission may result in the rejection of the whole consortium.

Name and address of organisation, Name and address of contact person Agriculture of Data 1st call Letter of Financial Commitment   Location, Date: .....   We hereby confirm that *(Organisation Name)* has sufficient resources and is committed to participating in the project *(project title)* ..... in accordance with the proposal submitted by *(Coordinator name)*

Annex X List of beneficiaries of Agriculture of Data (research performing organisations only)

The table below lists all of the beneficiaries of the Agriculture of Data partnership who might apply for funding under this call. Please be aware that inclusion of any Partner/Associated Partner among these organisations in a consortium will not have any influence on the evaluation procedure or the scores awarded to proposals. All short proposals and full proposals will be judged solely on their own merits. The organisations listed below have been strictly excluded from all activities related to the preparation and implementation of this call and have no prior information concerning the call or additional insights beyond what is outlined in the official, publicly available call documentation.

Country	Beneficiary
BE	EIGEN VERMOGEN VAN HET INSTITUUT VOOR LANDBOUW- EN VISSERIJONDERZOEK
BE	VLAAMSE INSTELLING VOOR TECHNOLOGISCH ONDERZOEK N.V.
BG	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF METEOROLOGY AND HYDROLOGY
CA	UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH
DE	FORSCHUNGSZENTRUM JULICH GMBH
DE	JULIUS KUHN-INSTITUT BUNDESFORSCHUNGSINSTITUT FUR KULTURPFLANZEN
DE	LEIBNIZ-INSTITUT FUR AGRARTECHNIK UND BIOOKONOMIE EV
DE	LEIBNIZ-ZENTRUM FUER AGRARLANDSCHAFTSFORSCHUNG
DE	JOHANN HEINRICH VON THUENEN-INSTITUT, BUNDESFORSCHUNGSINSTITUT FUER LAENDLICHE RAEUME, WALD UND FISCHEREI
DK	AARHUS UNIVERSITET
DK	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
EE	POLLUMAJANDUSE REGISTRITE JA INFORMATSIOONI AMET
ES	UNIVERSIDAD DE MALAGA
ES	CONSEJERIA DE AGRICULTURA , PESCA, AGUA Y DESARROLLO RURAL
ES	AGENCIA ESTATAL CONSEJO SUPERIOR DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTIFICAS
FR	INSTITUT NATIONAL DE L'INFORMATION GEOGRAPHIQUE ET FORESTIERE
FR	AGENCE DE SERVICE ET DE PAIEMENT
FR	INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE POUR L'AGRICULTURE, L'ALIMENTATION ET L'ENVIRONNEMENT
GR	NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURES FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
GR	ETHNIKO ASTEROSKOPEIO ATHINON
GR	BENAKI PHYTOPATHOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
IE	IRISH CATTLE BREEDING FEDERATION SOCIETY LTD
IE	AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
IL	THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION OF ISRAEL - THE VOLCANI CENTRE
IT	CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE
IT	CONSIGLIO PER LA RICERCA IN AGRICOLTURA E L'ANALISI DELL'ECONOMIA AGRARIA
NL	STICHTING WAGENINGEN RESEARCH
NL	WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY
PL	INSTYTUT CHEMII BIOORGANICZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK
PT	AGENCIA ESPACIAL PORTUGUESA
SI	INSTITUT JOZEF STEFAN
UK	ROTHAMSTED RESEARCH LTD

Annex XI Template for redress procedure

In case redress is sought, the Coordinator of the proposal shall submit their appeal to the Agriculture of Data Call Office (ptj-agdata-calls@fz-juelich.de) via email using the following template including all relevant information.

Please include a short (~1,000 characters max) explanation in the marked space below.

Name and address of organisation, Name and address of contact person

Proposal ID and acronym

Agriculture of Data 1st call

Application for Redress procedure

I wish to open a redress procedure concerning the following point(s) of the call procedure formalities:

- ☐ Short proposal eligibility
- ☐ Short proposal evaluation
- ☐ Full proposal eligibility
- ☐ Full proposal evaluation
- ☐ other

Explanation (1,000 characters max)

Location, Date: .....

.....

in accordance with the proposal submitted by *(Coordinator name)*

Annex XII Template Confirmation of no conflict of interest (CoI)

In the submission platform each IEP member will get access to the evaluation platform. Here the experts confirm for each proposal individually if a CoI, as described below, exists or not. The consortium composition of each proposal will be made available to facilitate this. **Only where no CoI exists, as described below, will the IEP member get full access to that specific proposal.**

I declare that I will be independent, impartial and objective in the evaluation of the assigned proposals.

Definition of the conflict of interest:

For a given proposal, a conflict of interest exists, if an evaluator:

- was involved in the preparation of any proposal submitted to the call, or
- benefits directly or indirectly if a proposal is accepted or rejected, or
- has close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with a person involved in the preparation of any proposal submitted to the call, or with a person who would benefit if such a proposal is accepted or rejected or
- is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant organisation,
- is employed or contracted by one of the applicant organisations, or
- is or was at any point in a competitive situation with one of the applicants of a proposal.

In the following circumstances, the call office will decide whether a CoI may or may not exist, taking into account the objective circumstances, available information and related risks. When an evaluator:

- was employed by one of the applicant organisations in the last three years, or
- is involved in a contract or grant agreement, grant decision, membership of management structures (e.g., member of management or advisory board, etc.) or research collaboration with an applicant organisation (or had been so in the last three years) or
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on their ability to participate in the evaluation of the proposal impartially (or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party).

If any such CoI exists or arises, I will inform the call office as soon as possible. The Call Office makes the final decision on the existence of a conflict of interest and on any disqualifications.

During the IEP meeting, even if I have not evaluated a specific proposal, in case of a possible CoI with that proposal, I will leave the virtual room during the discussion of this proposal. I will follow the instructions given by the Call Office with the aim of reaching an impartial evaluation of the proposals.

Annex XIII Funder regulations

The Funder regulations are a separate supporting document. The document can be found in the CALL DOCUMENTS section of the submission platform at https://agdata.ptj.de/.