



Horizon Europe Work Programme 2026

3. Research Infrastructures

Q&A

HORIZON-INFRA-2026 - General

- 1. Would it be possible to take part in the call if we are a company developing diagnostic tests in the field of “veterinary” and we plan to develop our infrastructure?**

In principle there is no prescriptive approach in this regard, but it is important that the proposal will target a **unique service**, relevant at EU level, essential for the European Research Area in the domain of the proposal.

A good preliminary action for the proposal could be the checking of the ESFRI Landscape on the domain, looking at how the proposal could complement and be engaged in one or another topic of the Work Programme.

- 2. If the project is on the “waiting list” for being an ESFRI project? Does it count as ESFRI in the partnership?**

No, being on the waiting list is not sufficient. Any eligibility conditions must be strictly fulfilled at the time of the call closure.

- 3. How will the INFRADEV that attribute to “clusters of ESFRI large RI” to pilot the TA with accent to support mission-oriented research or “main challenges” guarantee that CURIOSITY DRIVEN TNA will be maintained and "protected"?**

To some extent, this refers to the governance of access schemes.

The cluster topic is one element of this governance but equally important are the preparatory actions under the topic HORIZON-INFRA-2025-01-DEV-05 and the options tested by the pilots of topic HORIZON-INFRA-2027-SERV-01-01.

Furthermore, major steering will come from the process shaping the future FP10 and its Work Programmes, as well as the EU priorities that will be set during the next Multiannual Financial Framework.

Destination INFRADEV - Consolidation and evolution of the European Research Infrastructure landscape

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-01

- 4. Could emerging environmental protection infrastructures within the built environment - aimed at mitigating invisible environmental risks affecting human health - be considered within the scope of future European research infrastructures?**

This Work Programme is only dealing with research infrastructures, and not infrastructures at large. For example, only research infrastructures necessary for R&I in the field of environmental risks affecting human health, would be in scope for this domain.

The WP 2026 allows for the development of new concepts of research infrastructures. However, communities envisaging new capacities must build significant national support, considering national road mapping process, if any. As a reminder, the core funding for construction and operation of research infrastructures is mostly a national remit. Another requirement for proposals is to carefully consider the existing landscape and privilege the expansion of any relevant research infrastructure instead of the development of an entirely independent new one.

- 5. This topic funds RIA-type projects. What kind of R&D activities (and expenses) are expected in a project that only describes the desired RI to be implemented post-project through further funding (concept development)?**

It is unusual that for this concept development very specific designs, processes and even some equipment may need to be developed during the course of such a grant to validate its feasibility. E.g. the topic states *“Major upgrades or extensions of existing infrastructures may also be considered if the result is significantly transformative with regards to the scientific outputs.”* Proposals should identify technologies, with due attention to technology sovereignty, and the architecture for developing the research infrastructure.

- 6. Could a university-based research infrastructure be funded under this call, working towards a pan European distributed RI for talent development and access to advanced research facilities, covering the gap in talent training?**

In principle yes. There is no prescriptive information on which organisation is hosting a research infrastructure; furthermore, we have many universities participating in the current selected projects.

Nevertheless, the topic is addressing RIs with a kind of uniqueness (i.e. not easily replicated) and that can add something new to the current landscape (referring to the ESFRI Landscape analysis: [Landscape Analysis | www.esfri.eu](http://www.esfri.eu)). Therefore, an RI bringing added value by only/mostly addressing gap in talent training would not be in the scope.

The topic is intended to contribute to the next generation of EU relevant RIs.

While the main objective is scientific excellence, the development of the new research infrastructure must also consider the impact of promoting talent development through access to advanced RIs and covering the gap in talent training.

However, the main objective is the capacity to address the constantly changing scientific challenges.

7. Would a RI focused on a specific clinical domain (e.g. intensive care trials) be too narrow, or could it still be in scope if it provides reusable services and access to the broader European research community?

It is necessary to consider to which extent the project is building the next generation of EU relevant interest; something which has its own value as a new essential capacity.

A narrow incremental extension of what is already existing does not fit with the topic. However, the expert evaluator could consider positively a project proposing something, even narrow, but so specific that it goes far beyond the state-of-the art and can be considered equivalent to a next generation of research infrastructure.

It is vital that the proposal justifies clearly its approach and its positioning in the European landscape of research infrastructures.

8. For topic INFRA-2026-DEV-01-01, can a digital and methodological infrastructure for adaptive platform trials qualify as a RI if it provides structured services to the wider European clinical research community?

The 2026 Work Programme allows for the development of new research infrastructure concepts in any field of research, by any type of institution, and for the benefit of any research community.

However, it is important to highlight how the proposal fits into the current research infrastructure landscape.

It is worth noting that Member States and Associated Countries have repeatedly expressed their preference for consolidating this landscape, particularly through the expansion of existing research infrastructures.

Furthermore, the proposal should explain to what extent what will be provided is unique - amounting to a new, independent generation of research infrastructures - since a simple incremental extension of what already exists does not meet the purpose of this topic. Proposals should also clarify the limitations of existing research infrastructures in offering future services to broader European clinical research communities.

- 9. In this topic, are there expectations regarding the profile of the coordinating organisation? E.g. should proposals be coordinated by established research infrastructures, or can hospitals or universities also lead RI development actions?**

The Work Programme is not prescriptive in this regard.

If the proposal is developing a new RI, hospitals or universities can lead the RI development action, if they have proven significant expertise in the management of research capacities.

- 10. For DEV-2026-01-01, which encourages extending existing RIs, could developing a complementary infrastructure in a domain with existing ESFRI RIs, without formal partnerships with them, negatively affect a proposal's chances of success?**

The programme is not prescriptive in the topic. This is not an eligibility requirement or even requirement at all when drafting the proposal.

However, when considering a new infrastructure (equivalent to a *“Next Generation of Research Infrastructures”*), the project must demonstrate that it has secured the support of the community of potential users, Member States, associated countries, and, consequently, national authorities and national funding bodies. The EU support should allow the project to examine these potential relationships and be convincing regarding the approach taken. Throughout the project's lifecycle, one of the objectives and activities is the establishment of a stable and structured relationship with the existing RI that the proposal aims to expand.

- 11. How do you see the interaction between:
HORIZON-INFRA-2025-01-DEV-05,
HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-02,
HORIZON-INFRA-2027-SERV-01-01 and
HORIZON-INFRA-2027-SERV-01-02?
Should they build on each other, but how?**

Although sequential, the related actions will mostly develop in parallel. In this context, the approach is rather cooperation and coordination than one action 'building' on another. Proposals should describe in detail how such cooperation will be organised and in which specific areas. The scope explicitly mentions the example of the use of service catalogues and interoperability.

- 12. How would a “major upgrade of an existing RI” be defined? What is the definition of a “next generation” infrastructure in the context of INFRADEV Calls? Does this need to point to the ESFRI process for major upgrades?**

A simple incremental extension of what already exists does not meet the objectives of this topic. Proposals should offer something entirely unique, equivalent to a new, independent generation of research infrastructures, something worthy of inclusion in the ESFRI roadmap as a new ESFRI project, since it is not yet listed there. This is a major update. We recommend consulting the ESFRI website regarding the 2026 roadmap to identify the minimum requirements for such new research infrastructures ([ESFRI Roadmap | www.esfri.eu](https://www.esfri.eu)).

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-02

- 13. Does topic INFRA-2026-DEV-01-02 allow, within the framework of infrastructure structuring and integration activities, for the implementation of a TNA-type pilot call to test or demonstrate the operationalisation of the synergies developed?**

Piloting access is not covered by this topic; in addition, the use of the specific unit costs is not allowed.

14. What type of policy contribution is expected from the proposals?

For example, should this contribution mainly consist of direct support to policy design and implementation, structured dialogue with policymakers, evidence provision, or other forms of engagement?

This will depend on the initiatives that are relevant to the RIs and how these initiatives are developed, which is their scope, their level of maturity and type of governance. This can take the form of the above suggested contribution or any other appropriate activity usually carried out under a coordination and support action (i.e. other than R&I activities). Further to the expected outcomes of the topic, the proposal should consider most of the overall expected impact of the INFRADEV destination.

15. Regarding the scope of the proposed tool, is it expected to be designed to support one or more specific Horizon Europe partnerships or missions? Or could it also address broader needs, going beyond individual missions and partnerships and covering wider policy priorities?

Typically, six clusters are expected (i.e. one per large ESFRI domain).

Each cluster should consider “key EU policy developments and strategic initiatives” relevant to their large domain.

There is no restriction on the nature and the scope (be it broad or very specific one) of the initiatives as long as it is relevant to the expected outcomes and the impact. HE Partnerships and Missions are given as examples.

16. How to interpret:

“Beneficiaries shall grant royalty-free access to their intellectual property relating to tools, standards, specifications, and other relevant outputs generated by this action to the EU institutions and to the beneficiaries of projects funded by the EU in view of a more sustained and integrated EU access scheme”?

About the rationale: these actions receive a 100% EU funding. For the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, it is important that results generated under the actions that are relevant to a more sustained and integrated EU access scheme can be re-used in this context. For example, new catalogues of services from DEV-02 would be important in the context of the 2027 Pilot on access and in any related future actions under FP10.

Under Article 16 and Annex 5 of the Horizon Europe Grant Agreement, beneficiaries keep ownership of their results but must grant certain access rights to support EU interests. In addition, when required by call conditions, they must provide royalty-free access to key tools, standards, and specifications to ensure continuity and avoid barriers to EU-wide infrastructure. According to the Horizon Europe Annotated Grant Agreement, beneficiaries must also grant royalty-free access to results to all EU institutions, bodies, and agencies for policy development, implementation, and monitoring (non-commercial use only).

These rules mainly apply to outputs needed for compatibility and integration between systems, while beneficiaries remain free to commercially exploit their results in other contexts.

17. Under this topic can also be fund proposals coming from the humanities/social sciences?

Yes, this cluster is covered.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-03

18. In topic DEV-01-03 is the proposal expected to put 80% or 100% of eligible costs in the detailed budget table?

For this topic, applicants should enter 100% of the eligible costs in the detailed budget table provided in the submission system.

The detailed budget table for DEV-01-03 has been specifically designed to reflect the financial set-up of this topic. Therefore, all costs declared in the budget table (per beneficiary and per work package) must correspond to 100% of the eligible costs.

Then, as explained in the “Instructions” tab of the budget table, the tab called “Lump sum breakdown” will automatically calculate the maximum grant amount that can be requested, which corresponds to 80% of the total eligible costs.

It is therefore very important that applicants use the correct budget table template provided in the submission system.

Finally, the amount corresponding to 80% of the eligible costs (i.e. the maximum grant amount calculated in the lump sum table) is the amount that must be introduced in Part A of the proposal.

19. The funding rate is 80%. Could you give more information what kind of co-funding instruments for the remaining 20% would be acceptable? And do the 20% co-funding need to be equally provided by all beneficiaries?

We speak of co-financing rather than co-funding which has a specific meaning in Horizon Europe. The programme is not prescriptive with the **co-financing**. Under this topic is expected something that is critical for the targeted ESFRI or ERIC, for its sustainability, for its operation and optimised access to this facility.

It is essential that the RI itself has a strong interest in what will be developed. This co-financing approach is to ensure that only actions with the highest benefit are supported.

The proposal should describe the activities and justify the 100% of the costs. The EC will reimburse the 80% and the proposal should describe how the 20% will be covered by its own resources and/or any additional **non-EU funding** scheme.

The repartition of the 20% costs between beneficiaries can be defined by beneficiaries’ internal agreement and there is no prescription from the Commission for an equal repartition between beneficiaries (i.e. one beneficiary can cover the full costs; or some partners cover higher costs and others lower costs).

20. How will the gained experiences about 80% funding be analysed? Is it foreseen that this funding model will become common in the future?

It is not easy to anticipate, but nothing is excluded and, given the budget constraints, it is possible that this co-financing approach will be promoted in the future.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-05

- 21. This topic mentions offering “remote access” to Ukrainian researchers. What is the definition of “remote access”? Furthermore, shall remote access be funded by the proposal, or is it ok to promote existing access possibilities? (e.g. those offered currently by implemented SERV projects)**

Remote access is defined in the **Charter of Access for research infrastructures**: *“Remote Access is Access to resources and services offered by the Research Infrastructure without Users physically visiting the infrastructure’s facilities. This can entail shipping of samples, exchange of data. It can include Access to selective digital services such as Access to high-performance computing. In both physical and remote Access, the services or resources are limited, and a **selection is required**”*. This is distinct from the definition of Virtual access, where the resources and services can be used by many users simultaneously and there is no need for selection.

The remote access would be funded by the projects, beyond the offers implemented by the INFRASERV projects. As this is not a standard INFRASERV, there is no need to provide unit costs and to prepare a specific cost sheet, as it is the case in INFRASERV topic. Remote access and remote access costs should be covered, but not in the traditional INFRASERV approach.

Nevertheless, it can also benefit selected TNA users’ projects in INFRASERV projects, by complementing/cooperating with them if relevant and agreed by the TNA users.

- 22. Beyond research activities delivered through access and fellowships, should consortia also plan and conduct defined research or technological actions? For instance, in dedicated work packages with scientific-technical EU-Ukraine collaborative projects along RIs under this call?**

Therefore, there is no requirement for additional activities ‘beyond’ the fellowships. As this is not INFRATECH topic, the proposals would not need to specific work packages for specific collaborative projects. However, that would not preclude that the project designs specific collaborative projects, in which the fellowships are embedded. The aim is not to improve/develop new services in the non-Ukrainian RI *per se*, therefore such technical work is only possible if it directly benefits Ukrainian (current or future) RI and or the work is mostly carried out by Ukrainian researchers (fellowships).

- 23. Could you please comment on the fact that it is RIA and not CSA? Do you see the possibility to support existing cooperations with long-term perspective in framework of technical WPs in addition to fellowships?**

Supporting existing cooperations with a long-term perspective is one of the ways to fulfil the expected outcome of *“strong and sustainable collaboration frameworks between Ukrainian and European RIs, supporting joint research activities”*.

Therefore, the proposal brings the opportunity to do this development with a long-term perspective. However, it does not exclude short-term fellowships that have immediate benefit.

- 24. Should cost sheets and description of RI be included in the proposal since it should offer remote access.**

No need to provide unit costs and to prepare a specific cost sheet, as it is requested in INFRASERV topics.

Remote access and remote access costs should be covered, but not in the traditional INFRASERV approach. And the specific unit costs for access cannot be used.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-06

25. Research infrastructure in Africa, particularly in Ethiopia, remains very limited.

How has the European Union addressed similar challenges?

The research infrastructures programme is not a capacity building program. Its mandate is to support the joint development and joint use of scientific services in the European Union. It also supports EU research infrastructures international activities when they contribute to the scientific excellence of EU RIs. The programme has funded over the years some activities with scientific partners in African countries, in the fields of climate data, infectious diseases or digital services provision.

26. Could you confirm if some particular countries are eligible to participate in this call as beneficiaries, specifically Argentina, Paraguay, South Africa, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and the US?

Argentina, Paraguay and South Africa are automatically eligible for funding as they are named as such in the List of Participating Countries?

Indeed, for example, an entity established in Argentina is (automatically) eligible for funding and can therefore be a beneficiary (or affiliated entity).

We remind you that the EC publishes a list of countries automatically eligible for funding in HE: https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/guidance/list-3rd-country-participation_horizon- Euratom_en.pdf.

An entity in any other non-associated country that is not in this list, like for example Brazil, must be considered *essential* for implementing the action to be eligible for EU funding.

LINK to National Contact Points (NCPs): [Horizon Europe Research Infrastructures Info Day | Research infrastructure | Horizon Europe NCP Portal](#).

27. When is it mandatory to include one or several ERIC/ESFRI in the consortium, must they coordinate the project? Or an institution or RI non-ERIC/ESFRI can be coordinator? E.g. INFRA-2026-01-DEV-06, INFRA-2027-SERV-01-03, INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01 or INFRA-2027-TECH-01-01

The eligibility condition itself does not pre-empt on the exact role of the concerned ERIC/ESFRI, and notably does not provide any obligation on which entity will act as a coordinator, unless specified otherwise in the WP. Depending on the topic, the scope might provide further information on the expected role of ERIC/ESFRI, including those contributing to the eligibility condition.

28. Proposal can include the participation of entities from Brazil, Chile, Uruguay and the US as beneficiaries/affiliates but, in order to be granted funding, the proposal should describe and justify the EU benefit of the funding requested by the third country organization, which would then be assessed at the evaluation stage. Is it correct?

Yes, entities from all non-associated third countries (both the entities that are automatically eligible for funding and those that are eligible only if they are considered essential for the project) need to provide this information.

An additional comment: depending on the content of the proposal, justifying how an entity is essential for implementing the action and describing the benefit for the EU may not be exactly the same. There might be cases where an entity is essential to implement part of the action, but this part does not bring a significant EU benefit.

29. Could you explicitly confirm if countries from non-associated countries such as US and Japan eligible for funding?

Yes, all these countries that are not in the list of automatically eligible, can be considered eligible if the proposal justifies in which way they are essential for the project.

30. In this topic, can an entity/organisation legally based in a country that is not eligible for funding but that is of transnational and regional nature e.g. covering all LAC countries be eligible for funding?

HE considers automatically eligible international organisations with a majority of members that are EU Member States or Horizon Europe associated countries and whose main objective is promoting scientific and technological cooperation in Europe. Other international organisations are not automatically eligible and need to prove they are essential for the implementation of the project.

The specific topic includes the following additional eligibility conditions: 'If eligible for funding, legal entities established in non-associated third countries may exceptionally participate in this Coordination and support action as a beneficiary or affiliated entity'. Taking into account the General Annexes of the Work Program and the additional eligibility conditions, for this topic entities from EU Member States, associated countries, low-middle income countries and international organisations of European interest (IEROs) are eligible to participate and receive funding. Entities from high income countries and international organisations are not eligible to receive funding unless if they are considered essential for the implementation of the action. The same applies for entities from LAC countries.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-DEV-01-07

31. How can a proposal address links to initiatives such as the European centre of expertise on research security as this centre is not yet existing?

During the life of the project, it is necessary to monitor the landscape, in particular the geopolitical context that is changing fast, and adapt to the changing landscape.

The European Commission itself adapts its priorities and launches new initiatives accordingly.

The project is asked to plan, to describe the approach, but also to adapt to what is in your direct remit; thus, in the context of DEV-07, flexibility and capacity to adapt is of key relevance.

32. This topic is more "plan/desk-study oriented"? The combination of risk identification/planning along with the production of a technology product (TRL 7-8) that mitigates the risk itself could be the main focus of a proposal?

The topic itself is not only related to desk planning but wants to go beyond. The main idea of the proposal should be going beyond the desk planning activities, into implementation and contingency plans. You may have some activities that will help implementation, mitigation or for critical aspects implementing the contingency plans. Research infrastructures should be prepared for risks, test response systems and improve their resilience.

33. How strongly are research security and foreign interference issues interlinked with the other activities mentioned or is research security a separate issue of this call?

It is expected to have a cross-cutting approach in this proposal, making sure that all activities proposed in the different Work Packages will coherently contribute to risk management, mitigation and contingency. Activities related to research security should not be addressed in isolation to the work done in the other Work Package or ignored. The approach should take into consideration research security, technological and data sovereignty and preservation of critical research data. Coherence and a cross - cutting vision are expected.

34. How are RIs proposed through INFRADEV expected to be implemented post project? There is an info gap from the preparatory phase, funded through the Call, to the actual implementation phase (need for more tangible info on how things work).

Horizon Europe is providing targeted support to several phases of the life cycle of an ESFRI Project (and later, Landmark). However, the core funding is in the remit of the countries supporting the new or developing infrastructure, including through R&I organisations directly involved in developing this infrastructure. Since Horizon 2020, dedicated support to the early implementation phase i.e. following the preparatory phase has also been made available. Once an ESFRI Landmark, an infrastructure will also benefit from recurrent funding opportunities, on a competitive basis, aiming at consolidating the European RI landscape.

35. How can INFRADEV projects link to the ESFRI Roadmap? Is this necessary? And how is the roadmap updated with new entries (who proposes what, how and when)?

All INFRADEV topics but one (DEV-05 Ukraine) have an explicit link with the ESFRI Roadmap and/or with the ESFRI Landscape Analysis published in June 2024.

In DEV-01, new concepts should take into account the landscape. Some topics are targeting one or more ESFRI Landmarks (such as DEV-03, 06 or 07) sometime with a requirement to include at least one ESFRI Landmark or ERIC as beneficiary (DEV-03, 06).

DEV-02 proposals should involve, not necessarily as beneficiaries, ESFRI infrastructures.

The process for the update of the ESFRI roadmap is described on the ESFRI web site: see all relevant documents here: <https://www.esfri.eu/roadmap-2026>.

The deadline closed in April 2025 but those documents can be useful information in view of the next update around 2030-2031.

36. How does the Commission ensure continuity between the 2026/2027 work programme and a, so far not defined, work programme under FP10?

The European Commission cannot strictly ensure continuity as long as the next MFF, and FP10 in particular, are still being discussed. However, elements from the European Commission proposal

can be recognised as allowing for continuity where needed. Furthermore, both the FP10 proposal and part of the WP 2026-2027 are directly inspired by the European Strategy for Research and Technology Infrastructures that was published in Sept. 2025, strengthening therefore coherence.

Destination INFRAEOSC - Enabling an operational, open and FAIR EOSC ecosystem

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-EOSC-01-01

37. How to interpret that in the topic

INFRA-2026-01-EOSC-01 it is specified:

“The financial support to third parties for the open science projects must be provided in the form of grants that should be between EUR 100 000 and 250 000 per grant for a duration of 12 to 24 months.”

While in the call it is also specified that the maximum amount to be granted to each third party is EUR 750 000?

The first limit specifies the amount to be provided to each grant under the financial support to third parties (FSTP), which is between EUR 100 000 and 250 000. The second limit sets the maximum total amount that can be granted to a single third party (EUR 750 000) for its participation in multiple projects under the FSTP.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-EOSC-01-02

38. In the call text it is specified that “Proposals should include the following activities” and 8 activities are listed.

Should the proposal include all these activities or a subset of them?

Yes, the proposals should include all the activities.

39. Is a project with the contribution bigger than 5MEUR possible?”

The conditions of the topic specify that: ‘The Commission estimates that an EU contribution of between EUR 3.00 and 5.00 million would allow these outcomes to be addressed appropriately. Nonetheless, this does not preclude submission and selection of a proposal requesting different amounts.’

40. Two projects are expected to be funded, and type of the call is CSA. Is it expected that the two funded projects should focus same scope areas of the call, or should their approaches and focus areas be complementary?

Topic HORIZON-INFRA-2026-01-EOSC-02 specifies an estimated EU contribution per project between EUR 3 and 5 million, and the total indicative budget is EUR 10 million., therefore the topic is estimated to support between 2 and 3 projects.

Each proposal submitted should address the scope of the topic.

Destination INFRASERV - Research infrastructures services to support health research, accelerate the green transition and the digital transformation, and advance frontier knowledge

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-SERV-01-01

41. Is there a minimum share of resources to be allocated to transnational or virtual access?

And does the proposal have to offer both transnational and virtual accesses?

There is no minimum or maximum share of resources to be dedicated to fund access to the services offered by the research infrastructures. The Consortium needs to estimate the foreseen number of accesses and their costs proportionally to the expected impact in the research community. The expert evaluators will assess the proposal based on the quality of the services offered, the expected outcome in the community and then the suitability of the resources allocated. The type of services (transnational or virtual) to be offered are defined by the proposers, with no specific indications in the call text. However, the project proposal needs to comply with the requirements set out in the section “Specific section for Research Infrastructures” at the end of the Work Programme.

42. The call refers to AI.

Which type of AI technology can be considered for this application?

There is no restriction on the type of AI approach relevant for this specific call. Proposals can address generative, hybrid and agent AI, a mixed approach as well new forms of AI. However, proposals are expected to address brain inspired AI.

43. How should researchers applying for transnational access be selected?

The proposal needs to ensure mechanism for fair and transparent selection of researchers or group of researchers for “in person” or “remote” access. Open calls need to be widely advertised and selection of user’s projects should be carried by an independent peer-review evaluation process. Virtual access should be provided without prior selection of the users. More details are stipulated in the section “*Specific section for Research Infrastructures*” at the end of the Work Programme.

44. Is this topic earmarked for continuing funding of the EBRAINS 2.0 and/or eBRAIN-Health projects? Or can any “externa” consortium (i.e. partially or totally unrelated to these projects) apply and be funded?

The topic is not earmarked, and any consortium can apply. The objective of the topic is to bring added value to the significant investments already made in previous projects and build on those.

Destination INFRATECH - Next generation of scientific instrumentation, tools, methods, and advanced digital solutions of research infrastructures and foster innovation and co-creation with industry

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-TECH-01-01

45. INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01

Are Chinese organizations eligible to integrate infra tech applicant consortia? In which conditions?

No, Chinese legal entities are not eligible under INFRATECH, which only includes Research and Innovation Actions, because 'Legal entities established in China are not eligible to participate in both Research and Innovation Actions and Innovation Actions falling under this destination'.

46. INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01

What is the rationale behind the different TRLs to be reached, depending on the use case?

The topic specifies that developments for the use case of RIs is expected to go beyond TRL4. When proposed developments have the potential to lead to applications beyond RIs, the TRL of these additional developments should go to TRL3-4. Proposers should also clearly describe which TRL they are aiming at. With this measure, one of the eligibility conditions for applying later for EIC Transition funding is fulfilled: "Your [EIC Transition] proposal must build on results already achieved within an eligible project that are, at least, at experimental proof of concept (TRL 3) or, ideally, technology validated in the lab level (TRL 4). Proposals building on project results at TRLs other than TRL3 or TRL4 are not eligible."

47. INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01

In topics with mandatory participation of ESFRI RIs, ERICs or RIs that are international European research organisations, can the nodes of ERICs participate on behalf of the ERICs, representing the ERICs, fulfilling this requisite?

Under WP 2026-2027, and for topics in which it is an eligibility condition, there is no alternative to the specific condition. For topics that include a reference in the scope ("*should include [...]*"), the extent to which a proposal fulfils the scope and the extent to which the consortium is appropriate for the objectives and tasks of the project etc. are assessed by the independent experts evaluating the proposal. Note that in one of the topics, the scope explicitly refers to distributed ERICs.

48. INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01

I think my project is strongly aligned with European energy targets. Is there any support available in order to write a strong application?

Beyond guidance on Horizon Europe on the EU Funding & Tenders Portal, there is no specific support from the European Commission to help develop proposals, but you should contact the National Contact point for Research Infrastructure work programme in your country.

49. INFRA-2026-01-TECH-01

How do you expect us to show complementarity with actions funded under topics INFRA-2022-TECH-01-01 and INFRA-2024-TECH-01-01 in the proposal?

The intention is to avoid duplication or incremental efforts. Applicants must show clearly the ambition of new proposals versus related to past/ongoing ones if any.

If the same RI community has already been supported under INFRA-TECH calls, and considers the new application is not related, it is recommended to explicitly mention that the new application has no relation with the past one and briefly explain why.

50. Can we also tackle building advanced 'FAIRification' methods under the INFRA-TECH-01-01 call?

The topic is not prescriptive on the what if the expected outcomes are convincing and the scope can advance the state-of-art of research infrastructures and be transformative in the infrastructure operation.

51. Is it mandatory to include PCP subcontracting activities in the project? If the project includes no PCP activities, does it mean that receives lower scores?

This is not mandatory. PCP is a possibility offered to applicants and to be used if needed or more effective/efficient for the implementation of the action. Be it used or not, applicants must be convincing about implementation.

52. The info video mentions that this year's call focuses on resilience, greening, and efficiency through digitalisation, whereas the call text is much less explicit. Is the focus of the proposal on green/digitalization a must?

This topic is indeed broader than HORIZON-INFRA-2025-01-TECH-01. However, more than in the past, due attention to environmental footprint and increasing resilience is required at all stage of development although not the core objective. This is explicitly mentioned in the scope.

HORIZON-INFRA-2026-TECH-01-02

53. Are there specific domains or sectors which proposals should focus on for the development of digital twins and their components?

Proposals should focus on sectors where environmental and climate dynamics intersect with security risks such as disasters, health crises, energy systems, migration, and resource scarcity while developing digital twin technologies that enable better forecasting, prevention, and decision-making across these areas.

It is also important to highlight that proposals are welcome to either develop new digital twins, or major new components of existing digital twins, to strengthen foresight and anticipation capabilities at the intersection of environment, climate and security in short (operational), medium (tactical) and long-term (strategical) scenarios.

And finally, all these activities should leverage and contribute to Destination Earth initiative, which aims to create highly accurate digital replica of the Earth system.

54. How will the integration with the DestinE systems work and the link with the implementing entities?

Proposals should ensure adequate pathways to future integration of their project results into Destination Earth system. In other words, proposals are expected to ensure that the new digital twins and/or their components can interoperate with the DestinE ecosystem and collaborate with the organisations responsible for implementing the system.

55. Are dual-use security applications allowed?

All activities must be exclusively focused on civilian use and applications only in line with Horizon Europe requirements. In other words, the focus is on civil security challenges linked to environmental and climate risks – not for military use- and the demonstrate outcomes must remain applicable within the civilian domain.

56. Will the Commission support strategic technology development pilots that are hosted at large-scale industrial test facilities to bridge the gap between lab research and commercial scaling for carbon capture?

It can be covered by INFRATECH but reminding that it supports activities that have some openness. It supports Open Science and should have some impact.

When referring to industrial facilities we refer to facilities that do not open in a transparent way or are not open to external users that are not specific industry companies.

In short, it can be covered, pending that the proposal needs to ensure that it is reinforcing the European Research Area at large.

Clarify whether these 3 areas of application must be one for climate, one for the environment and one for security, or whether they can be use cases selected by the consortium and related to climate, the environment and security.

The proposers need to define new application areas that intersect with climate, environment and security. Some examples of potential application areas are given in the work programme text (not an exhaustive list) and the chose application areas will all need to have climate, environmental and security challenge dimension. It is not enough to only have a use case in each.

Management of the Research Infrastructures calls, from submission to evaluation and cross cutting issues

57. Restrictions for protection of EU communication networks? Can there be non-EU partners on board? What are these restrictions in practice?

The European Commission has made network security a core priority by extending its 5G security approach to Horizon Europe 2026–2027. Under this framework, “high-risk suppliers” are excluded from sensitive research and innovation actions to protect future 6G and post-5G development from foreign interference and dependencies. This designation is based on risks of third-country interference, supply chain security, and institutional assessments. As a result, such entities - and those they control - are generally not eligible to participate in restricted projects. The aim is to safeguard strategic technologies and reduce dependency risks within the EU. More details are available in the General Annexes of the Work Programme, especially Annex B.

58. Stricter data rules since Feb 26; AEPD enforces GDPR strictly with high fines. Lawyers advise separate new local infra. Allowed to create new entity to hold resources/infra & register patents for consortium? How to reflect in WP & budget?

Regarding the strategy for managing data infrastructure and intellectual property, the consortium may choose to subcontract a specialized entity to handle the technical operation of data servers and the administrative management of patent filings.

However, it is vital to distinguish between technical management and legal ownership. The default principle remains that each beneficiary is the owner of the results it generates.

Based on the Horizon Europe Annotated Grant Agreement (AGA), Article 16 and Annex 5 the essential points the consortium must know with regard to the particular issue are:

On Protection Obligations: that Beneficiaries have an obligation to adequately protect their results (e.g., via patents) if protection is possible and justified, taking into account commercial exploitation and the interests of other partners.

On Transfer of Results: that A beneficiary may transfer ownership of its results, but it must ensure that the obligations of the Grant Agreement (such as access rights for other partners and the Commission) are passed on to the new owner. All projects must provide a data management plan on handling personal data after contract signature. If a proposal proposes creating a new entity for this, evaluators will assess whether it is justified and proportionate.

(PP) All projects must submit a detailed data management plan detailing how the consortium will handle personal data. This is a standard project deliverable after contract signature. If a proposal wants to go beyond this practice and create a new entity for this purpose, with an impact on the budget, evaluators will assess whether the idea is reasonable and adequate.

59. Are the application form templates only available within the Submission System? Please guide on how to access and download them? What is the correct login page and necessary steps? We already have a PIC.

While application form templates may be available elsewhere on the EU Funding & Tenders Portal for general use, we strongly recommend that applicants retrieve the templates directly from the Submission System. This is the only way to ensure you are using the correct version tailored to the call's specific requirements.

To access the templates, please go to the Funding & Tenders Portal, locate the topic you wish to apply for, read the instructions carefully, and click the "Start submission" button. You will then be redirected to the Submission System, where you can click on "Download Part B templates". Following this procedure is the safest way to guarantee you have the latest and most accurate templates for your application.

60. Can an associate country organisation lead a bid?

Yes, if the country is included in Horizon Europe Associated Countries list, it is eligible for funding and for participating also as coordinator of the project.

61. Is there a standard timeline for mandatory reports in a lump-sum project? 12 months? 18 months? Do these mandatory reports have to coincide with the completion of one or more WPs?

Periodic reports are due after the end of each reporting period (the duration of the reporting period can vary based on the project duration).



