FAQs Coordinators Day 2022

The answers provided to below questions must be read in direct conjunction of the Horizon Europe Work Programme 2021-2022 ,the General Model Grant Agreement and the Horizon Europe programme Guide, published in the Funding and Tenders Portal.
Only these formal reference documents may be used for interpretation and legal reference.

Moreover, the Online Manual provides additional guidance on the different aspects addressed below.

Grant Agreement overview, legal and financial issues

Should the personnel costs be taken annually (MGA) or should they be taken on a monthly basis without taking into account the year (AMGA)?

We are not sure we understand the question but under Horizon Europe, a corporate daily rate is to be used for the calculation of the personnel costs. Examples are provided in the Annotated Grant Agreement (see version 0.2 of 30 November 2021 available at aga_en.pdf (europa.eu) page 36.

Could you inform us if the costs of a cancelled flight due to change of restrictions due to Covid would be eligible?

Article 35 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement (HE MGA) sets out the conditions in which the force majeure clause can be used. If such a situation occurs, beneficiaries must immediately inform the Commission/Agency/Funding Body, which will examine on a case-by-case basis the possible application of the rules on force majeure. Moreover, beneficiaries must immediately take all the necessary steps to limit any damage due to force majeure (e.g., try to cancel the flight ticket, claim the reimbursement from the cancellation insurance (if applicable)).

Costs will be eligible, if they fulfil the general eligibility conditions set out in Article 6 HEU MGA like any other costs incurred under the action. For example, if a meeting/event cannot take place due to force majeure, travel and accommodation costs may still be charged to the

HEU action if they fulfil the cost eligibility conditions, even if the beneficiary did not travel and did not take part in the meeting/event.

As a general principle, if due to COVID-19 beneficiaries may not use their initial ticket and do not get a refund from the travel company but receive a voucher instead they could still claim the full cost of the unused ticket if:

-The voucher is not used at all during the action duration or,

-The voucher is used for the purposes of the action during the action duration (e.g., to travel to the destination where a future rescheduled meeting necessary for the project is going to take place).

However, if the voucher is used for other purposes than for the action during the action duration, then the cost of the unused ticket would not be eligible.

What documents should we keep besides timesheets?

According to Article 20.1 (e) of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement (HE MGA), time worked for the beneficiary under the action must be supported by declarations signed monthly by the person and their supervisor, unless another reliable time-record system is in place (like timesheets).

For additional information, you may consult the annotations to the abovementioned Article in the Annotated Grant Agreement (see version 0.2 of 30 November 2021 available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/guidance/aga_en.pdf). However, please note that the annotations under this Article are still subject to internal corporate review process within Commission services. Therefore, the annotations reflect preliminary views for Horizon Europe.

Is there a formal procedure to appoint a "backup coordinator"?

There is no formal procedure to appoint a “back-up coordinator” as a second contact person of the Coordinator beneficiary. This is a recommendation we give to coordinators to ensure business continuity.

Are there guidelines as to what is included in the "budget flexibility" mentioned here and what is not?

There are no guidelines, but the budget flexibility is defined in the Grant Agreement.

According to Article 5.5 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement (MGA), the budget breakdown may be adjusted — without an amendment (see Article 39) — by transfers (between participants and budget categories), as long as this does not imply any substantive or important change to the description of the action in Annex 1.

However:

- changes to budget categories with lump sums costs or contributions (if used; including financing not linked to costs) always require an amendment.

- changes to budget categories with higher funding rates or budget ceilings (if used) always require an amendment.

- addition of amounts for subcontracts not provided for in Annex 1 either require an amendment or simplified approval in accordance with Article 6.2.

- other changes require an amendment or simplified approval, if specifically provided for in Article 6.2.

Simplified approval procedure: If provided in the Grant Agreement (and for the cases and types of cost indicated), beneficiaries can ask for an ex-post approval by the granting authority to accept costs which have been incurred but where not planned in the estimated budget. For such an ex-post approval, they must declare the costs in question in the periodic report and flag and justify them. Be aware however that simplified approval is at the discretion of the granting authority. This means that you bear the risk that the costs might not be approved.

Should accommodation costs for project travel be accounted based on the EC DSA rates or based on the real costs?

Travel costs must comply with the general cost eligibility conditions set out in Article 6.1 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement ('HE MGA' available here: general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf (europa.eu) (i.e. incurred in connection with the action and

necessary for its implementation, etc.) and be purchased for the action and in accordance with Article 6.2.C.

In particular, pursuant to Article 6.2.C.1 of the HE MGA, travel and subsistence costs are eligible provided that they are based on costs actually incurred and in line with the beneficiary's usual practices on travel.

For further information on travel costs, please consult the explanations provided in the Annotated Grant Agreement, pages 60-62 (v.02 of 30 November 2021, available at: aga_en.pdf (europa.eu)).

When we receive the first payment (80% minus 5% guarantee), do we have to pay the partners the same amount or can we pay 40%?

According to Article 22.1 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement, the coordinator must indeed distribute the payments received to the beneficiaries without unjustified delay. The way payments are then internally distributed is up to the consortium (e.g., this is usually defined in the consortium agreement).

What if a beneficiary changes its legal name during GAP? Should it communicate directly to the EC or should the coordinator report to the PO?

If a beneficiary changes its legal name during the GAP, the beneficiary should communicate the change via the Funding & Tender Portal and provide supporting documents. The Central Validation services will update the information accordingly. We recommend the beneficiary to inform the project officer about any change to its legal information, through the project coordinator, to ensure proper follow-up of the GAP process by the project officer.

What is the difference between affiliated partner, associated partner, third parties?

Affiliated entities and associated partners are third parties as they do not sign the Grant Agreement, but they implement parts of the action.

'Affiliated entities' are a specific type of participant as described under Art 8 HE Model Grant Agreement. They are entities with a particular legal or capital link to a beneficiary which implement parts of the action. This link is neither limited to the action nor established

for the sole purpose of its implementation. While 'Affiliated entities' do not become party to the Grant Agreement because they do not sign it, they are allowed to charge their eligible costs directly to the grant (yet, in practice 'Affiliated entities' do not have direct access to the Portal electronic exchange system, and they need to go through their beneficiaries to submit their costs). Affiliated entities are allowed to participate if they fulfil the eligibility conditions for participation and funding.

'Associated partners' (Article 9.1 of the HE Model Grant Agreement) are a separate category of participants. They are entities that implement action tasks but without receiving EU funding and thus, they do not become party to the Grant Agreement (they do not sign the Grant Agreement).

There are other types of third parties, such as subcontractors implementing action tasks and third party contributing to the action.

For further information on affiliated entities and other participants involved in the action, please refer to Article 8 and 9 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement ('HE MGA' available here: general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf (europa.eu) and consult the explanations provided in the Annotated Grant Agreement, pages 95-104 (v.02 of 30 November 2021, available at: aga_en.pdf (europa.eu))

How do we report in-kind contributions that support the project beyond initial expectations, so no appearing in the GA?

If the need for an in-kind contribution was not known at GA signature, the coordinator must request a GA amendment in order to introduce it in the Annex 1 (see Article 39) or flag it in the periodic report (simplified approval procedure; for details, see Article 6.1). In the latter case, you bear however the risk that the granting authority might not approve the new contribution and reject the costs. We advise you to contact your project officer in such case, to clarify whether an amendment is needed.

MGA (Art.7): the Consortium Agreement (CA) is signed by the beneficiaries. MGA (Art.2) Associated Partners are not beneficiaries. Do they have to sign the CA?

The fact that Associated Partners are not beneficiaries under Horizon Europe does not mean that they cannot sign the Consortium Agreement that is an internal contractual document among the consortium members.

Please note that the beneficiary or consortium to which the Associated Partner is linked, as shown in Article 9.1 of the grant agreement, is responsible for the proper implementation of the tasks implemented by the associated partner (proper quality, timely delivery, etc), to ensure that the Associated Partner complies with certain obligations listed in Article 9.1 and to ensure that the bodies mentioned in Article 25 of the HE MGA (e.g. granting authority, the European Court of Auditors, the European Anti-Fraud Office) can exercise their rights towards their Associated Partner. The beneficiary or consortium to which the Associated Partner is linked must ensure that these obligations are accepted by the Associated Partner (e.g. via contractual arrangements, consortium agreement, etc).

The prefinancing amount calculation is clear; can the calculation of following intermediate payment amounts be explained?

As detailed in Article 21 of the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement ('HE MGA' available here: general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf (europa.eu), at the end of each reporting period, beneficiaries must provide reports to request payments, in accordance with the schedule and modalities set out in the Data Sheet (see Point 4.2).

However, please be aware of the Interim payment ceiling set out in the Data Sheet whereby the sum of pre-financing (including the 5% initial contribution to the MIM) and interim payments cannot exceed 90% of the maximum grant amount.

Ethics aspects

Do all projects go through ethics review even if no ethics requirement was identified during grant agreement?

Yes, all the proposals in the main and reserve list undergo an ethics review.

The wording of the ethics requirement is not so clear, and project officers usually don't really know. Where can we get guidance on how to address the required?

Please refer to the “How to complete your ethics self-assessment" guide: how-to-complete-your-ethics-self-assessment_en.pdf (europa.eu)

For the implementation of the several activities in WP Ethics, should we shift PMs to this WP? Is an amendment needed for this PMs shift?

It is not possible to include PMs in the “Ethics requirements” WP. Therefore, the PMs can be included in the management WP.

The ethics review is completed prior to the signature of the GA, therefore any change can be implemented in the GA.

How can we know if our proposal has just undergone a "Screening" or if it went to an Assessment?

The ethics summary report after Screening contains a simplified ethics issues table with only the identification of the ethics issues and no comments. The only requirement that can be included in Screening is the appointment of an ethics advisor.

The ethics summary report after Assessment contains a detailed ethics issues table with comments. The experts can enter as many ethics requirements as needed.

Does the choice of the independent expert need to be validated by the programme officer? (based on CV, experience...)

The information about the independent external ethics advisor/board has to be provided in a deliverable at the start of the project. The project officer may ask questions about the profile/expertise of the ethics advisor/board, and it could be rejected if the expert is not independent and/or external to the consortium.

External Independent Ethics Advisor costs can be covered within which cost category? Other goods, works and services?

The costs of the ethics advisor may be covered by category purchase costs of other goods, works and services.

We have noticed that an ethics WP is added to DoAs. Should we include such a WP at proposal stage to ensure budget?

The "Ethics requirements" WP will be automatically added to the GA if there is at least one ethics requirement. The applicants could include a task and the corresponding budget in the management WP.

The price quote of IEA I have contacted was rather in the range of 20000 euro over a period of 4 years. Why would you think the costs are only 5000 euro?

The price will vary depending on the size of the project, project duration and complexity of the ethics issues of the project.

Do we need to collect several offers for Ethics Advisers in order to show best value for money, or can we select the best person we know from our network?

The ethics advisors must be independent, external to the consortium and the selection must be done ensuring best value for money and absence of CoI, as for any other service provider.

Costs for the advisory board members should be in which budget and what type of costs are eligible for these people?

The ethics advisor/board are service providers, and therefore the budget should be with the beneficiary that selects and signs the service agreement/contract with the ethics advisor/board members.

The types of costs are those related to the services that the ethics advisor/board provide such as the time to review the documents, preparation of reports, and travel costs, is they attend any relevant project meeting.

Does every project need an independent ethics advisor?

An independent external ethics advisor must be appointed for all the projects that have this requirement in the ethics summary report. However, any project may decide to appoint an ethics advisor/board, especially if the project involves multiple ethics issues, to help the consortium to deal with ethical issues and put in place the procedures to handle them appropriately.

Can nationally cleared ethics issues being overruled by EU law requirements, i.e., additional approvals on top of national of national be requested.

It depends on the nature of the activities. The project activities must comply with the ethics provisions set out in the Grant Agreement, and notably: highest ethical standards and applicable international, EU and national law.

In addition, a number of activities specified in Article 18 of REGULATION (EU) 2021/695 are not eligible for funding.

Sometimes there is no national ethics committee for giving the required approvals. who should we ask for approvals then?

If the approval is mandatory to perform a certain activity in a country, then there will be an ethics committee and/or competent authority responsible to provide the corresponding approval.

Implementation & reporting

Could you please give more details on the gender equality requirements for the project implementation and how the EC will monitor this?

More information is available here:
https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/other/event220623.htm#general-info

Please, could you explain the update of 6, 12 and 18 months before PR more in detail? Are specific templates for this?

It might be planned in the Description of action to deliver progress reports in between the reporting periods. This is to be discussed with the project adviser.

In the past (H2020) we were told to NOT add annexes to the periodic report, has this changed then?

This has not changed. More info in the online manual.

Is there a format of timesheet approved for reporting?

A template for the timesheet is available in the AMGA (Article 20 - page 119)

https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/temp-form/report/time-declaration_en.docx

Continuous reporting uploads will be automatically integrated into the official periodic reporting in the portal?

The continuous reporting information is always available on the Portal, including in the context of the periodic reporting.

We were informed that a consortium agreement with partners needs to be signed before the signature of the grant agreement for new projects. Is this the case?

As indicated in the Annotated Model Grant Agreement, *the consortium agreement should in principle be negotiated and concluded before GA signature (i.e., each beneficiary should sign the consortium agreement before signing the Accession Form to accede to the Grant Agreement). Otherwise, there is usually a serious risk that prolonged disagreement jeopardises the action. Of course, the consortium agreement does not have to remain the same during the lifetime of the action, it can be modified by the consortium at any moment.*

How soon the kick-off meeting should take place?

It is up to the consortium to decide when the kick off meeting should take place. However, it is a good practice to organise it in the first months of the project. It is often the first time that the whole consortium gathers, and it is a unique opportunity to build a common understanding of the Description of Action.

Is the Continuous reporting part (deliverables, milestones) checked by the Project Officer before the Reporting Period?

It depends on the projects and on the project advisers. Some deliverables can be checked as soon as they are deliverables whereas in other situations the deliverables will be checked during the periodic reporting.

Is the project review systematic at each RP?

It is a common practice to organise a review back-to-back with a reporting period. However, it is not systematic. In addition, a specific review can be organised when needed.

Table of Researchers in the PR template (in reference documents) has sections not available in Continuous Reporting in SyGMA. Will these be available for the PR?

Yes.

Excellent to take into account EU Green Priorities in the project implementation. Does the project need to report on this (decisions taken on e.g., why travel)?

The project can report on it in the periodic report.

Can REA help in the clustering activities by providing the contacts of sister projects coordinators?

Usually, the project advisers facilitate the clustering activities.

The technical periodic reports are uploaded as a pdf in the portal. Do you prefer the Horizon Europe template or a project specific template?

It is recommended to use the Horizon Europe template.

IPR management best practices

How does the Commission monitor the exploitation of the project results after the ending of the grant?

The Commission expects the projects to use the continuous reporting tool to report any exploitation and dissemination activity that took part after the end of the project and up until 4 years after the end. This is part of the non-financial obligations of the Grant Agreement, and it is residual up to 4 years after the end of the project. Non-compliance with these obligations can cause penalties such as grant reductions. In Horizon Europe, one year after the end of the project and if no exploitation took place, the projects are obliged to use (unless described differently in the call) the Horizon Results Platform: (https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/opportunities/horizon-results-platform) to make their exploitable result(s) known. This platform is made for beneficiaries, and it can provide opportunities for further exploitation and valorisation of the projects results. The remaining period until the 4 years after the end, the Commission can follow up directly to the projects through questionnaires or surveys to receive the latest valid information on the exploitation activities that took place.

What about IPR from CSA projects, is commercial exploitation applicable? How to approach exploitation of outputs from such projects?

All projects, CSAs included can have commercial exploitable results. If the call does not specify exclusion of the exploitation obligation for the CSA, then the beneficiaries of the CSA should develop an exploitation plan and treat the generated IP from the project the same way as any other project in the call. There can be also non-commercial exploitation that is relevant to the CSA, i.e., in policy and decision making and these results should also be managed and protected accordingly.

What is the third phase of post-project exploitation (years 3 - 4?)

There are no phases designated yet except the obligation to use the Horizon Results Platform in case no exploitation takes place one year after the end of the project. However, there are plans that the Commission inquires through questionnaires or surveys the beneficiaries of finished projects to acquire the latest information on their exploitation activities and to be able to provide support if needed through service delivery (i.e Horizon Results Booster: https://www.horizonresultsbooster.eu/). These questionnaires or surveys can be through the Funding & Tenders portal (https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/programmes/horizon) or through direct communication from the granting authority. The timing of this communication could be at the end of the 2nd and the end of the 4th year period after the end of the project.

Communication, Dissemination & Exploitation

Can REA support in proper communication to the general public to ensure that projects are not confusing member states' communication to citizens?

The first channel to direct messages to the general public is up to your project to define. This is part of your communication strategy as stated as a binding element of the Grant Agreement you have signed (Article 17).

The project should choose the adequate channels and tools to reach the general public. You communicate on behalf of your project, and REA can promote your message(s). The member states can also promote the same messages, no confusion here.

Please bear in mind that, in all your communication towards citizens, a full acknowledgement of the EU funding is compulsory including the logo of your project together with the EU flag and the sentence "funded by the EU".

Can REA help in the clustering activities by providing the contacts of sister projects coordinators?

REA wishes to help in any clustering activities among sister projects. To get the contact details of them, please contact your Project Officer as this should be done in close coordination with your PO. Common practice is to disclose this information after the signature of the Grant Agreement.

The contact details of all EU Funded projects are available on Cordis: https://cordis.europa.eu/

To optimise the dissemination of deliverables, what repositories could you recommend for this cluster specifically, please?

Deliverables are publicly available on Cordis after approval of them by your Project Officer (which usually happens at each reporting period).

For the public Deliverables, depending on their nature, you are highly encouraged to share them in Open access, i.e., on your website or any other relevant platforms.

Should funding signs also be used in Instagram posts?

It is binding for your project to use the EU flag together with the sentence "funded by the EU" in all your communication activities, documents or products. In the case of Instagram, the acknowledgement should be visible in the short description of your Instagram account.

Grant Agreement Article 17.2 Visibility — European flag and funding statement
Unless otherwise agreed with the granting authority, communication activities of the beneficiaries related to the action (including media relations, conferences, seminars, information material, such as brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, etc., in electronic form, via traditional or social media, etc.), dissemination activities and any infrastructure, equipment, vehicles, supplies or major result funded by the grant must acknowledge EU support and display the European flag (emblem) and funding statement (translated into local languages, where appropriate).

Is the selection of content (articles) for these channels (Horizon Magazine, etc.) top-down? Or can content be suggested bottom-up?

Horizon Magazine selects in advance key topics for each of its editions. There are linked to important international events or policy related. If an upcoming edition covers a research topic closely related to your project, your Project Officer may contact you. This selection of relevant projects, to have an article in Horizon Magazine, is also based on the pool of 'success stories' we have at REA. Your project should have media appeal, have led to scientific discoveries / achieved a scientific breakthrough / generated valuable research results (of a very high scientific quality) which might ultimately lead to a scientific breakthrough (e.g. new treatments, new vaccines, pioneer techniques) / had impact (concrete applications in real-life situations, prompted unexpected spin-offs) / generated market opportunities, economic growth and jobs. Your project must also generate EU added value: complementary/competing national research programmes might not have been able to deliver comparable research results would be an asset.

It can be bottom-up as well if, together with your Project Officer, you form part of a Cordis Results pack, together with other EU funded projects in the same field, to illustrate key results on a specific research topic.

An operational question: in the project we used a logo, now we would like to use a new one. We can do it or we must stick to the logo included in the project? Now for the implementation of the whole project we would like to use another logo. Is this possible?

As soon as your project starts, after the signature of the Grant Agreement, you can decide to change the logo. We encourage to do this as quickly as possible in order to start your Communication and Dissemination activities with the correct logo. Timing is key in Communication!

Shaping future R&I policy

Do you have policy making experts, or even policy makers at the REA to contact if you want help on policy making and shaping policy making exploitation?

At the Research Executive Agency (REA), we don't have policy makers/policy officers as part of our team. We are Project Officers following the implementation of projects, but we have close links with policy officers from Commission services (DGs) for the thematic areas of the projects we manage and work closely with them, to support a science-policy interface throughout the projects' cycle.

Moreover, as part of REA internal working arrangements to support such science-policy linkages and harvest policy relevant knowledge and results from projects for evidence-based policies, we have REA staff that coordinate and support such activities.

However, the projects themselves are the first ones that should work on driving forward the uptake of their project results into policy making. It should be noted that depending on the topic scope of the given project, this link and impact to policies may be prominent. The project's contribution to policies is assessed as part of the project review (art. 25 of the GA, assessing the progress of the project), that usually coincides with the end of each reporting period. In such exercise, we usually contract experts in the field to assist us in the review process, including on the policy related impacts of the project. The experts are chosen based on their expertise in the underlying thematic area, including related policy processes. As part of the review, experts assess whether the work carried out in the project contributes towards relevant policy objectives and strategies and have an impact on policy making. If this is

deemed not to be satisfactory, they can provide recommendations to further guide the project to improve in this area.

Also, the Horizon Results Platform is a tool to be used for promoting your results. This can include using it for facilitating the use of results for policy making.

Who is the target audience of the policy briefs? Is it basically European Commission officials or are other policy makers included?

Projects need to plan exploitation for policy making purposes like they would do for any other exploitation avenue. This means the target audience of their input to policies and possible policy briefs, would have to be tailored to the project's scope, ambitious and target audiences. This can cover policy makers and other stakeholders at the local, regional, national, EU and internal levels.

Do we need to use a specific template for the policy brief input?

You don't need to use a specific policy brief template. The type of policy brief made would depend on the format you want to have, the type of message you want to convey and the target audience(s) you have in mind. It is possible for the consortium to use whichever template/format they deem appropriate for developing a policy brief.

Your Project Officer can provide some examples of good policy briefs, as reference material or to support you. Any policy brief should use plain language (not too technical), be clear, concise and to the point. Like any other communication and dissemination material, the acknowledgement of the EU funding is compulsory, including the logo of your project together with the EU flag and the sentence "funded by the EU".

Overall, as a recommendation, projects should not exclusively rely on policy briefs to work on their inputs to policy. Please see the presentation from the coordinators' day Shaping future R&I policy, providing further information on this; such as the need to plan exploitation for policy making purposes like you would do for any other exploitation avenue and the recommendation to integrate this work in your project implementation from the project onset.

Horizon Results Booster

What are the newest services of the Horizon Results Booster?

The Horizon Results Booster offers 3 types of services:

1. Portfolio Dissemination & Exploitation Strategy
    - Identifying and creating the portfolio of Research & Innovation project results (module A),
    - Creating the portfolio of results; design and execute a portfolio dissemination plan (module B),
    - Improving existing exploitation strategy (module C).
2. Tailor made support services to develop a business plan.
3. Assistance, coaching and mentoring for go-to-market activities.

Will the Horizon Results Booster service be continued under Horizon Europe?

Horizon Results Booster framework contract will run until May 2024. An announcement of follow-up services (if any) will be issued in due time. We invite you to regularly consult the Funding & Tenders Portal for updates.

Open Science

Can you give more details about how to implement the Data Management Plan (DMP)? The online template is quite confusing and raises doubts on its importance.

Data management plans (DMPs) are a cornerstone for responsible management of research outputs, notably data and are mandatory in Horizon Europe for projects generating and/or reusing data (on requirements and the frequency of DMPs as deliverables consult the AGA article 17). A template for a DMP is provided under the reporting templates in the reference documents of the Funding and Tenders portal of the European Commission. Its use is recommended but not mandatory.

DMPs are formal documents that outline from the start of the project all aspects of the research data lifecycle, which includes its organisation and curation, and adequate provisions for its access, preservation, sharing, and eventual deletion, both during and after a project.

DMPs play a key role in helping researchers to adequately manage research outputs other than data and publications, also in line with the FAIR principles. Such research outputs may be physical or digital, and include original software created during the project, workflows, protocols, new materials such as samples, cell-lines, antibodies, among many others. DMPs should reflect an adequate management strategy for such outputs as well.

A DMP should be a living document, which is updated and enriched as the project evolves. Such updates might occur after attaining milestones related e.g., to the generation of new data or to reflect changes related to the original planning, changes in data/output access provisions or curation policies, changes in consortium practices (e.g. new innovation potential, decision to file for a patent), changes in consortium composition, etc.

A good practice regarding DMPs is to register them as a non-restricted public deliverable to make them openly accessible, unless legitimate reasons exist to keep them confidential. An additional good practice is to publish the DMP in specialised journals or publishing platforms such as RIO etc., or to deposit them in DMP-specific public repositories such as DMP Online and others.

As practices regarding data management, storage, and sharing differ widely across disciplines, the DMPs should reflect common disciplinary practices. In addition to domain specificities, DMPs across the board should address an overarching set of data-related requirements including those aspects related to making the data FAIR. Common aspects that need to be addressed in all DMPs include:

- Data set description: a sufficiently detailed description of the data generated or re-used, including the scientific focus and technical approach to allow association of their data sets with specific research as well as information on data types and an estimate of the data set's size.

- Standards and metadata: the protocols and standards used to structure the data (i.e. fully reference the metadata) so that other scientists can make an assessment and reproduce the dataset. If available, a reference to the community data standards with which their data conform and that make them interoperable with other data sets of similar type.

• Name and persistent identifier for the datasets: a unique and persistent identification (an identifier) of the data sets and a stable resolvable link to where the data sets can be directly accessed. Submission to a public repository normally provides this; many institutional repositories provide similar services.

• Curation and preservation methodology: information on the standards that will be used to ensure the integrity of the data sets and the period during which they will be maintained, as well as how they will be preserved and kept accessible in the longer term. A reference to the public data repository in which the data will be/is deposited with relevant consideration on whether the chosen repository meets the requirements of a trusted repository.

• Data sharing methodology: information on how the data sets can be accessed, including the terms-of-use or the license under which they can be accessed and re-used, and information on any restrictions that may apply or relevant security and privacy considerations. It is also important to specify and justify the timing of data sharing. On open access to research data see below relevant section on open access.

• Output management, for research outputs other than data and publications: The section on output management should show efforts to manage outputs in line with the FAIR principles, including a detailed description of the output, consider relevant metadata standards and the provision of PIDs when depositing the output, or its digital representation if it is physical. The plan should further detail the deposition, curation and preservation methodology foreseen, identifying the right home for the output, and it should set out an approach likely to maximise the re-use and adoption of the output by the wider research community. If the output is physical, the plan should indicate how it would be made available to potential users.

• Costs and personnel related to RDM: An estimation of costs related to RDM such as costs for data collection, data documentation, data storage, data access and security, data preservation, data availability and reuse as well as the person/team responsible for data management and quality assurance processes.

Are there specific instructions for DMPs for CSA projects? Since the official template works in case of RIA projects.

There are no specific instructions for DMP for CSA; The same principle applies, i.e., to outline from the start of the project all aspects of the research data lifecycle, which includes its organisation and curation, and adequate provisions for its access, preservation, sharing, and eventual deletion, both during and after a project.

Could you elaborate a bit more on open access, golden access and green access journals?

Providing open access to peer-reviewed publications is mandatory in Horizon Europe, when peer-reviewed publications are produced, immediately at publication time under open licenses (such as Creative Commons), providing specific minimum sets of rights of reuse (CC BY for articles and book chapters in edited books and CC BY, CC BY-NC, CC BY-ND, CC BY-NCND or equivalent for long-text formats). To this extent, there are indeed no distinctions between green or gold open access, as publication schemes that include an embargo period before the publication is made open access are not compliant to HE rules.

Are there templates or examples to follow for the DMP? We found several different ones from H2020 mostly, which confused us on the way to do it right.

A template for the DMP is available in the funding and tender portal, under the section reference documents for Horizon Europe. (Reference Documents (europa.eu) under the 'project reporting templates

It is mandatory to have a repository to store deliverables to make them publicly available. What certified repositories do you recommend?

Deliverables that are set as "public" in the grant agreement will be automatically published in CORDIS, once they are approved by the EC / Agency. We recommend storing public deliverables in repositories, to enhance visibility, but this is not an obligation. We cannot recommend a specific repository. For the definition of trusted repositories please refer to the HE annotated Grant Agreement, Annex 5.

Will the European Commission do something to control the prices paid to open-access journals? And about the open access journals with low-quality peer review?

The beneficiaries are free to publish in the venue of their choice.

The costs claimed for the peer-reviewed publications will follow the standard process of cost assessment by the Agency, as for all other costs claimed by the projects. In addition to fulfilling the other costs eligibility criteria, publication fees are ONLY eligible when publishing in full open access publishing venues.

Would it be possible to publish on Open Research Europe (ORE) papers from projects not funded by the EU?

Open Research Europe (ORE) is the open access publishing platform of the European Commission for all disciplines for research stemming from Horizon Europe (https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/)

Currently only articles can be published on this platform if at least one author is/was involved in a running or finished Horizon 2020, Horizon Europe or Euratom project from the European Commission and if the article is a result of that project.

Can publications be published on high impact journal instead of Open Research Europe by paying a fee? It could enhance the impact of the publication itself.

Beneficiaries can publish peer-reviewed publications in the venue of their choice. In parallel, beneficiaries/authors must deposit their publication in a machine-readable format in a trusted repository before or at publication time and immediately provide open access to the publication through that repository. However, costs for publication are ONLY eligible when publishing in full open access publishing venues and if compliant with the other costs eligibility criteria.

The Open Research Europe (ORE) platform looks really promising, is it supposed to be a replacement for journals, with an impact factor etc or more like a preprint server?

No, Open Research Europe is not a preprint server, it is a peer-reviewed publishing platform. For more information please see the Open Research Europe FAQ: Open Research Europe (europa.eu)

Has Open Research Europe JCR Impact Factor?

Open Research Europe does not and will not ask to have an Impact Factor. For more information, please see the Open Research Europe FAQ: Open Research Europe (europa.eu)

Can REA provide guidance what type or level of data to make available in repositories? Final data / datasets, not preliminary/intermediate data I assume?

Data should be deposited in a trusted repository as soon as possible after data production and at the latest by the end of the project. Data underpinning a scientific publication should be deposited at the latest at the time of publication and in line with standard community practices. Beneficiaries of Horizon Europe have to ensure open access to research data generated in their projects under the principle 'as open as possible and as closed as necessary'. This means that data is in principle open, unless beneficiaries decide to restrict access to some or all their research data for legitimate reasons. On open access to data and the legitimate reasons for restricting access consult the AGA (Article 17).

What do you mean by publishing venue? Do you mean the repository or the publisher/journal?

Publishing venues are venues where beneficiaries publish their peer-reviewed publications, for example a journal, book, publishing platforms etc.