

European partnership for a sustainable Future of Food Systems

Second Joint Transnational Co-funded Call



FutureFoodS Call 2025

Accelerating Food Sustainability - through Household Dietary Shifts, Trust and Transparency, and Innovations in Circular Food Processing Systems

Version 01, 27 November 2025

Call launch: 03 December 2025

Submission platform: <https://futurefoods.ptj.de>

Webinar for applicants: 11 December 2025, 11:00-13:00 CET

Deadline for pre-proposals: 11 February 2026, 13:00:00 CET

Deadline for full-proposals: 27 July 2026, 13:00:00 CEST



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

History of changes

Definitions and abbreviations

Associated partners		Associated partners are self-funded partners bringing their own resources and/ or own funding; they have a clear role in the consortium and need to fill the partner profile for associated partners on the submission platform. A letter of commitment (Annex E) is mandatory for full-proposal submission. Self-funded partners will not be subject to national/regional eligibility assessments, do not count towards the minimum of 3 eligible partners from 3 different countries and cannot be coordinators.
Associated countries		Associated countries are non-EU countries, who are associated to Horizon Europe ¹ , which allows entities of associated countries to participate in programme actions on equal terms with entities of EU countries. Associated countries involved in FutureFoodS and represented by a Funding Organisation within this call are: Iceland, Norway, Türkiye
Call Board	CB	The CB consists of all Funding Organisations giving funding to the co-funded call. The CB will make the final decision on the selection of projects based on the ranking lists provided by the IEP and on the availability of funds.
Call Office	CO	The CO is responsible for administrative support in relation to the co-funded call, call documents and procedures, submission platform and webinar.
Code of Conduct		A code of conduct is a set of rules outlining the norms, rules, and responsibilities or proper practices of an individual party or an organization.
Co-funded call		The 1 st FutureFoodS co-funded call for proposals also referred to as the “call”.
Conflict of Interest	Col	
Coordinator		The Coordinator coordinates and manages the project consortium at pre- 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 5.6.
Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication	DEC	

¹ https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/strategy/strategy-research-and-innovation/europe-world/international-cooperation/association-horizon-europe_en

End-term report	ETR	Report that all projects funded under the co-funded call need to provide after the end of the project
European Commission	EC	
Evaluation Office	EO	The EO is responsible for the management of the evaluation and supports the CB and the IEP.
Funding Organisation	FO	FO is the Funding Organization listed in Table 3 which participates in the co-funded call and provides funding for the selected topic(s).
Independent Observer	IO	An independent expert who will observe the selection procedure and its requirements (in particular, for the peer review evaluation and the ranking) and will document his/her observations in a report.
International Expert Panel	IEP	The IEP consists of international experts in the fields covered in the topics of the co-funded call. Members of the IEP will evaluate each proposal according to the evaluation guidelines (see section 7 of this document). During the IEP meeting, the IEP will rank the proposals.
Key Performance Indicators	KPI	
Mid-term report	MTR	Report that all projects funded under the co-funded call need to provide at midterm of the project runtime
National Contact Point/ Regional Contact Point	NCP/ RCP	National and Regional Contact Points of each FO. NCP/RCP will provide support in of the event that potential applicants have nationally or regionally specific questions regarding eligibility and national/regional funding procedures.
Proposal		In this call document the term “proposal” refers to pre-proposals and full-proposals. Where the text refers specifically to either the pre-proposal or the full-proposal, this will be written explicitly.
Project partners		Projects must consist of at least 3 partners from 3 different countries eligible and requesting funding from a FO participating in this call; self-funded partners are “associated partners” who participate with own resources (see above)
Redress Committee		The Redress Committee has the role to evaluate the requests for redress ensuring fair and equal treatment of applicants (see section 7.3).
Research and Innovation	R&D	
Sustainable Development Goals	SDGs	

Outline

1	Preamble	6
1.1	Background.....	6
1.2	The FutureFoodS Partnership.....	6
2	FutureFoodS ambition - Food Systems Approach	7
3	Project types for achieving impact	8
4	Call description	10
4.1	Scope and objectives of the call	10
4.2	Call topics	11
4.2.1	Topic 1: Domestic food practices for enhancing sustainable and healthy diets	11
4.2.2	Topic 2: Towards diverse, sustainable and circular food processing systems	12
4.2.3	Topic 3: Importance of trust and transparency.....	13
5	Timeline, Call Office (CO) contacts and funding opportunities.....	15
5.1	Timeline	15
5.2	Call Office contacts	16
5.3	Overview of participating Funding Organisations and funding opportunities.....	16
6	Funding modalities	20
6.1	Who can apply	20
6.2	Eligibility	20
6.2.1	General eligibility criteria	21
6.2.2	Regional/ national eligibility criteria.....	22
6.2.3	Ineligibility	22
6.3	Ethical issues.....	22
6.4	Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest	23
6.5	General Data Protection Regulation	24
6.6	Project Coordinator	24
7	Call procedures	25
7.1	Step1: Pre-proposal phase	25
7.1.1	Submission.....	25
7.1.2	Evaluation	25
7.1.3	Selection	25
7.2	Step 2: Full-proposal phase	25
7.2.1	Requests for changes in the full-proposal phase	25
7.2.2	Widening option	26
7.2.3	Submission.....	27
7.2.4	Evaluation	27
7.2.5	Selection	27
8	Evaluation	28
8.1	International Expert Panel.....	28
8.2	Evaluation criteria and scoring system.....	28

8.3	Selection and funding decision.....	32
8.4	Redress procedure	33
9	Obligations of funded projects.....	34
9.1	Contract negotiations.....	34
9.2	Contractual requirements	35
9.3	Consortium agreement	35
9.4	Project monitoring and reporting	35
9.5	Dissemination requirements	36
10	ANNEXES	36

Annex A Impact Plan

Annex B Overview of National Contact Points / Regional Contact Points (NCP/RCP)

Annex C Pre-proposal template

Annex D Full-proposal template

Annex E Letter of commitment template

Annex F Data Management Plan

Annex G Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication Plan

Annex H List of FutureFoodS partners allowed to participate in co-funded projects

Annex I Regional/ national regulations

1 Preamble

1.1 Background

The European Commission (EC) has identified an urgent need to future-proof our food systems. This is due to various impacts that our food systems are facing, such as those linked to climate change, land degradation, biodiversity loss, hunger, malnutrition, diet-related diseases, food and packaging waste, safety, scarcity of fresh water and (renewable) resources, social and economic inequalities, political tensions, and the need to safeguard our food cultural heritage.

The transformation of food systems is key to meet the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is a central element with respect to ending poverty and protecting the planet (Rockström et al., 2009²), and is necessary to ensure that all people have access to safe and affordable diets that promote health and wellbeing (FAO and WHO, 2019³). Food is an element that connects all 17 SDGs given the interplay between the economic, environmental and the social dimensions of food systems.

A sustainable food system for the EU should “...provide and promote safe, nutritious and healthy food of low environmental impact for all current and future EU citizens in a manner that itself also protects and restores the natural environment and its ecosystem services, is robust and resilient, economically dynamic, just and fair, and socially acceptable and inclusive. It does so without compromising the availability of nutritious and healthy food for people living outside the EU, nor impairing their natural environment.” (SAPEA, 2020⁴).

1.2 The FutureFoodS Partnership

The FutureFoodS Partnership is one of eight cofunded partnerships launched by the EC under Cluster 6 of Horizon Europe to drive green and digital transitions. While the partnerships AGROECOLOGY, EUPAHW, SBEP and AgData also look at various aspects of agricultural and food production, the FutureFoodS partnership has a clear focus on food post-harvest.

The vision of the FutureFoodS Partnership is to collectively achieve environmentally friendly, socially secure and fair, economically viable, healthy and safe food systems in Europe by 2050.

This is based on three identified priority needs:

- 1) The need for transformation of the current types of production, processing, distribution, and consumption in linear food chains towards circular food systems functioning within planetary boundaries;
- 2) The need for an overarching food systems approach to address several challenges in an integrative manner and empowering all relevant stakeholders, diverse voices and geographical regions;
- 3) The need for food that is safe, sustainable, healthy and from fair and trusted value chains for everyone.

The FutureFoodS Partnership aims to generate impact (summarized in General & Specific Objectives) through a combination of interrelated activities like case studies in living labs, agendas for research, innovation, policy-science topics and education and joint transnational calls for research and innovation (R&I) proposals across four thematic areas:

² Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., ... & Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461 (7263), 472-475

³ Sustainable healthy diets, Guiding principles: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/ca6640en>

⁴ European Commission: Directorate-General for Research and Innovation and Group of Chief Scientific Advisors, *Towards a sustainable food system – Moving from food as a commodity to food as more of a common good – Independent expert report*, Publications Office, 2020, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/282386>

- i. 'Change the way we eat';
- ii. 'Change the way we process and supply food';
- iii. 'Change the way we connect with food systems' and
- iv. 'Change the way we govern food systems.

Its potential impact is closely related to the capacity to align actors of the food system around the goals identified by the European Green Deal and the UN's SDGs and to quantify contributions to the objectives in the Farm to Fork Strategy as well as the FOOD2030 agenda and the Commission's vision for the Future of Farming and Food production in the EU. The FutureFoodS beneficiaries represent 83 partners from 22 EU Member States, six associated countries and one third country - 29 countries in total.

The incorporation of research actors from social sciences and humanities, of policy makers and the involvement of external experts and stakeholders ensures the consideration of multiple perspectives, needs and experiences in the planning and implementation of FutureFoodS activities.

This clearly reflects the partnership's mission to mobilize R&I to accelerate the transition towards sustainable food systems with a wide range of actors, who are joining forces in this partnership.

2 FutureFoodS ambition - Food Systems Approach

The FutureFoodS Partnership is planning to launch up to six calls for transnational R&I projects during its ten-year lifetime. As the second call of the partnership, the current call draws the applicants' attention to essential guiding elements that articulate the partnership's ambition for this call, as well as for all subsequent calls.

Central to the FutureFoodS Partnership is the ambition that tackling the complex challenges making current European food systems unsustainable requires mobilizing knowledge, actors and resources through a **food systems approach**. An approach of this kind is important as it propounds a holistic view when addressing wicked problems, acknowledging enduring dependencies between food system actors, as well as identifying drivers and leverage points within systems.

Food systems approach⁵: „a system that embraces all **elements** (environment, people, inputs, processes, infrastructure, institutions, and power relations, markets and trade) and **activities** that relate to production, processing, distribution and marketing, preparation and consumption of food. A systems approach acknowledges the **interactions** between natural resources/ecosystems services, primary food production (farming, aquaculture and fishery), food processing, packaging, logistics, marketing, retail, food services, food consumption and waste management/recycling and the many **feedback loops** between them, which together defines the degree of **complexity**“.

The European food system R&I community has an important role to play in promoting the design and realisation of a food systems approach involving relevant food system actors. The proposals submitted to this call should clearly delineate and characterise the particular food system under inquiry. What are its key actors? What are the main dependencies within the system? What levers may induce enhanced sustainability of the system? How does the chosen one connect to other food systems?

⁵ FutureFoodS SRIA, cited from: Halberg, N. & Westhoek, H. 2019. SCAR SWG Food systems Policy Brief: The added value of a Food Systems Approach in Research and Innovation? *European Union Publication*. ISBN 978-92-76-08794-6.

What are guiding elements for FutureFoodS projects?

A. Transformative perspective

- Research should be solution- and impact-driven (proposals are required to set up an **Impact Plan** for food system transformation which follows a theory of change)⁶;
- Projects should investigate the context in which they operate (the Impact Plan is expected to include a problem- and context-analysis);
- The diversity of European food systems means that solutions for a more sustainable food system may vary depending on the context⁷, e.g. different geographical conditions, different institutional settings, different demographical or cultural settings.

B. Inter- and transdisciplinarity⁸

- Project consortia need to bring together scientific approaches from multiple academic disciplines or research fields (linking life sciences with social sciences and humanities);
- Consortia can choose the level of cross-disciplinarity, appropriate for the R&I questions under inquiry, project specific aims and Impact Plan.

C. Multi-stakeholder engagement⁹

- Engagement of stakeholders from different sectors, governance levels and countries to foster real-life relevance and applicability of R&I actions;
- Engagement should encompass all stages of the R&I process, from design to implementation and monitoring;
- The participation of a broad range of food system actors is encouraged along the “quadruple helix” (science, policy, industry and society), e.g. citizens/ consumers, civil society organisations, food companies, research organisations, regional authorities, decision makers, municipalities and the food nutrition and health community.

D. Sustainability

- Projects should take all three dimensions of sustainability (environmental/ economic/ social incl. nutrition and health¹⁰) into account, but are not obliged to address all dimensions to the same extent;
- Projects should envisage clearly how they will contribute to the transformation towards sustainable food systems (*see SAPEA definition on p. 4*).

The guiding elements will be part of the proposal evaluation and should be described in corresponding sections of the proposal and especially in the **Impact Plan** towards Food system Transformation (Annex A).

3 Project types for achieving impact

To unlock the underlying potential from transnational cooperation and maximize the contribution of its FOs, it is essential for the Partnership to invest in varied range of projects that boost food sustainability

⁶ a theory of change is a conceptual model for planning R&I activities that makes explicit key assumptions that underpin the realisation of a long-term goal and anticipate the effects of a desired outcome/change

⁷ Determinants of food choices are context-specific (European Commission, 2022) [scoping-paper sustainable-food-consumption.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

⁸ Further info can be found here: <https://km4djournal.org/index.php/km4dj/article/view/170>;
<https://www.nwo.nl/en/knowledge-platform-for-interdisciplinary-and-transdisciplinary-research#background-information>

⁹ Please consult the eligibility guidelines of your national/ regional funding organisation to ensure what activities/ which actors can be supported

¹⁰ [Sustainable food systems: Concept and framework \(fao.org\)](#)

transitions from various vantage points and by using multiple levers in the R&I system by advancing the knowledge basis in the field of food system transformation as well as promoting the uptake of novel practices in the industry, public sector and civil society.

Applicants are now able to apply for two different types of projects that seek to address this broad range of needs in the research and innovation system. As different Funding Agencies have the possibility to fund different parts of the R&I landscape, from basic (sometimes also referred to as fundamental/strategic) research to applied research to innovation initiatives, the choice between 2 project types aims at maximizing their contribution and generating increased added value for their respective country or region. Table 3 indicates the project types that each FO is able to fund (also displayed in Annex I).

The first project type, labelled as **Exploratory Research Project**, shall advance the state-of-the-art of scientific knowledge in multiple academic fields related to food sustainability, ranging from ground research developing new theoretical understandings on food sustainability transitions to more applied research aimed at the acquisition of new knowledge and skills for developing new products, processes, tools or services. Such projects may range from theory development to proof of concept, essentially in an academic or laboratory setting. For projects focusing on technical advancements these would cover the stages 3 to 5 according to the TRL scale¹¹. Applications should provide an assessment of the expected impacts that the project may have for food systems transformation and should embrace multi-stakeholder engagement and inter- and transdisciplinarity following the guiding elements for FutureFoodS food systems approach (see section 2).

The second project type, labelled as **Accelerating Innovation Project**, is targeting research and innovation activities related to new sustainable food practices, services, products and processes that are ready for practical application in real life settings. These projects aim at developing and up-scaling science-based solutions in industry, policy and society and corresponding to stages 6 to 8 in the TRL scale (if applicable). For more technically oriented innovations, besides technical feasibility other aspects such as market acceptance, regulatory compliance, market potential analysis and business models, could be considered. We encourage applications that address a wide range of types of innovations, including those that address social needs and improve societal well-being of all/specified consumer groups, those that contribute to new business practices or more efficient relationships between food system actors or those that develop new marketing strategies, including changes in product design, packaging, or pricing models. Applications should provide an assessment of the expected impacts that the project may have for food systems transformation including expected gains and added value for end users when applying the proposed solutions.

It is the applicant's responsibility to select the project type that is best suited for the activities, results and expected impacts generated by their application, as well as the collective and individual competences of the participating team members. Applications submitted using each project type will be evaluated and ranked separately to generate a greater diversity of projects under the present call. Please note that all 3 call topics are open to both project types.

In summary, here is a guideline helping to decide if your application fits best within Exploratory Research Project or Accelerating Innovation Project:

	Exploratory Research	Accelerating Innovation
Concept	Basic and/ or applied research focused on knowledge co-	Focused to translating scientific knowledge into new practices and smart solutions

¹¹ <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/career-development/researchers/manual-scientific-entrepreneurship/major-steps/trl>

	creation, mainly researcher-led (comparable to EC- RIA)	in industry, public sector or society, clear stakeholder commitment and collaboration with professional practice (comparable to EC- IA)
Foreseen impacts	Develop the state of the art of scientific knowledge laying the ground for an accelerated food system transformation	Increase and develop the adoption and uptake of new sustainable food practices, services, products and processes across Europe
Expected outputs	Classic academic outputs such as articles, books, conference articles, but also open-source datasets, simulation tools, methodological guidelines, e-learning modules etc	Practical and smart solutions for societal issues. Prototypes and pilots, digital tools, business models, consumer acceptance analysis, data analysis frameworks, patents, manufacturing techniques, AI models, regulatory sandboxes etc
Concretion level	Ideas development and implementing proof of concept	Testing and validating prototypes or pilots that are ready for practical application in real life settings
TRL scale (if applicable)	3-5	6-8
Guiding elements for food systems approach	Essential, see section 2	Essential, see section 2

4 Call description

4.1 Scope and objectives of the call

In its **Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA)**¹², FutureFoodS has identified **four thematic areas** for which better knowledge, advanced know-how and more scalable, innovative solutions can be determinant to fulfill food system transformations: (i) change the way we eat, (ii) change the way we process and supply food, (iii) change the way we connect, and (iv) change the way we govern food systems.

Within these four thematic R&I Areas, the partnership has identified a subset of high priority topics, with regards to the need for new knowledge and innovations in society and the food sector, that require specific attention within the framework of this second call.

The objective of this call is to fund transnational research and/or innovation projects addressing one of the following call topics. Each call topic brings together several of the priority thematic areas identified by the partnership and presented here above.

Applicants shall demonstrate the originality of their approach and build on the results of existing EU level initiatives when possible. Funded projects shall foster synergies with other initiatives and shall have the capacities to take a changing policy environment into consideration - also during the lifetime of the project.

¹² Sustainable Food Systems Partnership for People, Planet and Climate: STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND INNOVATION AGENDA (SRIA) <https://www.futurefoodpartnership.eu/strategy>

Each application submitted under this call should focus on one of the three call topics listed below. The topic chosen should be clearly indicated in the proposal:

1 Domestic food practices for enhancing sustainable and healthy diets

2 Towards diverse, sustainable and circular food processing systems

3 Importance of trust and transparency

Please note that primary production (on land and sea/water), such as growing food, agricultural production and other specific aspects related to it, as well as diseases related to nutrition and lifestyle are not in focus in this partnership. These aspects are covered in other Horizon Europe partnerships. However, dependencies and impacts related to these aspects may need to be reflected upon in a project to fully embrace a food systems approach.

4.2 Call topics

4.2.1 Topic 1: Domestic food practices for enhancing sustainable and healthy diets

The household level is the key level in society where immense food sustainability gains can be unlocked. Indeed, food choices made in the household are related to the more general public context, e.g. related to environmental impacts and public health, and personal life-style choices¹³. In addition, long-term shifts in food consumption habits could potentially reduce emissions from the food sector significantly¹⁴. However, shifting dietary habits is a highly complex endeavour, as households' food choices are often engrained in the household's identity as a social unit and carry cultural and personal significance¹⁵ strengthening the sense of belonging. Moreover, food preferences also differ significantly for different household types based on age, income, background and location¹⁶. Factors such as affordability, nutritional value and taste tend to outweigh environmental impacts when households make food choices¹⁷. Reducing food waste is also prioritized in households educated to university degree level and above¹⁸ and could potentially be expanded to all household categories. Overall, making sustainable food less pricy, more nutritional and sensorially appealing may provide a lasting leverage for the uptake of more sustainable food practices with significant gains for society.

This call topic aims at exploring new ways to promote dietary shifts towards sustainable healthy food choices at household level and ensure access for all population groups, including the most vulnerable ones, to balanced intake of (macro- and micro-) nutrients, fibres, calories and proteins in line with dietary advice and without compromising with food safety and security concerns. Projects should create and develop new scientific knowledge and/or design and implement innovative solutions that shape more virtuous food habits at the household and thus reconnect individuals' consumption behaviour with society's health and environmental concerns. Research and innovation projects are expected to contribute to shifting dietary habits by households towards sustainable healthy food products that can

¹³ Thøgersen, J. (2017). Sustainable food consumption in the nexus between national context and private lifestyle: A multi-level study. *Food quality and preference*, 55, 16-25.

¹⁴ Hassett, K., Nauges, C., Giner, C., Koetse, M., Tikoudis, I., & Bystrom, O. (2025). Household food choices. OECD Environment Working Papers.

¹⁵ Thøgersen, J. (2017). Sustainable food consumption in the nexus between national context and private lifestyle: A multi-level study. *Food quality and preference*, 55, 16-25.

¹⁶ Reisch, L., Eberle, U., & Lorek, S. (2013). Sustainable food consumption: an overview of contemporary issues and policies. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 9(2), 7-25.

¹⁷ Thøgersen, J. (2017). Sustainable food consumption in the nexus between national context and private lifestyle: A multi-level study. *Food quality and preference*, 55, 16-25.

¹⁸ Barker, H., Shaw, P. J., Richards, B., Clegg, Z., & Smith, D. M. (2023). Towards sustainable food systems: exploring household food waste by photographic diary in relation to unprocessed, processed and ultra-processed food. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2051.

be produced and supplied in various European locales. As interest in food self-sufficiency and sustainable food practices grows, it is essential to combine these efforts with awareness of food safety principles.

Suggested R&I aspects to consider:

Applicants choosing to address this call topic might touch upon some of the aspects listed below in their proposals. Applicants may choose to address other issues; either way a clear argumentation about how the chosen relates to the scope of this call topic is required.

- Explore and develop strategies to improve access to nutritional options to a wider range of households, particularly for those including vulnerable populations whether physiologically (e.g., early childhood, women of childbearing age, the elderly, people suffering from chronic diseases) or socio-economically;
- Options for redesign of nutrient profiling and household-level dietary strategies to effectively promote healthy and sustainable eating, e.g. increased consumption of potassium-rich foods;
- Understand and address the importance of access to robust, evidence-based information in shaping consumer perceptions of food safety risks, particularly in contrast with non-expert sources as appearing in social media and advertising;
- Investigate and monitor the significance of sociocultural, demographic and economic factors in promoting/hampering the adoption of sustainable, safe and healthy food practices at household level (including household food waste);
- Investigate the potential implications for policy and practice by looking at targeted interventions and policy mixes successfully shifting household choices towards sustainable food products through a combination of demand- and supply-side measures (including role of retail);
- Develop accessible and reliable methods of data collection and sharing, enabling evidence-based food choices and sustainable habits in different household types (including household food waste);
- Design and develop new products, processes and services that can significantly improve the ability of various household types to choose sustainable, healthy food;
- Develop novel understandings and solutions regarding the role of food environments in contributing/hampering the shift of household choices towards sustainable, healthy foods and habits.

4.2.2 Topic 2: Towards diverse, sustainable and circular food processing systems

Making food value chains more sustainable is crucial in order to promote lasting health and societal effects and booster food sustainability transitions across multiple scales and food environments tailored to diverse consumer groups. To achieve and preserve sustainable, resilient and competitive value chains and food systems, the deployment of innovative technologies in processing and distribution, targeted investments in energy-efficient equipment, and the optimisation of production processes are essential. Multiple levers can be activated to reduce the sector's carbon footprint (such as minimising or converting waste, reformulation, resource-efficient methods for processing and storage and shift to renewable or alternative energy sources). Circularity is a strong driver to close nutrient cycles and efficient usage and consumption of resources, food products and by-products. This asks for new recycling, processing and packaging on-demand methods to create added value, prevent food waste and develop tools for efficient production, by-product utilization, product remanufacture to cite a few. Tools for waste reduction guidance (for households, local communities, food service and retailers, producers), safety measures, conservation, hygienic design and disease control are necessary.

Stakeholder involvement through co-creation and participatory design can emphasize the visibility and acceptance of circularity as means to more sustainable food systems.

This call topic aims at expanding the knowledge base and developing and testing novel solutions addressing systemic challenges hindering and identifying opportunities for improving the provision of fair, carbon-neutral, environmentally low-impact, safe, healthy, near-zero-waste, and diversified food products and diets. Next to environmental aspects, research and innovation projects applying under this topic are expected to take into account all dimensions of sustainability, including economic and social aspects.

Suggested R&I aspects

Applicants choosing to address this call topic might touch upon some of the aspects listed below in their proposals. Applicants may choose to address other issues; either way a clear argumentation about how the chosen relates to the scope of this call topic is required.

- Explore long-term benefits and risks associated with the design of food products and services that are more climate-neutral, have less impact on the environment (use of new sources of energy, reduction of environmental pollution) and, at the same time, safeguard healthy and tasteful eating experiences;
- Exploitation of major side streams (up-cycle) for tasty, safe and affordable food products;
- Investigate the potential of novel food processing methods in enhancing the preservation of the freshness of natural raw materials, including vegetables and fruit, with limited transformation of food components and limited use of additives while seeking optimal health properties of food;
- Designing and testing of innovative preservation schemes (storage, packaging, natural preservatives), adaptable to various supply chains keeping shelf-life, while guaranteeing safety, all along the food chain;
- Investigate the potential of biotechnologies (incl. advanced fermentation technologies) in food processing;
- Assess the impact of minimal or gentle processing (including alternative extraction processes) on maintaining the nutritional quality and functionality of a product over time while ensuring food safety;
- Develop innovative methods that prevent or detect the formation/ accumulation of undesirable, harmful substances in the food, including the adaptation of pathogens in recycled processing environments, effect on human micro-biome, risk of accumulation of food safety hazards in an ever-increasing, circular way;
- Explore pathways to adapt food chains to new resources of energy and to make them resilient to power grid disruptions;
- Find solutions to revisit food processing in terms of energy consumption, unexploited co- or by-products, waste and transformation to assess its environmental footprints and develop strategies to improve its overall sustainability.

4.2.3 Topic 3: Importance of trust and transparency

The decoupling between consumers and how food is produced is a well-documented challenge that hampers food sustainability transitions for individuals and society at large. Lack of trust can lead to scepticism, misinformation, and reduced engagement with sustainable food choices. Hence, it is imperative to increase trust and transparency when aiming at reshaping food systems to be more inclusive, participatory and sustainable. Building consumer trust requires a standardized and transparent system of quality signals and sustainability information, which is evidence-based and

designed for the digital and physical food environments where dietary choices are made and sustainable habits are happening.

Integrated labelling systems can be valuable options, if various dimensions of food products (e.g. nutritional, environmental, climate and social dimensions) are encompassed. Thereby, legal requirements on consumer information (accurate, clear, easy and not misleading) must be met and knowledge is missing on how different consumer groups and socio-demographic segments interpret and respond to such holistic schemes, food-related signals and perceived risks in general. Specific metrics and indicators for measuring the effectiveness are a prerequisite and require collection of data. Digital innovations such as technological tools (e.g. QR codes or mobile applications) can provide real-time access to information and offer possible feedback mechanisms to enhance effectiveness by ensuring they meet the needs and expectations of diverse consumer groups.

Relevant research and innovation actions for this call topic will seek new insights for establishing a holistic framework to oversee labelling standards across different products and regions, propose new metrics/ indicators, data methods, digital tools and evaluation frameworks to measure the effectiveness of engagement efforts. Projects should respect existing legal requirements and build on existing efforts in the area of labelling on EU level. Such projects may also take advantage of existing actor networks between academia and stakeholder groups (including relevant policy initiatives) in order to create new leverage points for improving trust and transparency in the food systems also across borders.

Suggested R&I aspects

Applicants choosing to address this call topic might touch upon some of the aspects listed below in their proposals. Applicants may choose to address other issues; either way a clear argumentation about how the chosen relates to the scope of this call topic is required.

- Understand how unified frameworks could regulate labelling standards across different products and regions in Europe and promote trust and transparency;
- Test feasibility and highlight potential gains as well as trade-offs of standardized frameworks for different food system actors and segments (including producers, retailers, end-users);
- Establish knowledge and recommendations on how genuine practices can be ensured (including monitoring against label washing or misleading claims);
- Identify and test effective ways to communicate sustainability/ multiple attributes and gain knowledge how consumers, especially those in vulnerable situations, respond to different types of communication with regard to trust;
- Analyse and evaluate different transparency tools, their impact on consumer trust in sustainable production/ trade/ waste and recycling/ circular ingredients or reused components and identify possible barriers for their uptake;
- Explore how smart and dynamic solutions may increase consumer trust (e.g. mobile applications, QR codes, options for real-time access to sustainability, origin, and nutritional data, traceability);
- Investigate interlinkages between governance (who decides on data and formats, accounting of costs and benefits for different actors) and data (space and sovereignty, use of data infrastructures);
- Design interactive processes between citizens and other food system actors, such as retailers, producers (particularly SMEs), national and regional policymakers regarding information provided to consumers (including testing in real-life settings such as living-labs, field validations, data platforms etc).

5 Timeline, Call Office (CO) contacts and funding opportunities

5.1 Timeline

Table 1 Timeline

1. STEP: PRE-PROPOSAL PHASE	
01 October 2025	Pre-announcement
03 December 2025	Launch of the co-funded call (opening of the electronic submission system + the partnering tool)
11 December 2025	Webinar for applicants
11 February 2026 (13:00:00 CET)	Deadline for pre-proposal submission
Mid Feb – end of April	1. Step eligibility check, evaluation and selection
Early May	Communication of eligibility check and evaluation outcomes to project Coordinators
First half of May	Period for pre-proposal phase redress
Until end of May	Evaluation of redress requests and communication of decisions to applicants
01 June 2026	Invitation to submit full-proposals
2. STEP: FULL-PROPOSAL PHASE	
08 July 2026	Deadline to inform about exceptional changes (see section 6.2.1)
27 July 2026 (13:00:00 CEST)	Deadline for full-proposal submission
End July –late October	2. Step eligibility check, evaluation and selection
End of October 2026	Communication of eligibility check and evaluation outcomes to project Coordinators
~First half of November 2026	Period for full-proposal stage redress
~End November 2026	Evaluation of redress requests and communication of decisions to applicants
~End November 2026	Communication of the funding decision to the project Coordinators
NATIONAL/ REGIONAL CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS	
December 2026 - April 2027	Nat/reg. contract negotiations and start of projects
FUNDED PROJECT MONITORING AND MEETINGS (tentative timeframe)	
2nd quarter 2027	Kick-off meeting
Project month 18	Mid-term report (MTR); depends on runtime (given for 36 months)
By mid of 2028	Mid-term meeting
By end of 2029	Final meeting
Project month 36	End-term report (ETR); depends on runtime (given for 36 months)

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

How to start: to prepare a proposal, the coordinator needs to register and generate the proposal first. The coordinator can then assign partners, who will receive an invitation to join and register themselves to the submission platform. More info can be found on the submission platform itself.

Submission platform: <https://futurefoods.ptj.de>

Partnering tool

A partnering tool is attached to the submission platform, where interested parties can submit and search partner profiles.

A **webinar will be hosted on 11th of December 2025 from 11:00 am to 13:00 CET** for all interested applicants. The webinar will provide an overview of all relevant aspects of the call and a short introduction to the submission platform. The webinar is open to everyone interested and no registration is required.

Access information to the webinar:

<https://ptj-fzj.webex.com/ptj-fzj-en/j.php?MTID=m14a526209bda8332db9dc711ce01848a>

Webinar password:

FbUrdDBc264 (32873322 when dialing from a phone or video system)

Webinar number:

2780 381 0835

The FO might organize national/regional webinars besides the FutureFoodS webinar. Applicants should be aware of the respective communication channels.

5.2 Call Office contacts

The CO will be operated by Project Management Juelich (Germany).

Table 2 CO contacts

Name	E-Mail	Phone
CO	ptj-futurefoods@fz-juelich.de	N/A
Emilie Gätje	e.gaetje@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 61 96367
Frank Hensgen	f.hensgen@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 61 85443
Nikola Hassan	n.hassan@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 61 96787

All technical issues with the submission system are to be addressed to the CO.

5.3 Overview of participating Funding Organisations and funding opportunities

The following table provides an overview of the countries and FO involved, as well as the financial contributions committed to the call and individual topics. For further guidance on the applicable national/regional regulations please consult your NCP/RCP (Annex B) and the information given in Annex I.

A total of approx. 39 million EUR have been provisionally allocated for this Joint Transnational Call by the participating FOs combined with the contribution from the European Union (EU).

Table 3 Overview of participating FOs and funding opportunities

Country	FO full name	Abbreviation	Supported project type		National/regional call contribution (provisional)		Topic		
			Research	Innovation	Indicative budget in EUR (provisional)	Maximum national/regional amount in EUR per project	1	2	3
Austria (AT)	Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds	FWF	X		1.000.000	max. 450.000	X	X	X
Belgium (BE)	Fonds de la recherche scientifique	F.R.S.-FNRS	X		300.000	300.000	X	X	X
Belgium (BE)	Fonds Voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-Vlaanderen	FWO	X		750.000	350.000	X	X	X
Belgium (BE)	Service public de Wallonie, Département de la Recherche et du développement technologique	SPW	X	X	1.000.000	1.000.000	X	X	
Belgium (BE)	Vlaanderen Agentschap Innoveren & Ondernemen	FIO/ VLAIO	X	X	2.000.000/ 750.000	500.000/ 375.000	X	X	X
Bulgaria (BG)	Bulgarian National Science Fund	BNSF	X		450.000	150.000	X	X	X
Denmark (DK)	Danish AgriFish Agency	DAFA	X	X	1.500.000	300.000/ 500.000	X	X	X
Estonia (EE)	Sihtasutus Eesti Teadusagentuur	ETAG	X		300.000	150.000/ 300.000	X	X	X
Finland (FI)	Maa- ja metsätalousministeriö	MMM	X	X	500.000	250.000	X	X	X
Finland (FI)	Business Finland	BFI	X	X	2.000.000	600.000	X	X	X
France (FR)	Agence nationale de la recherche	ANR	X		2.000.000	300.000 / 350.000*	X	X	X
Germany (DE)	Bundesministerium für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat	BMLEH/ BLE	X		750.000	250.000	X		
Germany (DE)	Bundesministerium für Forschung, Technologie und Raumfahrt	BMFTR/ PtJ	X	X	2.000.000	350.000		X	

Country	FO full name	Abbreviation	Supported project type		National/regional call contribution (provisional)		Topic		
			Research	Innovation	Indicative budget in EUR (provisional)	Maximum national/regional amount in EUR per project	1	2	3
Iceland (IS)	Rannsóknamiðstöð Íslands	RANNIS	X	X	300.000	300.000	X	X	X
Ireland (IE)	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	DAFM	X		350.000	350.000		X	
Italy (IT)	Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano/ BOZEN	PROV.BZ/ BOZEN	X	X	225.000	300.000	X	X	X
Lithuania (LT)	Lietuvos mokslo taryba	LMT	X	X	300.000	150.000-250.000	X	X	X
Lithuania (LT)	Lietuvos Respublikos Žemės Ūkio Ministerija	ZUM	X	X	120.000	120.000	X	X	X
Norway (NO)	Norges Forskningsrad	RCN	X	X	2.100.000	~260.000	X	X	X
Portugal (PT)	Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia	FCT	X		500.000	150.000/ 250.000*	X	X	X
Romania (RO)	Unitatea Executivă pentru Finanțarea Învățământului Superior a Cercetării, Dezvoltării și Inovării	UEFISCDI	X	X	500.000	200.000/ 250.000	X	X	X
Slovakia (SK)	Ministerstvo Podohospodarstva a Rozvoja Vidieka Slovenskej Republiky	MARD	X		110.000	110.000	X	X	X
Slovakia (SK)	Centrum vedecko-technických informácií	CVTISR	X	X	1.200.000	300.000/ 400.000	X	X	X
Spain (ES)	Agencia Estatal de Investigación	AEI/ FECYT	X	X	1.000.000	175.000/ 275.000/ 325.000*	X	X	X
Spain (ES)	Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnológico y la Innovación E.P.E.	CDTI	X	X	900.000	n.a.	X	X	X
Spain (ES)	Elika Nekazaritzako Elikagaien Segurtasunarako Euskal Fundazioa	ELIKA	X	X	100.000	100.000	X	X	X
Spain (ES)	Agencia de Ciencia, Competitividad Empresarial e Innovación Asturiana	Sekuens/ FICYT	X	X	150.000	150.000	X	X	X

Country	FO full name	Abbreviation	Supported project type		National/regional call contribution (provisional)		Topic		
			Research	Innovation	Indicative budget in EUR (provisional)	Maximum national/regional amount in EUR per project	1	2	3
Sweden (SE)	Forskningsrådet För Miljö, Areella Näringar Och Samhällsbyggande	FORMAS	X		2.000.000	300.000/ 450.000	X		X
The Netherlands (NL)	De Staat, Vertegenwoordigd door de minister van Landbouw, Visserij, Voedselzekerheid en Natuur	MIN-LVVN	X	X	2.000.000	350.000/ 450.000	X	X	X
The Netherlands (NL)	Nederlandse organisatie voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek	NWO	X		2.000.000	400.000	X	X	X
The Netherlands (NL)	Regieorgaan SIA	SIA	X	X	900.000	300.000	X	X	X
Türkiye (TR)	Tarımsal Araştırmalar ve Politikalar Genel Müdürlüğü	TAGEM	X	X	200.000	100.000	X	X	X
Türkiye (TR)	Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu	TÜBİTAK	X	X	500.000	200.000	X	X	X

*See details in the national/regional funding regulations

6 Funding modalities

The FOs participating in the co-funded call are listed in Table 3. The funding for transnational projects will be based on a virtual common pot mechanism. This means that the partners (applicants) in the projects selected for funding will receive the grant directly from their corresponding national/regional FO¹⁹, according to their legal terms and conditions for project funding (see national/regional funding regulations, Annex I).

All applicants need to check terms and conditions of the respective national/ regional funding regulations (Annex I). In addition, it is strongly recommended to contact the NCP/RCPs from one's FO (Annex B).

6.1 Who can apply

In general terms, universities and universities of applied sciences, research institutes, non-profit legal entities (i.e. non governmental organisations, associations, societies, cooperatives, federations etc.), small and medium sized enterprises and large enterprises and public bodies (i.e. municipalities, regional/ national administrative bodies, authorities etc.) can apply for funding under this call, subject to the national/ regional funding regulations and eligibility criteria (see also Annex I). Each FO funds the participation of different kind of institutions, so applicants must check the national/ regional funding regulations and eligibility criteria, in order to confirm their eligibility for funding.

Please, see the Annex I for the eligibility rules of the FO to which you submit an application. If in doubt please consult your NCP/ RCP.

Conditions for the participation in the call for beneficiaries of the FutureFoodS Partnership:

Research teams from some of the organisations that are also beneficiaries of the FutureFoodS Partnership may participate in this co-funded call; the list of the beneficiaries of FutureFoodS allowed to participate in the projects' consortia is indicated in Annex H. Firewall measures are being implemented within the partnership to prevent these beneficiaries obtaining any advance or additional insights in to this call so as to mitigate the risk of, perception of, or de facto conflict of interest (CoI) or unequal treatment of applicants, including clear segregation of duties. All other beneficiaries of the FutureFoodS Partnership not listed in Annex H may not apply for funding under the co-funded call for proposals.

6.2 Eligibility

Proposals must be in line with the general eligibility criteria as described below and applicants requesting funding from participating FOs within this call must comply with national/ regional criteria as established in Annex I respectively.

After the closing dates, the CO will carry out the general eligibility check of the proposals submitted with respect to the criteria cited in this section. Proposals not meeting these minimum requirements will be rejected, following consultation with the Call Board (CB). Each member of the CB will then check the proposals and applicants requesting funding against national/ regional eligibility criteria as described in the national/ regional funding regulations.

¹⁹ In case of countries with more than one national/regional FO, the applicants may need to select (during application phase) the one to which they are requesting funding. For this selection they will need to check concrete requirements of the respective FO in Annex I "National/Regional regulations".

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

6.2.1 General eligibility criteria

After the closing date for submission, all proposals will be checked against the following mandatory general eligibility criteria:

- The minimum requirement for project consortia is to be comprised of at least three partners
 - 1) from at least three different Member States or Associated Countries participating in the call and
 - 2) eligible to request funding from the FOs participating in this call and providing funding for the selected topic and project type (Table 3).

There is no rule for setting out the maximum number of partners that may participate in a consortium. The number should be appropriate to meet the project goals and should remain manageable (experience from past calls indicates a range of 4-8 partners per project);

- Each consortium applying must be led by a project Coordinator, who must be from an organisation eligible and applying for funding from a FO of this call;
- In order to achieve balanced consortia and promote real collaboration, the proportion of the overall effort that is allocated to all of the partners (excluding associated partners) from a single country shall not exceed 60% of the total number of person months allocated to the project;
- An individual affiliated to several organisations cannot request funding from more than one FO in one proposal. If participating in the call as an affiliate of more than one organisation, the individual must declare which partner and thus which organisation within the consortium they represent. That person will not be considered as two different partners within the same consortium;
- The same person cannot act as Principal Investigator of a Coordinator for more than one proposal. Please additionally check the relevant nat/reg regulations (Annex I).
- The maximum project duration is 36 months (please check Annex I for specifications);
- Proposals must be written in English;
- Proposals must be complete, respect page limits and the number/type of attachments allowed, including CV templates that are in line with sound principles for project assessment according to the proposal templates (Annexes C and D) and information provided in the online submission system;
- Proposals must be submitted using the online submission system (<https://www.futurefoods.ptj.de>) by **11th of February 2026 (13:00:00 CET) for pre-proposals** and **27th of July 2026 (13:00:00 CEST) for full-proposals**;
- The prior submission of a pre-proposal is a requirement for the submission of a full-proposal. The information given in the pre-proposals is binding. No change to the objectives outlined in a proposal is allowed. A limited number of changes with respect to the administrative details/minor revisions may be allowed upon request and approval by the CO and the FOs concerned (see section 7.2.1);
- Applicants must complete an ethics self-assessment as part of the application;

- Self-funding/ associated partners: partners can join project consortia with their own resources and/ or can bring their own funding (e.g. in the case eligibility to receive funding is not met or due to other reasons). Self-funded partners will not be subject to national/regional eligibility assessments. They will appear within the project proposal as “associated partners” and will need to submit a “letter of commitment” (Annex E) with the full-proposal submission. In case the letter of commitment is not included at the point of full-proposal submission, the associated partner will be rejected and will not be taken into account in the evaluation. Associated partners cannot be coordinators of projects, their role should be clear and they are not counted towards the minimum number of eligible partners and countries (minimum of three funded partners from three different countries).

There is no set maximum overall project budget for the transnational project stipulated as part of the call. The costs must be appropriate to meet the project goals. Nonetheless, individual FOs may have regulations and/or restrictions concerning the budget they can award within projects that must be respected (for example, some funders may limit the maximum budget per partner in a project to a certain amount). Therefore, it is essential that each project partner carefully reads their national/regional funding regulations (see Annex I). If in doubt, applicants should consult their NCP/RCP who can inform them of the relevant regulations (see Annex B).

In addition, applicants need to respect that entities subject to EU restrictive measures²⁰ under Article 29 of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU) and Article 215 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) as well as Article 75 TFEU are not eligible to participate in any capacity. In addition, restrictions apply to legal entities established in Russia, Belarus, or in non-government controlled territories of Ukraine and measures for the protection of the Union budget against breaches of the principles of the rule of law in Hungary need to be respected²¹.

6.2.2 Regional/ national eligibility criteria

National/ regional eligibility criteria must be respected and the proposed project must be consistent with the national/ regional thematic priorities and requirements of the FO, as stated in the respective “national/regional funding regulations” (see Annex I). FOs may require additional procedures and documents according to their own national/regional or organisational regulations. Applicants should consider that certain national/regional FOs may not fund all topics/ all project types or all organisation types. Moreover, some FO do not allow the same person to participate in more than one proposal per call (see Annex I).

Applicants must carefully read the national/regional funding regulations and it is highly recommended to contact their NCP/ RCP before submitting a proposal to make sure that they respect all the national/regional eligibility criteria and rules.

6.2.3 Ineligibility

After the closing date, the CO will carry out a general eligibility check of the proposals followed by the national/ regional eligibility checks performed by FOs respectively. Proposals not meeting the eligibility criteria listed in the call announcement or national/ regional funding regulations will be rejected after consultation within the CB.

6.3 Ethical issues

The evaluation criteria of this call for proposals include the evaluation of compliance with relevant ethical requirements. Applicants should always describe any relevant ethical aspects in their project plans. Any work involving the use of animals or humans should be carried out with the appropriate

²⁰ <https://www.sanctionsmap.eu/#/main>

²¹ https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2025/wp-14-general-annexes_horizon-2025_en.pdf

authorisation, taking into account EU 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 & fetuses, 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 EC's Guidance Note – Ethics and Food-Related Research²² 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 International Expert Panel (IEP) and the Ethical, Regulatory and Deontology advisory Board of FutureFoodS, will be shared with national/regional funders who may stipulate specific ethics requirements, which in turn must be met by successful applicants as part of the national/ regional funding contract.

Any proposal deemed to violate fundamental ethical principles, after review by the Ethical, Regulatory and Deontology advisory Board of FutureFoodS, will not be accepted. Assessment of the significance of ethical issues will be made applying the criteria published by the EC in its guidelines for the Horizon Europe Framework Programme.

Where activities undertaken in non-EU and non-associated countries raise ethical issues, the applicants must ensure that the research conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State or Associated Country.

6.4 Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest

The FutureFoodS Partnership is committed to avoiding any Col and safeguarding good scientific practice. A code of Conduct related to Col, confidentiality and non-disclosure is defined and **applies to the CB, Independent Observer, Ethical, Regulatory and Deontology advisory Board and IEP**. An important aspect of this code is the avoidance of any conflicts between personal interests and the interests of the applicants. The CB and related NCP/RCPs, the IO, and the IEP will perform their work impartially and take all measures to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the work is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest ('conflicts of interest').

The following situations will automatically be considered a Col (list not exhaustive):

- Being involved in (the preparation of) any pre- and/or full-proposal;
- Having submitted a proposal as a principal investigator or a team member, under the call;
- Being director, trustee or partner or in any way involved in the management of an applicant;
- Being employed or contracted by one of the applicants;
- Having close professional proximity, *e.g.*, being a member of the same scientific institution with a hierarchical or department relation or impending change of the IEP member to the institution of the applicant in a position with a hierarchical or department relation or vice versa;
- Having close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationships with the applicants of the proposal;

²² Guidance Note – Ethics and Food-Related Research:
https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/fp7/89847/research-food_en.pdf (accessed: 9 February 2024)

- Having (or have had during the last five years) a close scientific collaboration with an applicant of the proposal;
- Having (or have had) a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional hostility with an applicant of the proposal;
- Having (or have had), a mentor/mentee relationship with a principal investigator of the proposal;
- Having a current or prior (past five years) activity in advisory bodies of the applicant's institution, *e.g.*, scientific advisory boards;
- Having direct or indirect benefit / disadvantage if any proposal submitted is accepted or rejected;
- Having personal economic interests in the funding decision. Other situations preventing the IEP members or reviewers from participating in the evaluation impartially could be considered a Col and should be reported as such by the IEP members.

Applicants included in a proposal submitted to this call (including all the team members) can not serve as IEP members.

Those beneficiaries of FutureFoodS Partnership that might apply to the co-funded calls are completely excluded from the work of call preparation, selection and project follow-up and monitoring. All call-related information is inaccessible to these beneficiaries. In this way, the possibility for research units belonging to these organisations to participate in the FutureFoodS Partnership calls for proposals is safeguarded. To ensure complete transparency, the beneficiaries of the FutureFoodS Partnership that may apply to the co-funded calls are explicitly listed in Annex H, emphasizing their absolute exclusion from the process of preparing the calls both in terms of defining the priority areas of the call and the procedures for evaluating and selecting project proposals. Concrete measures to avoid potential Col or unequal treatment of applicants are ensured.

6.5 General Data Protection Regulation

All personal data provided to the FutureFoodS Partnership in the execution of the call (e.g., project applications, 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 online submission platform.

6.6 Project Coordinator

Each project consortium needs to appoint a Coordinator. The Coordinator has the following roles and responsibilities:

- Make sure that the national/ regional funding 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 project;
- Lead the consortium throughout the application procedure and be responsible for the correct pre-proposal and full-proposal submission. The Coordinator is the one who creates an account for the proposal in the online submission platform;
- 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;
- Inform the CO 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 agreed deliverables and milestones presented in the proposal and approved by the FOs;
- Be responsible for sharing all information with consortium partners;
- Be responsible for monitoring data and for the punctual delivery of project reports;
- Be responsible for the set up of a consortium agreement between project partners.

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

7 Call procedures

The co-funded call is conducted as a two-step-procedure. As a first step, a pre-proposal has to be submitted and following an invitation, a full-proposal can be submitted in a second step.

Deadline for pre-proposals is 11th of February 2026, 13:00:00 CET

Deadline for full-proposals is 27th of July 2026, 13:00:00 CEST

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

Details on each step are explained in the following sections.

7.1 Step1: Pre-proposal phase

7.1.1 Submission

The objective of a pre-proposal is to present the project idea, objectives and aim and the consortium without providing much detail on the work plan. The detailed template for the pre-proposal with explanations is provided in Annex C and an example is also available within the document section of the submission platform: <https://futurefoods.ptj.de>.

Following the submission, pre-proposals will be checked against the general and national/regional eligibility criteria as defined in the respective funding regulations (see Annex I). Pre-proposals that do not pass the general and national/regional eligibility check will be rejected.

Only eligible pre-proposals will be evaluated.

7.1.2 Evaluation

Eligible pre-proposals will be evaluated against the two equally weighted evaluation criteria excellence and impact, as described in section 8.2. The evaluation procedure will be conducted as described in section 8.

7.1.3 Selection

The selection of pre-proposals will be decided by the CB based on a ranking list and the availability of funds (see table 3 and Annex I). The Coordinators of the selected pre-proposals will be invited to submit a full-proposal. The Coordinators of pre-proposals that are not selected will also be also informed accordingly by the CO. The decision letter will include the summary evaluation report prepared in response to the pre-proposal.

7.2 Step 2: Full-proposal phase

7.2.1 Requests for changes in the full-proposal phase

The information given in the pre-proposals is binding and thus, no changes are allowed, unless in case of force majeure or explicitly requested by the IEP, a FO or the CB. However, all changes must comply with the requirements of the call and the respective FOs. The following changes between the pre- and full-proposal stage might be possible, but always require prior endorsement by the respective FOs of the proposal and the CO, as described below for each case.

Change of budget can be allowed by the relevant FO. The NCP/ RCP of a FO can decide according to its own rules whether a justification is needed. Prior to such a change, the CO must be informed.

Applicants must explicitly indicate any changes made compared to the pre-proposal in the online submission platform.

Changes in the consortium composition:

- A change of project Coordinator (person and organisation in charge) can exceptionally be allowed in case of force majeure. In this case, a request to change the Coordinator must be submitted to the CO and to all of the FOs from whom the partners in the consortium have requested funding. The deadline for any such request is 08th of July 2026 (13:00:00 CEST);
- Changes in the consortium composition (i.e. addition, removal and replacement of a partner) can exceptionally be allowed in case of force majeure or if explicitly requested by the CB for the particular cases of i) ineligibility of a partner (e.g. because of a legal restructuring of a partner between the pre- and full-proposal stage) and/or ii) invitation to add a partner that will request funds to an undersubscribed FO (widening option, see 7.2.2). Requests must be submitted to the CO and to all of the FOs from whom the partners in the consortium have requested funding. The deadline for any such request is 08th of July 2026 (13:00:00 CEST). Regardless of the type of changes, the eligibility criteria, both general and national/regional criteria (section 5) must be respected;
- Changes in associated partners (i.e. addition, removal or replacement) are possible but should be communicated to the CO and clearly described in the proposal.

All new partners requesting funding must comply with the applicable national/ regional funding regulations. If a new partner is declared ineligible at Step 2/ full-proposal phase, the whole consortium will be declared ineligible and the proposal will not be evaluated.

It is the responsibility of the Coordinator to ensure that a new partner is eligible to receive funding from the respective FO before submitting the full-proposal. This includes checking whether the proposal is compatible with the national/regional programme of the relevant FO and thus, whether eligibility of a new partner is verified. All changes have to be explicitly indicated in the online submission platform.

7.2.2 Widening option

In case of undersubscription of one or more FOs, a so-called widening option will be offered to all proposals entering the full-proposal phase. FOs are considered undersubscribed if their available budget is significantly higher than the requested budget by successful applicants in the pre-proposal step. This would mean a loss of R&I funding and thus, should be prevented if possible.

For full-proposal consortia, the widening option gives an additional opportunity to react on comments or recommendations given in the pre-proposal evaluation, or by FOs to refine the proposal, i.e. by adding additional expertise/ disciplines/ know-how by involving a new partner fundable by an undersubscribed FO. A list with respective FOs that are undersubscribed and have clearly expressed their willingness to apply the widening process will be provided to applicants and optionally, consortia are allowed to include one new partner fundable by the respective FOs. Widening partners can be found using the consortium partners' networks and taking advantage of the [partnering tool](#) available on the Call submission platform.

A change following the widening option will only be allowed under recommendation by the CB and under the following conditions:

- The Coordinator of an application considering using the widening option must inform the CO in case the consortium would like to add an eligible partner from an undersubscribed FO.
Please note that only one additional partner requesting funding is allowed per proposal;

Information about the additional partner must be given to the CO and respective FO by 08th of July 2026;

- The total number and composition of partners including the newly added one from undersubscribed FOs in the consortium must fulfil all eligibility criteria stated in section 5.2;
- 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/ regional FO. Therefore, it is necessary to contact the respective national/ regional FO of the new partner prior to submission of the full-proposal, in order to comply with national/ regional requirements and receive approval.

7.2.3 Submission

Following the invitation to submit a full-proposal, the Coordinator can submit a full-proposal via the submission platform: <https://futurefoods.ptj.de>. Applicants are strongly advised to consult with their NCP/ RCP to clarify any uncertainties or doubts regarding compliance with the applicable funding regulations before submitting a proposal (see Annex B).

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

Note that in the full-proposal phase all associated project partners, participating at their own expense (self-funded partners) need to submit a letter of commitment (see Annex E **Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.**). The absence of this letter will result in the rejection of the associated partner who will be excluded from the proposal (see section 6.2 Eligibility).

National/ regional eligibility criteria, as defined in the respective funding regulation (see Annex I), must be respected and the proposed research project must be consistent with the national/regional thematic priorities and requirements of the FO. The FOs may require additional procedures and/or documents according to their own national/regional or organisational regulations.

Failure of one applicant to meet any of the eligibility criteria, including the national/regional eligibility criteria, will result in the rejection of the entire proposal. The inclusion of an associated partner participating at own expense in a full-proposal without a letter of commitment will result in the rejection of the respective partner. Rejected associated partners, their expertise and activities, will be disregarded in the full-proposal evaluation.

After the closing date, the CO will carry out the general eligibility check of the proposals with respect to the criteria listed in section 6.2.1. Proposals not meeting the minimum requirements will be rejected by the CO, following consultation with the CB. The members of the CB will then check the proposals against national/ regional eligibility criteria as described in the funding regulations.

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

7.2.4 Evaluation

Full proposals will be evaluated against the following three equally weighted evaluation criteria excellence, impact and quality and efficiency of the implementation, as described in section 8.2. The procedure will be conducted as described in section 8.

7.2.5 Selection

The list of full-proposals selected for funding is established by the CB, based on the availability of funds and the ranking list, which strictly follows the evaluation results. This is in accordance with the Horizon Europe regulations for co-funded calls in partnerships.

8 Evaluation

8.1 International Expert Panel

The EO will establish an IEP. The IEP will be endorsed by the CB and has the following mandate:

- Provide a peer review of proposals, on the basis of the evaluation criteria outlined in section 8.2;
- Provide a written evaluation summary report (consolidated report of the individual evaluations) for each proposal to explain the evaluation result to the CB. The evaluation summary report will be provided to the Coordinator of each proposal by the CO;
- Provide ranking lists of proposals based on the evaluation scores. There will be two separate ranking lists for the two project types (see section 3).

A chair and a vice-chair of the IEP will coordinate the work of the IEP with the support of the EO. The IEP members will be independent of the FOs and applicants involved in this co-funded call. The EO will ensure that no 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 CoI and a declaration of confidentiality. The online evaluation tool will include a feature that will prevent access to a proposal where a CoI 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, unless disclosure of information is required by national law. Proposals will be accessible to the CB, the IEP members involved and the EO. The full-proposals will also be read by the FutureFoodS Ethical, Regulatory and Deontology advisory Board in order to fulfil the obligations outlined in section 6.3. All collected data will be handled in accordance with the GDPR, see also section 6.5.

Each proposal will be evaluated by a minimum of three IEP members. They will apply evaluation criteria and score the pre-proposals and full-proposals as described in 8.2, respectively. They will prepare individual written evaluation reports, in advance of the IEP meeting. Following the individual evaluation, a rapporteur (one of the three evaluators will be assigned as rapporteur) will summarise the individual evaluation reports and write a draft summary report, which will be used to present the proposal at the IEP meeting and initiate the discussions of the IEP members. During the IEP meeting, all proposals will be introduced and evaluations presented by evaluators, with the rapporteur being the first to present the proposal. The IEP members will discuss each proposal and give feedback on the scores and reports given for each proposal. The experts shall agree on scores for each of the criteria. In case of disagreements among the three evaluators assigned and high deviations in scoring, a fourth evaluator might be consulted. Based on the agreed final scores, a ranking list of proposals will be compiled.

After the IEP meeting, the rapporteur will finalize the summary report and validate with the involved evaluators. The summary reports shall reflect the evaluation along the given criteria, the discussions by the IEP and should be in line with the score. They will be shared with the applicants.

The ranking lists and the summary evaluation reports will be shared with the CB.

An IO will oversee the entire evaluation procedure in terms of compliance with the Horizon Europe regulations for co-funded calls and will report to the FutureFoodS coordination team.

8.2 Evaluation criteria and scoring system

If a proposal passes the general and national/regional eligibility check, it will be evaluated following the procedure described above. A detailed description of each criterion is provided in table 4 below. Criteria/ sub-criteria written in *italic* are only applied in the full-proposal evaluation.

Excellence (threshold 3/5)

- 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,
 - Including the integration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content as well as open science practices
 - *including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary 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. (full-proposal only)*

Impact (threshold 3/5)

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the 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 (full-proposal only).*

Quality and efficiency of the implementation (threshold 3/5; full-proposal only)

- *Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.*
- *Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.*

Table 4 Evaluation criteria, subcriteria and supportive questions

EXCELLENCE	
Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives	– <i>To what extent will the proposed project contribute to tackle the challenges at hand (question of relevance)?</i> – <i>How well does the proposed project fit the overall scope of the call and the aims of the Partnership?</i> – <i>To what extent are the proposed objectives and research questions adequate to contribute to the thematic priorities of the call?</i>
Extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art	– <i>How /innovative is the proposed work?</i> – <i>What is the degree of innovation? (i.e. is the proposed product, process or service state of the art? Is there sufficient technological maturity and risk?)</i> – <i>Are knowledge gaps clearly identified and described?</i> – <i>To what extent is the proposal contributing to and/or increasing the advancement of its field and across different fields (inter- and transdisciplinarity)?</i> – <i>Does the proposal offer a potential breakthrough or have significant leverage points been identified?</i>
Soundness of the proposed overall methodology, including the integration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content as well as open science practices/ <i>including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary 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.</i>	– <i>To what extent are the methods and research design clear, feasible and suitable to answer the identified knowledge gaps and/or achieve the proposed objectives?</i> – <i>To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts that support a systems approach (see section 2)?</i> – <i>Does the consortium show an inter- or transdisciplinarity character and involvement of a diversity of actors?</i> – <i>Is the involvement of social sciences and humanities convincingly integrated?</i> – <i>Does the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-and transdisciplinary approaches, appropriately consider ethical issues according to the EU "Do no significant harm" principle (DNSH), gender dimension in research and innovation content?</i> – <i>Does the proposed methodology address, when appropriate, the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of stakeholders and diversity of food system actors (e.g. citizens, civil society and end users)?</i>
IMPACT	
Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from the project	– <i>Is the project's Impact Plan (including the problem analysis at pre-proposal level and the impact pathway at full-proposal level) clear and does it follow logically from the expected results of the project?</i> – <i>Is the Impact Plan both suitably ambitious and actionable and to what extent does it follow FutureFoodS guiding elements of a systems approach (transformative perspective, inter-and transdisciplinarity, multi-stakeholder engagement and sustainability)?</i> – <i>Is there a strategic impact in terms of solving sustainability-related (environmental, economic and social) food system challenges at different scales (local to global)?</i> – <i>Can contribution to sustainable development and Agenda 2030 including gender equality be expected?</i>

	– To what extent is the benefit from a transnational approach clearly argued and addressed in comparison with a regional/ national one? –
<i>Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities (full-proposal only)</i>	– Is there a feasible plan for the exploitation and dissemination of the project's scientific results (including management of intellectual property rights - IPR) – Are the expected results or the knowledge acquired of importance for economic/ societal sectors and for future development? – Are the plans for strategic activities clear and appropriate, including communication, stakeholder engagement, monitoring, evaluation and learning and capacity building? – To which extent are interactions with / exchange and transfer of results within the consortium, to stakeholders, other EU initiatives or civil society clearly thought through and described?
QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION (full-proposal only)	
<i>Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall</i>	– Is the proposed organisation and management of the scientific project adequate to achieve the proposed objectives? – Are the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management properly developed and laid out? – Is the estimated effort/ allocation of resources appropriate? – Are the resources assigned to the work packages in line with their objectives and deliverables? – Is the planned work feasible in terms of workload allocation (time/ person months)? – Is the project inherently coherent and do the individual workpackages interlink well with one other?
<i>Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.</i>	– Do participants in the proposal have the required competences to carry out the tasks assigned to them (necessary expertise)? – Is their role clearly defined and do they complement each other well? – Is the scientific workload and financial burden balanced among the partners and countries (e.g. distribution of person months, equipment and facilities, involvement of young researchers to be trained)? – Is gender equality sufficiently integrated in the consortia as well as the work plan, including the distribution of power and influence?

Individual scores will be attributed only to the three main criteria, even though the IEP members will evaluate all sub-criteria described above in the scoring system.

For both pre- and full-proposal evaluation, each criterion will be scored out of five (no half marks allowed) based on the following scoring system (Table 5). The threshold for each criterion is three out of five. Any project with a lower score for one of the main criteria or an overall score lower than 10 at Step 2 (full-proposal) will not be considered for funding.

IEP members will identify strengths and weaknesses (if any) and provide context for their comments based on the application, i.e., IEP members will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an IEP member identifies

substantial shortcomings, they must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned. There should be consistency between the numerical scores and the written comments.

The 0-5 scoring system for each criterion indicates the following assessment:

Table 5 Scoring system

0	Failure	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 score is agreed upon for each criterion by minimum of the three IEP members who evaluated the proposal. The agreement on the score will be obtained during the IEP meeting. An individual threshold of three out of five will be applied for each criterion. For pre-proposals, and as a derogation from the Horizon Europe general annexes, a threshold of three out of five will be applied; i.e. pre-proposals with a score less than three in any of the two criteria will not be recommended for invitation to submit a full-proposal. For full-proposals, the general annexes fully apply, i.e. full-proposals with a score less than three for any of the three criteria will not be recommended for funding. For full-proposals, a second overall threshold of 10/15 will be applied with respect to the total score (sum of the three scores per criterion); i.e., proposals with a total score under 10 will not be selected for funding. All proposals will be ranked according to the final scores agreed during the IEP meeting. The outcome of the joint evaluation is irrevocable.

8.3 Selection and funding decision

The final ranking list will be communicated to the CB, which will meet to decide on the projects to be selected for funding.

For this decision, the CB will select projects for funding on the basis of the ranking list built in accordance with the evaluation results, and the availability of funds.

Proposals with the same final scores will be prioritised by the CB taking into consideration the following principles (priority order as listed). The CB can decide how to use these principles providing that they are used uniformly for all proposals:

- 1) Promoting a balanced funding among FOs (favouring proposals which request funding from FOs that have no projects selected yet or have a low amount of funding requested); thereby also striving for geographical balance;
- 2) Maximizing the total number of projects funded and thus optimizing the amount of EU financial support to the FutureFoodS Partnership call;
- 3) Strive for balance between different topics and types of projects of the Call;

The outcome of the evaluation process and the funding decision will be communicated to the Coordinators by the CO. Evaluation summary reports will be provided to the Coordinators. The

Coordinators are responsible for forwarding all of the information to the proposal partners. Following receipt of the selection letter, the Coordinator and all of the partners involved in the successful proposal will initiate all necessary steps for the project start as described in section 9.1.

The decision on the full-proposals selected for funding will be published on the FutureFoodS website, with a mention that this decision is subject to final approval by the FOs concerned. The following information will be published:

- Project title and project acronym;
- Duration of the project;
- Project summary;
- Total requested funding of the project;
- Name and contact information of the project Coordinator;
- Country, organisation and participant name of each partner.

8.4 Redress procedure

A mechanism will be established according to Article 30 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/695 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 April 2021²³ to ensure the independent and fair treatment of complaints related to this call. An applicant may request an evaluation review if it considers that the applicable evaluation procedure has not been correctly applied to its proposal. This redress procedure only covers the procedural aspects of the evaluation and/or eligibility checks, including the national/regional eligibility checks. The request for redress will not call into question the scientific or technical judgement of appropriately qualified members of the IEP.

Where redress is sought, the Coordinator of the proposal shall submit their appeal to the FutureFoodS CO via email. The appeal must be submitted within no more than 14 calendar days after the date of dispatch of the evaluation outcome by the CO at the end of relevant phase (pre-proposal or full-proposal phase).

Admissibility of request for redress

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

- The request for redress must be submitted by the Coordinator of the (pre- or full-) proposal to which the request for redress relates;
- Only one request for redress per (pre- or full-) proposal will be considered;
- The request for redress must be addressed to the CO;
- The request for redress must be submitted via email within the 14 calendar days deadline.

The request for redress must respect the format and contain the minimum information as follows:

- The acronym and the title of the (pre- or full-) proposal;
- A description of the alleged shortcomings of the evaluation procedure;
- Description of the redress must respect the limit of 7000 character counts (excluding spaces).

The request for redress must demonstrate a procedural irregularity, factual error or misuse of powers, or a Col. Requests for redress that do not meet the above conditions, that do not deal with the evaluation of a specific proposal or that express mere disagreement with the result or the reasoning of the evaluation will be judged unsuitable for redress.

²³ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/695/oj>

Procedure

Upon receipt of a request for redress, an acknowledgement of receipt will be sent by the CO at once and no later than within three calendar days.

All requests for redress received within the 14 calendar days deadline will be processed together and the decision will be communicated to the Coordinator of the proposal within 14 calendar days from the deadline for submitting requests for redress.

The FutureFoodS CB will establish a redress committee for each request consisting of the nominated IO of the respective call as well as two representatives of participating FOs not involved in the research proposal seeking redress. The role of the Redress Committee is to evaluate the requests for redress according to the procedure, ensuring fair and equal treatment of applicants, with the support of the CO. The committee will provide its opinion on the implementation of the evaluation procedure, based on the available information related to the proposal and its evaluation, and will make a recommendation to the CB. The final decision on the outcome is made by the CB.

A negative outcome of a national/ regional eligibility check conducted by a FO cannot be overruled by the Redress Committee. Requests for redress concerning national/ regional eligibility decisions will be assessed by the FO responsible for the national/ regional eligibility check, which will justify its decision to the Redress Committee, to prove that national/ regional funding rules listed in the call text have been applied correctly.

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 in that there was a breach that affected the evaluation outcome and the final decision on whether to fund the proposal in question. 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 the basis of another criterion, or if by adding the maximum points for this criterion, the final score remains below the funding threshold.

The score following any re-evaluation will be deemed definitive. It may be lower than the original score. All requests for redress will be treated in confidence and will not prejudice future applications.

9 Obligations of funded projects

9.1 Contract negotiations

Once the Coordinators have been informed of the funding decision, the partners within the projects selected for funding will either be contacted by the FOs or will need to contact the FOs of their respective countries/regions themselves. This in accordance with the applicable regulations and practices, in order to start the contract negotiation process and accomplish the remaining steps until the project can start. All project partners within the funded projects shall start no later than April 2027. Please be aware that applicable European regulations on all aspects of funding must also be respected, e.g., state aid regulations.

Each FO will fund their respective applicant(s) within the project. Formal funding decisions are made by the participating FOs and funding will be provided according to applicable national/ regional funding regulations and subject to clarification of any specific ethical issues raised by the evaluators.

The start date and end date of the groups within the consortium must be aligned as far as possible.

9.2 Contractual requirements

In this call for proposals, being co-funded by the European Union, project partners are considered as third parties of FOs. All project partners commit to the following articles of the Horizon Europe Annotated Grant Agreement²⁴ and related regulations of Annex 5:

- Conflicts of interest (Article 12)
- Confidentiality and security (Article 13)
- Ethics and values (Article 14)
- Visibility (Article 17)
- Specific rules for carrying out the action (Article 18)
- Information obligations (Article 19)
- Record-keeping (Article 20)

Moreover, the bodies mentioned in Article 25 (e.g. granting authority, the European Court of Auditors (ECA), the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF)) have the right to carry out checks, reviews, audits and investigations on the project partners, and in particular to audit the payments received. If access is denied by the project partners, the costs will be rejected.

9.3 Consortium agreement

For some FOs, a signed consortium agreement might be required for release of the national/regional funds. Successful consortia shall negotiate and sign a consortium agreement before commencement of the project to satisfy applicable national/regional funding regulations. 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/>).

9.4 Project monitoring and reporting

In addition to the reporting required by the national/regional regulations of the relevant FOs, reporting will be required half-way through the project in the form of a mid-term report (MTR; M18 for 36-month projects) and an End-term report (ETR) at the end of each project. 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 co-funded call and FutureFoodS's general objectives. All project partners will have to deliver input for these reports. However, it is the responsibility of the Coordinator to submit the complete reports on time (see section 5.6). 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 FutureFoodS Partnership.

In order to enhance knowledge sharing and networking amongst the projects and the dissemination of the project results, kick-off, mid-term and final meetings will be organised by FutureFoodS. The Coordinators shall represent their projects at these meetings. Coordinators should include budget for attendance of three mandatory joint network meetings (kick-off in 2027, mid-term in 2028 and final meeting in 2029) in their finance plan during proposal submission. These meetings will take place in Europe (for budgeting purposes it is suggested to assume these meetings will take place in Brussels).

²⁴ https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/guidance/aga_en.pdf

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 FutureFoodS.

9.5 Dissemination requirements

A list of the funded projects will be published on the website of the FutureFoodS Partnership and all communication channels the partnership is contributing to upon completion of all contract negotiations. Applicants should be aware that certain information obtained from the proposals, as listed under section 8.3, will be published for promotion purposes.

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 FutureFoodS. Respective logos will be provided on the submission platform and the FutureFoodS website.

National/ regional funders' regulations in terms of acknowledgement of national/ regional grants must also be respected.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to make sure that any peer-reviewed journal articles they publish are 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 (see Annex G). Please note that the respective FOs may also have specific requirements in terms of open access to data.

10 ANNEXES

Annex A Impact Plan

Annex B Overview of National Contact Points/ Regional Contact Points (NCP/RCP)

Annex C Pre-proposal template

Annex D Full-proposal template (full-proposal only)

Annex E Letter of commitment template (full-proposal only)

Annex F Data Management Plan (full-proposal only)

Annex G Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication Plan (full-proposal only)

Annex H List of FutureFoodS partners allowed to participate in co-funded projects

Annex I National/ Regional regulations