

Clarification Note No 3

EUSPA internal reference: [WF 320080](#)

Grant procedure:
EUSPA/GRANT/01/2025
"Galileo HAS enabled Space receiver"

Questions raised through the grant mailbox

Question no. 9: In the Call for Proposals EUSPA/GRANT/01/2025 – Galileo HAS enabled Space Receiver, Section "2.1 Objective of the call for proposal" defines both Objective 1 and Objective 2 as targeting the development of technologies for GNSS receivers that can benefit from the Galileo HAS service for assets in space, differing only in terms of time horizon and market readiness.

In Section "2.2 "Scope of the project", for both Objective 1 and Objective 2, it is further stated that the proposed solution shall *"exploit the availability of HAS SiS and demonstrate the achievement of a PPP solution also when the receiver operates at ground, potentially adopting a suitable (alternative) dynamical model and configuration"*.

From a technical perspective, ground-based PPP processing relies on a dynamical model fundamentally different from spaceborne POD and does not represent a spaceborne navigation capability. In addition, the target receiver technology for ground and spaceborne operation typically differs significantly, including aspects such as RF front-end, signal chain and DSP architecture.

Could EUSPA please clarify the intended role, scope and expected level of development of the ground PPP operation within the context of the call?

This clarification is requested in order to ensure a consistent interpretation between Sections 2.1 and 2.2 and to allow to appropriately scope the associated development and demonstration activities, avoiding the unintended development of two distinct receiver solutions within a single action.

Answer no. 9: The dynamical model at ground (i.e.: modelling a constant acceleration) is completely different with regard to what can be experienced in space by a satellite.

The Contracting Authority wants to be sure that the processing chain for HAS corrections disseminated by Galileo E6-B SIS is correctly implemented. This implies adopting the genuine data flow that is effectively disseminated by Galileo space segment, and not a simulated one which might represent a potential misleading interpretation of how HAS really works.

Thus, while the configuration of the RF front-end can be tested for spaceborne dynamics with a modern RF simulator, including the original HAS messages disseminated by Galileo becomes quite cumbersome with such kind of set-up.

In order to demonstrate that the receiver equipment outcome of the project is fully compatible with the HAS well before embarking it on a space vehicle, minimising the potential risk of failing its mission, it should be demonstrated that the receiver equipment has PPP capability by a proper configuration of the RF front-end and a modification of the sequential filter, in order to host a simplified dynamical model when performing a test at ground; if this technical approach is deemed not viable by the applicant, it has to demonstrate the possibility of testing PPP capability when at ground with real HAS data messages by an alternative, adequate approach.

Question no. 10: We would like to ask for a clarification regarding the interaction between Article I.10 of the draft Grant Agreement (Mono-Beneficiary), Special Conditions and Article II.9.3(d) of Annex II

of the draft Grant Agreement.

Article I.10 provides that, without prejudice to Article II.9.3, the European Commission and EUSPA acquire rights to use the results of the action, and that such results will be exploited for non-commercial purposes only.

However, Article II.9.3(d) refers to the right to authorise any form of distribution of results or copies of the results to the public. In light of the definition of "Results" in Article II.1, which is broad and includes data, knowledge, information and associated IPR, we would appreciate confirmation that the right of distribution under Article II.9.3(d) is also limited to non-commercial purposes.

In other words, we would like to understand whether Article I.10 should be read as limiting the exercise of the rights listed in Article II.9.3, including distribution, strictly to non-commercial purposes.

Answer no. 10: We confirm that the right of distribution under Article II.9.3 (d) is limited to non-commercial purposes. With regard to Article I.10 please note that this provision is part of the special conditions which prevail and specify the provisions included in the general conditions, including Article II.9.3.

Question no. 11: In view of Section 5.5 of the Call for Proposal, does any legal or capital link (including an indirect) suffice for the definition of "affiliate" and if not, what are specific requirements to the quality of a legal or capital link to qualify the respective entity as "affiliate" in relation to the beneficiary?

Answer no. 11: Please note that an entity affiliated to a beneficiary is an entity that has a structural link with a beneficiary, in particular a legal or capital link.

The legal and capital link defining the affiliation encompasses mainly two notions:

- (i) *Control*, as defined in Directive 2013/34/EU, on the annual financial statements, consolidated financial statements and related reports of certain types of undertakings (thus encompassing Entities directly or indirectly controlled by the beneficiary such as daughter companies or first-tier subsidiaries; entities controlled by an entity controlled by the beneficiary also under further tiers of control; entities directly or indirectly controlling the beneficiary such as parent companies. Likewise, they may be entities controlling an entity controlling the beneficiary and entities under the same direct or indirect control as the beneficiary (sister companies).
- (ii) *Membership*, i.e. the beneficiary is legally defined as a e.g. network, federation, association in which the proposed affiliated entities also participate, or the beneficiary participates in the same entity (e.g. network, federation, association) as the proposed affiliated entities.

Please note that the structural link referred above is neither limited to the action nor established for the sole purpose of its implementation. This means that the link would exist independently of the award of the grant; it should exist before the call for proposals and remain valid after the end of the action.

Question no. 12: Please confirm that, as part of the core activities, the items "Design and development plan of the innovative technology", "Dissemination plan" and "Testing and validation plan" as used in Section 2.3 of the Call for Proposals shall be read as referring to planning activities only (definition, structuring, scheduling, and resourcing), and not to the execution of the corresponding design, development, testing, validation or dissemination activities.

Answer no. 12: Yes, it is confirmed.

- End of document -