

Clarification Note #1

Grant procedure: EUSPA/GRANT/01/2026 “Receiver box for PRS civilian applications”

(EUSPA internal reference: 324664)

Question #1:

Paragraph 9.2 Operational capacity (A4 Form), page 21

The A4 Form does not include any section related to the Operational capacity and, in fact, A4 Form refers to “Declaration of Honor”.

EUSPA-GRANT-01-2026 - Annex III - B1 FORMs (the template for the technical and financial proposal), includes the paragraph “OPERATIONAL CAPACITY – FORM B2”, page 12.

Could you please confirm this is the correct reference described in the mentioned para. 9.2?

Paragraph 16.1.1 Structure of the Proposals, page 40

The table included in this paragraph lists a set of sections of the proposal that seems not to be aligned with the templates for the proposals available in the EUSPA call web page ([Receiver box for PRS civilian applications / EU Agency for the Space Programme](#)). Specifically:

- *A1: Coordinator profile, should read: “A1: Consortium Composition”*
- *A2: Co-Applicant profile, should read: “A2: Coordinator”*
- *A3: Declaration of Honor, should read: “A3 Co-Applicant profile”*
- *A4: Operational capacity form, should read: “A4 Declaration of Honor”*
- *As mentioned in the first clarification bullet, Operational capacity form should refer to B2 (a section of the B1 template)*

Could you please confirm this is the correct association?

Paragraph 16.1.2 Structure of the Proposals, page 41

Clarifications similar to the previous request apply also to this paragraph.

Paragraph 16.2 Form and Supporting Documents, page 42

The table included in this paragraph lists the deliverables to be provided by content/applicant. The association with the templates provided for the call seems to be affected by the same issues reported in the previous requests.

Could you please confirm this misalignment and provide the updated table?

Answer:

It is confirmed that the correct reference of the Operational Capacity form is "B2". This form is embedded within form B1.

Sections 9.2, 16.1.1, 16.1.2 and 16.2 of the Call for Proposals are modified accordingly.

Please refer to Corrigendum no.2.

Question #2:

We would like to kindly request clarification regarding the following questions included in the call documentation:

- *Have you submitted (or do you intend to submit) in the current year a grant and/or procurement application directly or indirectly from a European institution or agency?*
- *Have you during the last three years obtained EU grants, procurement contracts or loans directly or indirectly from a European institution or agency?*

From our perspective, the wording of these questions leaves some room for interpretation, in particular with respect to the scope of "directly or indirectly" and the intended level of detail.

[Our entity] is involved in a very high number of EU-funded activities each year, including proposal submissions, successful evaluations, and ongoing grants and contracts across multiple institutes and thematic areas. Due to this scale and organizational structure, it is not feasible to provide a fully comprehensive overview in a limited tabular format.

We would therefore appreciate your guidance on the following points:

- What level of completeness is expected in the response (e.g. exhaustive listing vs. representative selection)?

- How should “directly or indirectly” be interpreted in the context of a large organization with multiple legal entities and institutes?
- Whether it would be acceptable to provide a selection of relevant projects/proposals from the submitting institute or business area instead of a complete list across the entire organization?

Answer:

The questions (contained in A1 and A3 forms of Annex I to the Call for proposals) related to involvement in past or ongoing grant or procurement procedures aim in particular at assessing whether the participation in the present Call for proposals could result in double funding. Therefore, the list provided by the Applicant and co-applicants shall allow the Granting Authority to assess that.

It is clarified that the list shall be submitted only for the legal entities involved in the Call for proposals (in their capacity of Applicant or Co-Applicant), and not for all the legal entities constituting the Undertaking¹ in which the legal entity belongs.

Question #3:

Indicative number of awarded projects

Section 4 states that the indicative number of projects is “up to 1 project”. Could you please confirm whether EUSPA intends to award only one grant agreement under this call, subject to the quality and admissibility of proposals, or whether more than one project could still be awarded if several proposals are technically relevant?

Answer: It is confirmed that EUSPA intends to award one grant.

¹ The term “Undertaking” encompasses all entities belonging to the same “single economic unit”, i.e. directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by or under common control of the tenderer or any of the members of the group acting as tenderer, provided that (i) an entity shall be considered part of the Undertaking only for the time during which such control exists, and (ii) for the purpose of this definition, “control” shall be constituted in case any of the following applies to either the legal entity on one side or the tenderer or any of the members of the group acting as tenderer on the other side in relation to each other: (a) holding, whether directly or indirectly, a majority of the voting rights, (b) holding, whether directly or indirectly, more than 50% (fifty per cent) of the share capital, (c) having the right to appoint or remove a majority of the members of the board of directors or other management body, (d) having, by agreement, the right to exercise a majority of the voting rights. Entities which are directly or indirectly controlled by the same entity (as described in points (a), (b), (c) and (d) above are also considered being part of the same Undertaking.

Question #4

Scope of conventional PRS receiver vs server-based PRS receiver approaches

Section 2.1 refers to the development and adaptation of PRS-AM solutions based on conventional PRS receivers, i.e. with integrated security modules, but also server-based approaches, i.e. where the security module is outsourced to a secure environment.

Could you please clarify whether a proposal may focus on a server-based PRS receiver approach only, provided that it addresses the receiver-box objectives, standardised interfaces, PRS-AM integration principles, required use case, prototypes and validation campaign?

Alternatively, is an applicant expected to implement and demonstrate both:

- a conventional PRS receiver / integrated security-module architecture; and
- a server-based PRS receiver architecture?

Answer:

The scope of the grant targets solutions supporting both conventional PRS receivers and server-based approaches. Attention is drawn to the fact that applicants are expected to develop a hosting system (i.e., receiver box) compatible with both scenarios. More details are part of the Proprietary Information accessible following the provision of section 3.2 of the Call for Proposal.

Question #5:

In the Call for Proposals, we understand that indirect costs are to be calculated as a flat-rate of **25% of eligible direct costs (see p.30)**. However, the draft Multi-Beneficiary Grant Agreement appears to provide for a **7% flat-rate for indirect costs (Article I.3.2 (iv))**.

We would be grateful if you could clarify whether the 25% rate mentioned in the Call takes precedence, or whether the 7% rate foreseen in the draft Grant Agreement is intended to apply.

Answer:

It is clarified that indirect costs shall be calculated by applying a flat rate of up to 25% to the direct cost categories that qualify for the calculation of indirect costs, as indicated in sections 12.2 and 12.3.3 the Call for Proposals.

Please see Corrigendum no. 2 for the draft Grant Agreements (both mono and multi, Annex V and Annex VI to the Call for proposals) and Annex IV "C1 Form".

End of document