



Co-funded by the
European Union



Frequently Asked Questions

Lower Silesia 360° Integrated Farm Advisory Implementation

Anonymised publication | 7 October 2026

Important

This FAQ consolidates and paraphrases applicant questions so that applicants and organisations cannot be identified from names, contact details, distinctive business profiles or copied email wording. It is a clarification aid only. The published call documents and the final contracting documents remain authoritative.

How to use this document. Questions are grouped by topic. Applicants should read each answer together with the published Call Guidelines and the documents referenced at the end of this FAQ.

Topics covered

- Eligibility and consortium composition
- Funding, financial assessment and payments
- Technical scope, software and data access
- Farm data, training and KPIs
- Soil sampling and MRV coordination
- Application and contracting boundaries

1. Eligibility and consortium composition

1.1 Does a recently incorporated organisation face an automatic exclusion from this call?

No. There is no separate call-specific exclusion merely because an organisation is recently incorporated. Each consortium member must independently satisfy the applicable legal eligibility, exclusion and sanctions conditions. The applicant or consortium must also meet the call-specific requirements, including the required organisational experience in Poland and delivery capacity.

1.2 How are a young organisation's eligibility and financial capacity assessed?

Legal eligibility and any requested financial-capacity assessment are handled during onboarding and cannot be pre-cleared through the FAQ process. EIT Food may request supporting information from a selected participant and will determine any resulting conditions through the applicable onboarding and contracting process.

1.3 Must the organisation itself have been legally established in Poland for three years?

No. The call requires the applicant or consortium to demonstrate at least three years of relevant organisational experience in agronomic advisory, farmer training or regenerative agriculture implementation in Poland. It does not state that the organisation must have been legally established in Poland for three years. The applicant must nevertheless demonstrate the required experience and capacity to deliver in Poland, including continuous Polish-language farmer-facing capacity and English-language reporting capacity.

1.4 Can the professional experience of key experts replace the organisational-experience requirement?

The qualifications and previous experience of key experts may strengthen the evidence of team and operational capacity. However, the published criterion refers specifically to organisational experience. Individual experience should therefore not be assumed to replace the required organisational experience automatically.

1.5 In a consortium, must every member independently have three years of relevant experience in Poland?

No. The wording of the call is that the applicant or consortium must demonstrate the relevant organisational experience. It does not state that each consortium member must independently have three years of that experience. Each member must still independently satisfy the applicable legal eligibility, exclusion and sanctions conditions.

1.6 What should a consortium demonstrate in addition to eligibility?

The consortium must designate one Activity Leader and present one coherent implementation approach. The proposal should clearly explain roles, budgets, decision-making, data access, quality control and accountability, and show how the consortium collectively provides the experience and operational capacity required to deliver all areas of the call.

1.7 Can legal entities established outside Poland participate?

The call permits applications from legal entities established in eligible countries under the applicable Horizon Europe rules. An entity established in an EU Member State can in principle participate, subject to the other call conditions. An entity from a non-associated third country may participate, but its eligibility for EIT funding is subject to the applicable Horizon Europe country and funding rules. EIT Food cannot pre-confirm a specific entity's eligibility or funding status through an FAQ response.

2. Funding, financial assessment and payments

2.1 Are applicants expected to provide co-funding?

For this call, funding is based on actual eligible costs and the Call Guidelines state that applicants are not expected to provide co-funding. All claimed costs must still satisfy the applicable Horizon Europe eligibility requirements and the call's value-for-money requirements.

2.2 Does this call impose equity, royalties, profit-sharing or revenue-sharing?

The Call Guidelines do not themselves establish a specific equity, royalty, profit-sharing or revenue-sharing mechanism for this advisory implementation call. The model KAVA states that provisions concerning a financial return mechanism apply where required and stipulated in the Activity Plan. Applicants should rely on the final approved Activity Plan and contracting documents for the arrangement that applies to a selected participant.

2.3 Is prefinancing available?

Yes. The Call Guidelines state that EIT Food will disburse funding in instalments and that a proportion of the Activity budget will be pre-financed based on company size. Subsequent annual payments are linked to eligible costs reported by the recipient. The precise amount and timing also depend on the disbursement of funds from EIT to EIT Food.

2.4 Can EIT Food confirm a fixed advance percentage or first-payment date before application?

No single call-wide percentage or fixed first-payment date is specified in the published Call Guidelines or model KAVA. The annual disbursement schedule is determined under the applicable EIT Food funding-allocation and payment rules, taking account of participant category, project type, onboarding, contracting and individual circumstances.

2.5 What evidence is accepted from a newly incorporated organisation without several years of accounts?

The Call Guidelines do not prescribe a separate fixed document list specifically for recently incorporated organisations. EIT Food may request a financial-capacity assessment during onboarding. Applicants should be ready to provide the evidence requested in that process rather than assume a particular substitute document will be accepted.

2.6 Can a minimum advance be guaranteed, and will a guarantee be required?

No applicant-specific minimum advance or guarantee outcome can be confirmed through the FAQ process. Depending on the financial assessment, EIT Food may apply an enhanced financial-responsibility regime, additional or multiple prefinancing instalments, one or more guarantees, or no prefinancing. An unsatisfactory assessment may also result in a request to replace the entity or, where necessary, rejection of the proposal.

2.7 Can later payments be linked to milestones or deliverables?

The model KAVA allows further disbursements through instalments linked to milestones, deliverables or acceptance conditions, in accordance with the applicable annual disbursement schedule. Disbursements may also be linked to reported eligible costs. The balance reimburses remaining eligible costs and is subject to approval of the final periodic report.

2.8 Does the published material specify payment deadlines after acceptance or the percentage retained until closure?

No. The published Call Guidelines and model KAVA do not specify an applicant-specific payment interval, guaranteed payment deadline after each deliverable, or fixed retention percentage for this call. For consortium applications, the Call Guidelines state that payments will only be made once all required contracts have been signed.

3. Technical scope, software and data access

3.1 Can a consortium include a technical partner providing digital tools or software adaptations?

Yes, a technical contribution may be proposed where it supports the implementation functions required by the call. The proposal should explain the purpose, readiness, interfaces, responsibilities and budget of the technical contribution and demonstrate that it is necessary, feasible and proportionate.

3.2 Where is the boundary between eligible implementation development and open-ended software R&D?

This is an implementation call, not an open-ended software R&D call. Technical work must be demonstrably necessary for approved implementation tasks, consistent with the work plan, eligible under the applicable actual-cost rules and justified as value for money. The call does not specify a separate software technology-readiness threshold.

3.3 How must a proposed technical solution relate to the existing MRV infrastructure?

The call requires one integrated implementation model that complements, rather than duplicates, the separately contracted MRV infrastructure. The designated infrastructure covers data management, modelling, environmental assessment and reporting. The selected implementer is expected to work with the designated project platform and MRV consortium.

3.4 Which platform- and evidence-related functions fall within the advisory implementer's scope?

The call includes collecting and validating required farm information, supporting completion of records in MyEasyFarm, maintaining visibility of data completeness, resolving platform validation issues and MRV queries, quality-controlling evidence, and preparing Transition Plans and implementation outputs.

3.5 Who owns background intellectual property and funded results?

Applicants retain full and exclusive ownership of their prior information and intellectual-property rights and must hold the rights needed for material included in the application. The Call Guidelines also preserve the right to further develop, use and license an applicant's intellectual property for products, services and technology. Ownership of Results, Access Rights and any consortium-specific arrangements are governed by the documents referenced in the call and should be addressed in the consortium agreement.

3.6 May applicants assume unrestricted access to APIs or farmer data?

No. Applicants should not assume unrestricted API or farmer-data access. Proposals must explain data access, security, retention and traceability arrangements. The technical and data interfaces needed by the selected implementation will have to be agreed within the approved operating model and applicable data-governance arrangements.

4. Farm data, training and KPIs

4.1 Must the advisory team recollect a complete historical dataset from every farmer every year?

No. The call requires the selected applicant to collect and validate the historical, baseline and annual farm-management information required by the approved landscape MRV framework. For the inherited cohort, implementation should start from existing project records and transferred data, with gaps identified during mobilisation rather than duplicating information already available.

4.2 What data is expected from newly recruited farmers?

New farmers must provide sufficient historical or baseline information where required by the approved MRV methodology. After the baseline is established, the normal expectation is annual updating of relevant management and practice information while maintaining continuity against that baseline.

4.3 How should the 120-farmer EITHE07 target be interpreted?

The target relates to "Graduates from EIT labelled programmes." Applicants are required to set annual targets in their proposed implementation model. It should not be interpreted as requiring every participant to complete an identical three-year programme. The final annual targets and evidence requirements will be confirmed in the approved proposal and Activity Plan.

4.4 Can the training programme use modular or cohort-based pathways?

Yes. The programme may be modular or cohort-based to accommodate a growing farmer cohort, provided the proposal explains how the programme will satisfy the EIT Label requirements and how participants will achieve the learning outcomes needed to be reported under EITHE07.

4.5 When is a participant considered an EITHE07 graduate?

Attendance at a single training event is not sufficient. EITHE07 concerns graduates of an EIT-labelled programme. Completion requirements must be defined through the accredited programme design, including its learning outcomes and assessment approach, and supported by the required participant data and evidence.

4.6 When should accreditation be obtained?

Accreditation is required for training to be claimable under EITHE07. Applicants should therefore include accreditation early enough in their programme planning for the accredited pathway and its participants to support the KPI during the activity period, and should plan around the official application windows and process.

4.7 Is there an automatic exemption from accreditation fees?

No automatic fee waiver is established by the call. Applicants should review the current accreditation guidance and, where an accreditation-related cost is considered necessary, treat it in accordance with the call's actual-cost, eligibility and value-for-money requirements.

4.8 What does the annual 90% training and demonstration-activity KPI mean?

For 2027 and 2028, the requirement is at least four farmer group training sessions annually and at least 90% of active farmers participating in one or more eligible training, demonstration or structured peer-learning activities during the relevant year. It does not require 90% of farmers to attend every event. Percentage-based reporting must state both numerator and denominator, and a farmer should not be counted more than once within the same indicator merely because they attended several activities.

5. Soil sampling and MRV coordination

5.1 Is there a fixed number of MRV soil organic carbon samples for 2027 or 2028?

No fixed annual number is provided in the call. The KPI is completion of 100% of the MRV-designated SOC sampling, or an approved exception, by 30 November of the relevant year. The MRV consortium will define or approve the methodology, strata, selected farms and land-management units, sampling locations, depths, composite requirements, quality controls and replacement rules.

5.2 Why can the sample number vary?

The technical sampling design is statistical and depends on factors including final project area, spatial variability, the approved methodology and the available sampling envelope. The implementer must therefore be capable of delivering the approved annual campaign rather than assuming a fixed volume in advance.

5.3 What is the difference between MRV SOC sampling and agronomic soil assessment?

MRV SOC sampling follows the MRV-approved design. Agronomic soil assessment supports Transition Plans and requires the applicant to propose a proportionate methodology that uses existing suitable analyses where appropriate and avoids unnecessary duplicate testing.

5.4 How should applicants cost soil sampling where annual volumes may vary?

Applicants should propose a credible costing and unit-rate approach that can accommodate reasonable variation in annual volumes. They should not independently increase or decrease the MRV SOC sample count outside the approved MRV design. For agronomic assessment, applicants should justify the testing needed for credible Transition Plans.

6. Application and contracting boundaries

6.1 Can EIT Food pre-approve an applicant structure or consortium arrangement through the FAQ?

No. EIT Food can clarify how the published requirements should be interpreted, but it cannot recommend or pre-approve a particular applicant structure before evaluation. Applicants must determine the most appropriate structure based on the eligibility requirements and the roles proposed in the application.

6.2 Which documents should applicants use as the controlling source?

Applicants should base their proposals on the published call materials and the final documents referenced in them. This FAQ is a clarification aid and does not amend the Call Guidelines, evaluation criteria, model KAVA, applicable policies or the final contracting documents.

Reference documents and official guidance

- [Lower Silesia 360° Integrated Farm Advisory Implementation call page and published materials](#)
- [Call Guidelines: financial aspects, payment arrangements and requirements for selected proposals](#)
- [EIT Food KAVA Contract BP 2026–2028 model: Articles 7 and 8](#)
- [EIT Food EIT Label accreditation information](#)
- [Horizon Europe participating countries](#)

Applicants should also consult the Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement and Annotated Model Grant Agreement, the EIT Food IP Policy, the applicable Financial Support Agreement, and the EIT Food Payments Schedule / Project Financing Policy referenced by the Call Guidelines.

Publication and privacy note

This version intentionally omits applicant names, organisation names, email addresses, personal qualifications, jurisdictions linked to a particular applicant, and verbatim email correspondence. Questions have been reframed as generally applicable clarifications.