

CALL FOR PROPOSALS CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE

Publication date: 31 January 2018

Call deadline: 15 May 2018

Questions and Answers (Q&A) Batch N.4 (last update 04/05/2018)

Important Note

Full details of the call requirements are provided on the [SJU web page](#).

Disclaimer

This Q&A (Questions and Answers) list is based on the terms and conditions contained in the documents that comprise the CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE Call for Proposals and relevant rules.

In this document, the SJU may communicate additional information:

- (a) at the instance of potential applicants, solely for the purpose of clarifying the call documentation;
- (b) at SJU own instance, if it discovers an error, a lack of precision, an omission or any other type of clerical defect in the text of the call documentation.

In this context, the Q&A list is intended to ensure that the same guidance is provided simultaneously to all potential applicants.

CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE: Q&As (04 May 2018)

N.	Question	Answer
1	What is a Drone Traffic Manager (DTM) compared to a U-space Service Providers?	Please remind that U2 is about initial services that support the management of drone operations. From the Blueprint we can say a DTM is a specific service provider that provides services essential for the drone traffic management such as flight planning, flight approval, tracking, airspace dynamic information, and procedural interfaces with air traffic control. In addition to the DTM there are other service providers for U-space providing useful services for the operations.
2	Is Norway eligible as an applicant for this call?	<p>Norway is a country falling within the scope of the European Economic Area and the European Free Trade Association and thus falls within the definition of 'third countries' (see Call for proposals, Section 6.1.2 first paragraph, and footnote 8).</p> <p>For the detailed rules for the potential participation of third countries and entities established in third countries under this call, see section 6.1.2 of the call for proposals (second and third paragraph).</p>
3	<p>Is a multiple of participating countries needed in application?</p> <p>Can a consortium be composed by participants from one country? If not how many countries must be in application?</p>	<p>A consortium can be composed of entities forming the consortium from one country if this is a configuration that best delivers the requested scope of work.</p> <p>Please note that for each consortium, at least one of the entities forming the consortium shall be established in an EU Member State (Section 6.1 of the call for proposals).</p> <p>For further guidance on the eligibility criteria, see Section 6 of the call for proposals.</p>
4	<p>For how long will activities run?</p> <p>How long will the project run? 1,2 or 3 years? U1 is supposed to be up in 2019.</p>	See Technical Specification Section 4.4 where the latest date for administrative closure of the grant is shown as March 2020.
5	Is the U-Space Call open to Israeli participants? I have seen no reference to associated countries in the call text, so I assume it is open to all.	<p>Israel is a country falling within the scope of the European Neighbourhood Policy and thus falls within the definition of third countries (see Call for proposals, Section 6.1.2 first paragraph, footnote 8; and EC: European Neighbourhood Policy available at: https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/countries_en).</p> <p>For the detailed rules for the potential participation of third countries and entities</p>

		established in third countries under this call, see section 6.1.2 of the call for proposals (second and third paragraph).
6	Does this call follow the H2020 rules? I could not find in the text any reference for Horizon or any limitation for consortium size (other than the obligation to have at list one EU Member state).	As specified in the Call for proposals, Section 1, the present call is governed by the rules of the SESAR Regulation, CEF Regulation and the Financial Regulation and therefore does not follow the rules designed specifically for H2020. For more details, please consult the relevant reference at page 4 of the Call for proposals. Guidance on eligible applicants can be found in Section 6.1 of the Call for proposals.
7	Pag. 10 of the Application Template presents the model for the Member State Approval. We've made an internal check. Our State does provide this kind of Approvals for CEFs actions proposal, but this follows a process initiated by an online application, which can be traced at ministerial level. The approval is released by mean of form A2.3. Normally, the online application is mandatory (i.e. Application Form Part A - TENtec eSubmission module, for CEF SESAR Call 2017). Do you confirm that no online application is required?	We confirm that no online application is required for this call. Instead, the model of Member State agreement can be found in the Application form, Annex II to the Call of proposals, Section 4.3. It must be dated, signed and sent following the submission procedure in Section 14 of the Call for proposals.
8	The Call sets a calendar posing the grant signature event in between October-November 2018 (cfr. § 3 Timetable). The Technical specification poses a set of "fixed milestones" (cfr. § 4.4 Fixed milestones) including the delivery of the final Study by the end of January 2020, i.e. approximately 13-14 months after the supposed signature of the grant. Should this event be delayed, for any cause, will the "fixed milestones" be forwarded accordingly?	The SJU will make every effort to ensure there is no undue delay in signing the grant. There is no possibility of flexibility to the "fixed milestones" given in the Technical Specifications Section 4.4 and as stated in the call for proposals in Section 6.3 part c) - Eligibility Criteria, Eligible Activities.
9	How will SJU ensure proper coordination, synchronization, mutual understanding, common definitions, same "glossary" and a shared unique reference in between the 9 Long Term Research projects, the VLD already granted (PODIUM), the one being awarded on geofencing (U1?) and the latest projects resulting awarded through this call?	The SJU will provide all Projects access to a collaborative platform for exchange of documentation and inter-project collaboration as described in Section 4.3 of the Technical Specification. Additional details will be provided at the first coordination meeting with the SJU, subject to award and signature of a grant.

10	As a government institution in Switzerland, we are very interested in the Drone initiative. We would like to take part in a consortium to answer the CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE Call. Are you aware of other cities or regions in Europe that would like to take part in this Call?	Unfortunately the SJU is not in a position to provide this kind of information to potential applicants.
11	<p>The call states that: <i>"Only expenditure incurred in EU Member States may be eligible, except where the project of common interest involves the territory of one or more third countries and where the action is indispensable to the achievement of the project concerned"</i></p> <p>Also: <i>"Third countries and entities established in third countries may participate in actions contributing to projects of common interest where necessary in order to achieve the objectives of a given project of common interest. They may not receive financial assistance except where it is indispensable to the achievement of the objectives of a given project of common interest. "</i></p> <p>Can you confirm that the evaluation of this criteria (if the activity is indispensable) will be taken per project (as an Eligibility criteria) before the evaluation and scoring of the proposal– or will this be done at the end together with all other projects to see if there are other projects covering the activity planned in the third country?</p>	<p>Eligibility criteria are laid down in Section 6 of the Call for proposals.</p> <p>Moreover, as specified in section 9.1, "Proposals must first meet the admissibility requirements, as well as the eligibility and selection criteria (of applicants and applications)".</p> <p>The evaluation of the eligibility criteria is performed on each project, independently, and based on its own merit.</p>
12	Can you clarify how "indispensable" under section 6 ("Eligibility criteria") is interpreted?	<p>In accordance with Section 6.1.2 of the Call for proposals, third countries and entities established in third countries may only participate in actions as part of a consortium with (an) entity(ies) forming the consortium from one or more EU Member State(s).</p> <p>In order to receive financial assistance for this participation, two pre-requisites must be cumulatively met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the third countries and entities established in third countries' contribution must be

		<p>"necessary", meaning technically essential for the implementation of the project and to achieve the objectives of this project, and</p> <p>2. the third countries and entities established in third countries' contribution must be "indispensable", meaning that a financial assistance is decisive in the provision of this contribution to the project.</p>
13	Can you confirm that the funding rate is 50%, or what does maximum co-financing rate of 50% indicate?	As specified in the Call for proposals, section 11.3, "The grant will be defined by applying a maximum co-financing rate of 50% to the eligible costs actually incurred and declared by the beneficiary and its affiliated entities".
14	Is a Swiss legal entity eligible only as third country entity? If so, which are the means for demonstrating the necessity of the participation and being therefore eligible for financial assistance (6.1.2)?	See answers to question 5 and 12.
15	Is [<i>an International organisation</i>] an eligible applicant to this call?	<p>As per Section 6.1 of the Call for proposals, International Organisations are not eligible applicants.</p> <p>International Organisation may however be involved in implementing the action under the grant under the provisions governing contracting and sub-contracting under the call for proposals and grant agreement.</p> <p>In the particular case of EUROCONTROL (Founding Member of the SJU) the SJU may systematically involve EUROCONTROL as an integral part of the SJU Coordination with all beneficiaries described in Section 4.1 (Management activities and deliverables) of Annex I – Technical Specifications.</p>
16	<p>Could you please explain the difference between the following two technical requirements:</p> <p>Requirement 1: First Layer The Common basis One or more flying demonstrations h. at least one of these two scenarios Scenario 1: at least two U-space service providers</p> <p>Requirement 2: Second Layer Two focus areas for demonstration Focus Area1: Two or more U-space providers</p>	<p>As specified in Annex I - Technical specifications, Section 3.3 (Page 17) on Second Layer - Focus Area 1: "This focus area deals with the provision of drone traffic management services (DTM) services by two or more different service providers interacting with each other in a common area of interest. This is delivered in addition to the separate provision of other U-space U2 services (e.g. information services) as specified in the common basis (see section 3.2.1 h) above).</p> <p>- All Actions under focus area 1 including "two (2) or more U-space service providers providing drone traffic management services in a shared airspace" shall include at least the following capabilities: sharing of information and data, management of strategic de-confliction, management of changes and updates during the flight, standardisation and regulatory needs."</p>

17	What are the specific functions of a U-Space Service Provider?	See page 24 of Annex I - Technical specifications. U-space services provider: an entity providing services to the end user (the drone operator or leisure drone user); it might use information from different sources identified as data or service providers. These data or service providers are not specific to the U-space ecosystem but, there might need to be recognised as reliable or qualified to provide these data relevant for U-space. Although each U-space service will be provided by a U-space service provider, this is not a one-to-one mapping, as it is likely that a service provider may be able to provide, as part of their portfolio, many U-space services. A provider may also bring in other providers to provide a wider set of services to create their business model."
18	Could you name some companies/institutions that might act as U-Space Service Providers?	See answer to question n.10. In addition, this is for applicants to propose entities that have the necessary competencies and skills required to deliver the services.
19	In section 9.2.1, paragraph 3 of the Call for proposals you state that "The proposal shall provide evidence of synergies between at least two of the sectors covered by Connecting European Facility Regulation and/or other Union Programmes, e.g. "Smart Cities", H2020 programme, SESAR project." Could you clarify what exactly do you mean with "Smart cities"?	See Document "European Smart Cities activities", published on the call page (http://www.sesarju.eu/procurement).
20	To fulfil requirements for application, shall we interpret that (#1) at least two U-space service providers (as legal entities) shall be part of the consortium of a specific proposal submission, or what is required by SESAR is to have (#2) at least two U-Space services, as functionalities for end user (drone operator or leisure drone user)? The latter interpretation would imply that two or more U-Space services will be integrated and offered in the demonstration by the consortium, but as	See answers to question 1 and 17. As a consequence, the focus area 2 is about having two (2) or more DTM in a same geographical area. This only requires having at least two different DTM systems/products and related organisation integrated in the demonstration.

	<p>a means of products, not as legal entities: through APIs and access to the U-space services (e.g. Unifly's Pro Mobile app, Altitude Angel's Guardian app, Airmap app, etc.) and the integration of these apps into the demonstrator, but without including those companies (as legal entities) as part of the consortium. As the rationale of the call is to create a future for an open market where multiple U-space service providers give U-space services and are compatible in shared airspace due to U-space protocol standardisation and not due to business partnerships between or among U-Space service providers (companies), #2 would be our interpretation, but could you please clarify what exactly do you mean under section 3.2, 1i in the Technical Specifications (i.e. "<i>Demonstration(s) shall include: - the use of drones from two (2) or more different manufacturers</i>"? If interpretation #2 is correct how will this be considered in the evaluation phase? As a weakness (and thus a reason for a lower score), or as a strength (and thus a reason for a higher score)?</p>	
<p>21</p>	<p>Analysing the ongoing U-Space SESAR projects which have won funding in previous calls (slides 24-25-26; https://www.sesarju.eu/sites/default/files/documents/events/U-space%20Call%20Infoday.pdf), there is the impression that some EU Member States (such as, for example "Benelux", France, Spain, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Denmark) have been preferred and might be preferred by SESAR respect to others (such as, for example, Greece, Cyprus, Romania, Bulgaria)? We are asking this question as (A) 5 different EU Member States are not that many, and (B) during the open day we heard that "<i>All Actions shall coordinate with other</i></p>	<p>There is no consideration of the EU state in which previous SESAR projects are being conducted in the declared admissibility, eligibility, exclusion, selection and award criteria for this call. The applicable criteria are declared in Sections 5-9 of the call for proposals document and these will be the only criteria used.</p>

	<p><i>projects also from previous calls"</i>, thus from those of slides 24-25-26 of link above, that take place in countries listed above. We wonder if a proposal for a demonstrator in a country that was not represented in winning consortia of previous calls will be considered by SESAR as a weakness or as a strength as it adds activity to a EU Member not involved on a U-Space funded project so far?</p>	
22	<p>In the Call for proposals under eligibility criteria it stated "<i>In accordance with the SPD 2018-2020 and pursuant to Article 9 of the CEF Regulation6, only those proposals submitted by one of the following types of applicants are eligible: - a consortium of public or private undertakings or bodies (hereinafter individually as "an entity forming the consortium") with the agreement of all the EU Member State(s) concerned ..."</i>. Does this mean that not only the agreement of the EU Member State where the demonstration will actually take place is needed (let's suppose Bulgaria), but if the consortium is made of N companies from M EU Member States, those N companies all have to have the agreement for all the M EU Member States? Our concerns is that this requirement will create a barrier to SMEs and give a huge advantage to big corporations or monopolistic ANSPs, who have direct contact and fast access with these offices.</p>	<p>The EU Member States "concerned" by the Action are those where Demonstration activities are proposed to take place. Consequently, it is NOT required that an applicant from an EU Member State, not concerned with the activities being performed, supply an agreement.</p>
23	<p>What is the purpose of this document (Frequently Asked Questions - FAQs)? Is SJU providing individual answers to applicants?</p>	<p>All questions asked, and not only frequent ones, are published in this document on the SJU public web and, for the purpose of clarity, the document has been renamed "Questions & Answers".</p> <p>In line with the principles of equal treatment and good administration, as set in Articles 96 and 112 of the Financial Regulation and 160 of its Rules of Application, the SJU publishes frequently on its public web the full set of answers to questions received during the submission phase and does not provide individual answers to applicants.</p>

		As stated in the Call for Proposals: "Questions shall be addressed to info-call@sesarju.eu and answers will be regularly published in http://www.sesarju.eu/procurement ".
24	Is Switzerland eligible to apply for CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-Space call? Switzerland is an EFTA member and not a fully EU member.	See answer to question n.2
25	Under Financial Provisions (section 11 of the Call for proposals document) it is stated: " <i>The grant will be defined by applying a maximum co-financing rate of 50% to the eligible costs actually incurred and declared by the beneficiary and its affiliated entities</i> ". Does this mean that only a 50% of SESAR JU financing is granted to all consortium partners in any case, no matter what kind of partner it is (Research institute, SMEs) ?	See answer to question 13. Moreover, there is no difference in financing based on the legal nature of the beneficiary.
26	Our consortium is formed by companies and one university from three different countries, but the demonstrator is planned in only one country. How many Approvals or any declarations/agreements from government do we need to deliver?	Please see answers to question 22 and 27. Apart from the Agreement of the Member State(s) concerned, please note the requirement of a letter of support from the National Supervisory Authority of the State where the activities are proposed to be performed (Section 8.2 of the Call).
27	In "Infoday" presentations, page 56, there is mentioned: " <i>A consortium of public or private undertakings or bodies with the agreement of all the EU Member State(s) concerned.</i> " followed by " <i>The application must contain the agreement of the EU MS where the activities will be performed.</i> " The activities, however, are not specified. If all is related just to the place of the demonstrator and flying UAVs, then I understand we need to provide an Approval only from one State where the demonstrator will be situated/performing demonstrations. Is this correct? Does the Approval mean the same as an agreement in statements above?	Please see answers to questions 22 and 26. Agreement is required from EU Member State(s) in which demonstration activities will take place. Agreements referred to in Sections 6.1 and 6.2.1 of the Call address the same type of the agreement.
28	With reference to section 8.1 of the Call for Proposals. We are preparing a proposal encompassing many	According to the Call for proposals the requirement applies to each entity forming the consortium.

	<p>companies, some of them with a very small contribution to the global project. Being the expected grant for the whole project bigger than 750.000 EUR, can you please confirm that all and each of the entities forming the consortium have to provide the audit report on their last financial year for which the accounts were closed, even if their contribution to the project is small (for instance, lower than 80.000 EUR)?</p>	
<p>29</p>	<p>We plan to submit an application for the call CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE. Before stating a such decision, we have some questions about this call :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it preferable to integer U-Space services suppliers as full members of a consortium or as subcontractors? 2. Page 8, “agreement of the EU Member State”: what is the expected level of agreement? Regulations authorities? Others? 3. Page 9, “The awarded projects shall perform full demonstration activities within their host EU Member State by August 2019...” : does the applicant have to do the demonstration in the country of the entity that submits the application? 4. Page 17, “costs of research activities are not eligible”: what are the expenditures considered as eligible for the funding by SJU (logistic workload for the preparation of operations, specific material renting, environmental studies, permitting, specific material integration, etc...)? 5. Annex I, page 7, “Technology Readiness Level (TRL8)”: linked with the previous question, do we have a flexibility for the targeted actions? It is mentioned TRL8, but is this level applicable for subsystems or for 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the choice of the applicant and the SJU will not evaluate the choice made only the ability to meet the requirements in accordance with the declared criteria in the call. However, please note that subcontracting cannot cover core tasks of the action. Please consult also answer to Q29. 2. See Page 10 of the Application Form (Annex II). 3. No, and the agreement of the Member State provided in point 2 above shall be that of the state(s) in which the demonstrations are proposed to be performed. 4. Eligible costs are costs actually incurred by the beneficiary of a grant, which meet all the criteria laid down in Article 126(2) of the Financial Regulation. Eligible costs may take exclusively the form of direct costs, i.e. those specific costs that are directly linked to the implementation of the action and can therefore be attributed directly to it. Costs of research are not eligible due to this call being governed by CEF rules. 5. Target level of TRL8 that is applicable at the System level, leaving flexibility for integration of modified sub-systems. Proposals will be assessed against the award criteria declared in the call - see Page 15, including "The proposal is sufficiently ambitious and credible to add substantial value to Europe if deployed at a wide scale and also has the potential to move to market take-up (B2B or B2C) within 36 months". 6. Yes. In support of their Studies, Actions shall perform full demonstration activities within their host EU Member State by August 2019 and deliver to the SJU an initial study report, concentrating on the results of the demonstration activities, in September 2019. 7. Please note that location is a crucial element for achieving the overall call objective leading to the establishment of between 5 and 10 sites undertaking pilot activities located in 5 different EU Member States. Thus, the location/s must be specified in the proposal. Providing alternative locations in a proposal has not been requested and will not be considered. You may submit a proposal that links together demonstrations in two or more

	<p>the whole system? In other terms, are the IVV activities at system level eligible for adding specific subsystems in relation with U-Space? Do some limited modifications of subsystems in order to integrate them in the system be eligible?</p> <p>6. Annex I, page 21, "Completion of demonstration activities" : Is the last date (August 2019) compulsory?</p> <p>7. Annex 2, page 16, description of the action": what is our level of flexibility about the localisation and the dimension of the actions? Concretely, we plan two areas for the actions (either Italy or France): could we mention this alternative in the annex 2 and give our final choice in the Study Plan submitted in February 2019?</p>	<p>Member States, either with or without cross border operations.</p>
<p>30</p>	<p>Our understanding has been that drone operations, telecom services, and use case owner interest can be addressed through a) partnership (and not consortium membership) where no money is transferred and b) subcontracting when costs need to be covered, e.g. for drone operations and telecom services. We see that although central to the Action, they are not necessarily "Core".</p> <p>Main question: how is "Core service" defined? Pragmatic questions:</p> <p>1. Can a drone operator be a part of the Action without being a consortium member, i.e. charge for modifying their drone, and operate it as part of a use case in the Action, and charge a consortium member coordinating drone operations for service? Or is the drone operator's role seen as "Core", and the drone operator should join the consortium?</p>	<p>Core activities are activities on which the achievement of the objectives of the action directly depends. Subcontracting is allowed for tasks which are auxiliary to the main object of the project. Their purpose is to facilitate/make possible the core activities. Please note that all entities performing the core activities must be members of the Consortium. To your pragmatic questions:</p> <p>A drone operator's role is considered to be a core activity. The nature of the involvement of a telecom operator (whether it is a core activity or an auxiliary one) might depend on the technological solutions proposed, for what a conclusive answer can be given only based on a more detailed description of the service/equipment to be provided. The described involvement of a police force or other authority is considered to be a core activity.</p>

	<p>2. Can a telecom operator supply sell 3G/4G modems, potentially with custom firmware to the drone operators and UTM service suppliers for the C2 links, and charge a consortium member for the products and services without being a member of the consortium, or is this seen as “Core”, and the telecom operator should join the consortium?</p> <p>3. If the police force or other authority is part of a use case and uses a consortium member’s UTM service to interact with the other drones in the use case – a use case which is part of the Action – does the police need to be a consortium member a) if they charge for their participation, b) if they do not charge for their participation?</p>	
31	<p>In the frame of the call CEF-SESAR-2018-1, we are setting up flying demonstrations. Most of the flights will happen in the summer 2019 to be able to submit tangible results by September 2019, as requested by the Call. However, we see the opportunity to fly another demonstration in October 2019 to bring in new and relevant outcomes to the final report of January 2020. Would that timeline be acceptable, considering the second set of flights will bring extra value to the first version of the report?</p>	<p>As long as the obligations for flying and contribution to the initial Study Report are fully met then additional opportunities to perform flying demonstrations after the summer of 2019, and that are performed in support of bringing additional and relevant outcomes, can be included in the proposed scope and reported within the final Study Report of January 2020.</p>
32	<p>In the “Checklist for Applicants” (Annex II – Grant Application Form) under point 3 is requested an “appropriate statement from banks or tax declaration or evidence of professional risk indemnity insurance” making reference to “section 9.1 CFP”. As in point 9.1 there is no reference to this document, we kindly ask you to clarify:</p> <p>a) which kind of document we need to produce;</p> <p>b) if a template is available;</p>	<p>Professional indemnity insurance provides your business with protection against claims for financial loss, bodily/personal injury or property damage arising from an act, error or omission in the performance of professional services. Your bank should be able to provide this document (each bank has their own template). Each entity of the Consortium has to provide a separate document.</p>

	c) if this statement must be unique for the whole consortium or provided by each entity forming the consortium.	
33	In the “Checklist for Applicants” (Annex II – Grant Application Form) under point 4 is requested “in case a grant is >750.000,00, an audit report produced by an approved external auditor certifying the accounts for the last financial year available (section 9.1 CFP)”. Since the balance sheet, requested under the correct point 8.1 of the financial capacity section CFP, is normally certified by an external auditor, we would like to know if the audit report is still necessary and if so, whether this report must be unique for the whole consortium or provided by each entity forming the consortium.	Yes, the audit report is necessary. According to the Call for proposals the requirement applies to each entity forming the consortium (see also answer to question 28).
34	NEW! Could you please confirm if a government entity could participate as a partner in this call?	Please see Section 6.1 of the Call. The following types of applicants are eligible: One or more EU Member State(s); or a consortium of public or private undertakings or bodies. Depending on its legal status, a government body appear to be entitled to participate as a public body.
35	NEW! Our entity is listed on a stock exchange, of which 53% of the shared capital is held by the Italian Government, in charge of the provision of air traffic control and navigation services within the airspace and the airports placed under its own responsibility by national law without time limit. Our understanding is that our entity falls within the definition of public sector body defined under section 8.2 of the Call for proposal CEF-SESAR-2018-1 U-SPACE and therefore, does not need to demonstrate its financial and operational capacity. We kindly ask you to confirm if our understanding is correct.	Under Section 8.2 of the Call for proposals, the need to demonstrate financial and operational capacity does not apply to applicants/entities which are either a Member State, a third country or a public sector body established in the EU. This Section further defines a public sector body as a “regional or local authority, body governed by public law or association formed by one or several such bodies governed by public law”. It appears therefore that an entity listed on a stock exchange would not fall under the definition of a public sector body. The need to demonstrate financial and operation capacity would consequently apply.

<p>36</p>	<p>NEW! Could you please confirm if a Municipality could be a partner in such project? Finally, can the coordinator have a managing and dissemination entity as a partner for the financial, administrative and dissemination activities?</p>	<p>Under Section 6.1 of the Call for proposals that defines the eligible applicants, EU Member State or a consortium made of public or private undertakings or bodies may apply to the present Call for proposals. As a public body, a municipality can participate to a consortium as a member thereto. Under Section 6.1, a consortium is formed by entities forming the consortium. A consortium must nominate a consortium coordinator. Please consult ANNEX III to the Call – Model Grant Agreement under the Connecting Europe Facility which stipulates the specific role and obligations of a consortium coordinator. It is not possible to transfer these obligations to another entity forming the consortium.</p>
<p>37</p>	<p>NEW! We are considering to participate in a consortium and would like to make some parts of the Agreement clear: a) Who are the "The Beneficiaries" in the Agreement; b) Is sharing intellectual property rights obligatory? If yes, what are the possibilities to avoid it?</p>	<p>a) Beneficiary/ies is/are the applicants (i.e. one or more EU Member State or all entities forming a consortium) whose proposal will be awarded under the conditions stipulated in the call and with whom the SJU will sign a grant agreement. For the definition of an applicant, please see Section 6.1 of the Call. b) The provisions on intellectual and industrial property rights stipulated in the grant agreement apply. Modifications of the provisions of the Model Grant Agreement are not possible.</p>
<p>38</p>	<p>NEW! Yet, we're still quite unclear what exactly is required as for the following Q&A n. 32. In the Annex II there's a request for "appropriate statement from banks or tax declaration or evidence of professional risk indemnity insurance for an insurance". This is referred to CFP 9.1, while clearly it refers the par. 8.1 of the Call "Financial Capacity". In the CFP text, there's no such request. When we compare the 8.1 text of this CFP with, i.e. the SJU Call for VLD GEOFENCING Call, this is even more evident. In this previous call, par. 8.1. the recital is the following: The applicants' financial capacity will be assessed on the basis of the following supporting documents to be submitted with the application: 1. a declaration on their honour and</p>	<p>The checklist for Applicant in Annex II - Application form has been corrected accordingly and published on the website https://www.sesarju.eu/procurement</p>

	<p>EITHER (2) the profit and loss account as well as the balance sheet for the last financial year for which the accounts were closed; for newly created entities: the business plan might replace the above documents; OR (3) the table provided for in the application form, filled in with the relevant statutory accounting figures, in order to calculate the ratios as detailed in the form. (3) Appropriate statement from banks or tax declaration or evidence of professional risk indemnity insurance. OR Looking more in depth on the web, it looks like this request is one of the possibilities to provide evidences of the financial capabilities, as for CFP 8.1. Specifically, the provision of “appropriate statement from banks or tax declaration or evidence of professional risk indemnity insurance”, seems to apply to “natural persons” rather than companies, which will provide the balance sheets and other evidences of its financial capability.</p> <p>Since deadline is quickly approaching, we urgently need to have a clear statement whether what is requested is mandatory (for each member of the consortium) or it is one of the options to prove each member financial capacity.</p>	
39	<p>NEW! Is it possible to submit application by the consortium, that formally will be set up (with the signed agreement) after submission the application? When is the deadline for establishing formally the consortium?</p>	<p>All entities involved in the Consortium must be identified in the Application Form at the time of the submission of the proposal. Under Art. 12 of the Model Grant Agreement, “beneficiaries within the Consortium shall conclude an internal cooperation agreement regarding their operation and co-ordination, including all internal aspects related to the management of the beneficiaries and the implementation of the action”. There is no obligation to have such a consortium agreement signed at the time of the submission of</p>

		proposal, however, the consortium shall have it signed, if awarded a grant, and before the signature of the relevant grant agreement, at the latest.
40	<p>NEW!</p> <p>1. <u>Omitting Affiliates & Management/Structure Info:</u> Section 6.1.5 of the CFP states that “[e]ntities forming the consortia may designate affiliated entities within the meaning of Article 122(2)(b) of the Financial Regulation, <i>for the purposes of supporting the implementation of the action submitted for funding.</i>” Accordingly, please confirm that if a coalition member is not requesting nor receiving funding, that coalition member does not need to identify affiliate entities (see Secs. I.1.3, I.3.3, II.1.3, II.2.3 of the Application, Annex. II.) and/or its management and entity structure (see Sec. I.4 of the application, Annex. II.);</p> <p>2. <u>Clarification on “Affiliate”:</u> We would appreciate further clarification on what is considered an Affiliate entity. Footnote 9 of the CFP states “Affiliated entities are legal entities having a structural legal or capital link with applicants, which is neither limited to the action nor established for the sole purpose of its implementation, may take part in the action as affiliated entities. For that purpose, applicants shall identify such affiliated entities in the application form.” We recognize your definition in Footnote 9 of the CFP is similarly worded to Article 122(2)(b) of the Financial Regulation, which is also referenced in Section 6.1.5 of the CFP. We would appreciate (a) confirmation that coalition members should only identify affiliate entities that will provide support to the coalition member in furtherance of the proposed activities; and (b) clarification on the level or type of support for which</p>	<p>1. All affiliated entities supporting the implementation of the action must be identified.</p> <p>2. a) Affiliated entities supporting the implementation of the action must be identified. There is no need to identify affiliated entities which are not supporting the action. b) All affiliated entities supporting the implementation of the action must be identified, regardless of the points quoted above.</p> <p>3. Please refer to paragraph 2 of Section 8.2 (Operational Capacity) of the call for proposals. “Applicants must show within their respective proposal the intended means of delivering the complete set of skills, competencies, experience and availabilities in all aspects of the planning, executing, coordination, analysis and reporting necessary to cover the full scope described in Section 2 and applicable parts of section 3 of the Technical Specifications document.” In this context the list and description of the technical equipment, tools and/or facilities at the disposal of the applicant” specifically refers to the technical equipment, tools and/or facilities related to the proposed activities (i.e., not all equipment, tools and facilities the Consortium Lead or Consortium Members may have that are unrelated to this proposal or the proposed activities). The list and description provided is therefore NOT limited to that provided solely by the consortium lead, but those at the disposal of the applicant in the context of the whole scope of the work to be performed.</p> <p>4. Please refer to paragraph 2 of Section 8.2 (Operational Capacity) of the call for proposals. “Applicants must show within their respective proposal the intended means of delivering the complete set of skills, competencies, experience and availabilities in all aspects of the planning, executing, coordination, analysis and reporting necessary to cover the full scope described in Section 2 and applicable parts of section 3 of the Technical Specifications document.” In this context the list and description of the patents at the disposal of the applicant relates</p>

	<p>an affiliate entity should be identified, including but not limited to whether an affiliate should be identified, for example, (i) only if it is contributing funds, or (ii) only if it is signing documents as part of the application; or (iii) if it pays the salary of one or more individuals who may also be involved in the proposed activities?;</p> <p>3. <u>Scope of Request Concerning Technical Equipment, Tools and Facilities:</u> Section 8.2 of the CFP indicates that applicant must provide “[a] list and description of the technical equipment, tools and/or facilities and patents at the disposal of the applicant”. With regard to a list and description of the technical equipment, tools and/or facilities at the applicant’s disposal, please confirm the information requested is only with regard to the consortium lead. Please also confirm the request is also only with regard to the technical equipment, tools and/or facilities related to the proposed activities (i.e., not all equipment, tools and facilities the Consortium Lead or Consortium Members may have that are unrelated to this proposal or the proposed activities);</p> <p>4. <u>Scope of Request Concerning Patents:</u> With regard to identifying and describing patents, as referenced in Section 8.2 of the CFP, please confirm that this is a request to identify and describe only EU patents specifically claiming a UAS traffic management system that are owned by the consortium lead or consortium members.</p> <p>5. <u>Scope of Judgments/Decisions:</u> Please confirm that any request to identify, declare or provide copies of final judgments or final administrative decisions is limited in scope to jurisdictions in the EU.</p>	<p>to the operational capacity of the organisation to perform the work being called for. You may choose relevant patents as necessary to best show the operational capacity of the organisation to undertake the Action.</p> <p>5. We understand it that your question refers to the Declaration on Honour – Situations of exclusion concerning the entity(ies). No, any relevant judgement or decision is to be considered when filling in the Declaration on Honour, regardless of the jurisdiction.</p>
41	<i>NEW!</i>	In case of termination, with regard to the rights and obligations towards the SJU, please

	<p>We are a privately held company and we intend to join one of the U-space consortiums. Can you explain the termination criteria and process for exiting the consortium, so that we can have a better understanding of our legal commitment?</p>	<p>refer to Article II.16 of the Model Grant Agreement which stipulates the rules on terminating the Grant Agreement. In particular, please refer to Article II.16.2 Termination of the participation of one or more beneficiaries by the coordinator. The SJU is not in the position to comment on the rights and obligations which the entities forming the consortium might stipulate among them.</p>
42	<p>NEW! Can a company participate in two projects within the U-space Call through different consortiums at the same time?</p>	<p>Yes, there are no restrictions in terms of participation as applicants.</p>
43	<p>NEW! If a consortium including both ANSP(s) and other organisations are awarded a co-financing grant for a U-Space demonstration, how should ANSP's take possible funding into account when defining their air navigation Unit rate for the coming years? More specifically, every year ANSP's are obliged to adjust their Unit Rate. How should ANSP's take possible funding into account, determining their Unit Rate? More on Unit Rates: https://www.eurocontrol.int/sites/default/files/content/documents/route-charges/reference-documents/eurocontrol-principles-effective-01-11-2013-en.pdf</p>	<p>Please take note of the following provisions of the model GA regarding the costs declared: II.19.1 (d) they are identifiable and verifiable, in particular being recorded in the accounting records of the beneficiary and determined according to the applicable accounting standards of the country where the beneficiary is established and with the usual cost accounting practices of the beneficiary; II.19.2 : "Direct costs" of the action are those specific costs which are directly linked to the implementation of the action and can therefore be attributed directly to it. II.20.1: the beneficiary must be able to provide adequate supporting documents to prove the costs declared, such as contracts, invoices and accounting records. In addition, the beneficiary's usual accounting and internal control procedures must permit direct reconciliation of the amounts declared with the amounts recorded in its accounting statements as well as with the amounts indicated in the supporting documents. II.25.3.5 : Where the final amount of the grant determined in accordance with Articles II.25.1 and II.25.2 would result in a profit for the beneficiaries, the profit shall be deducted in proportion to the final rate of reimbursement of the actual eligible costs of the action approved by the JU for the categories of costs referred to in Article 3(a)(i). This final rate shall be calculated on the basis of the final amount of the grant in the form referred to in Article 3(a)(i), as determined in accordance with Articles II.25.1 and II.25.2. Based on the above, the ANSP should have an accounting system that permits direct reconciliation of the costs claimed for U-SPACE and make sure that these activities are not reimbursed by the Unit Rates, or if they are, that you declare this part under receipts, which will be deducted in proportion to the final rate of reimbursement of the actual eligible costs of the action.</p>

44	<p>NEW!</p> <p>With reference to the para 8.1 of the document “Call for Proposals CEF-SESAR-2018-1 - U-space – Final”: Can it be understood that if some members of the consortium (with a small participation in the budget) do not comply with the requirement of presenting an audit report, the SJU may consider to require additional measures to guarantee the financial capacity of the Consortium for developing the project, but the proposal will continue with the evaluation process?</p>	<p>See Answer to question 28. According to the Call for proposals the requirement applies to each entity forming the consortium.</p>
45	<p>NEW!</p> <p>We do not fully understand the Call for Proposal 6.2.1. Section:</p> <p>1. Each member of the consortium needs a Member State Agreement where we would like to perform the demonstrations, or just the consortium leader needs that document?;</p> <p>2. If we perform the whole demonstration in the consortium’s leader country, do we need a member state agreement if other participants take part in the studies only?</p>	<p>1+2: Section 6.2.1 of the Call states that “any applicant that cannot provide the agreement of the EU Member State for the location where the studies and/or pilot activities are proposed to be performed will not be eligible.” This follows the provisions of Article 9.1 of the CEF Regulation where proposals shall be submitted [...] with the agreement of the Member States concerned”. The concept of “Member State concerned” is explained in Q27.</p> <p>Hence, if the demonstration activities are to be carried out on the territory of several Member States, each of these Member States must provide its agreement to the proposal. The Coordinator shall provide one agreement on behalf of the Consortium for (each of the) Member State concerned (see Section 4.3 of the Application form).</p>
46	<p>NEW!</p> <p>As we have only applied for funding under the H2020 programme and not under the CEF programme before, we feel uncertain on how we can do this. On the CEF programme web page is only little information and this call is not listed there. How shall we apply?</p>	<p>Full information on submission procedure is provided in the Call for Proposals, Section 14. For more information about this call for proposals, please consult the website https://www.sesarju.eu/procurement.</p>
47	<p>NEW!</p> <p>What is the difference in the proposal submission process between H2020 and CEF programmes? How to submit a proposal under CEF programme?</p>	<p>See Answer to question n.46.</p>
48	<p>NEW!</p> <p>I want to use specific sections of a proposal submitted</p>	<p>Templates for submission to the call CEF-SESAR-2018-1 are available at the website https://www.sesarju.eu/procurement, and in particular Annex II - Application form, Annex</p>

	<p>within the H2020 Call. The proposal was not successful and we didn't receive funding. What are the differences between H2020 and CEF templates for proposals? According to my interpretation of Technical Specifications in Annex 1 there are no major differences in the sectioning and subtopics between the templates of the two mentioned programmes.</p>	<p>II a Declaration on honour on eligibility, exclusion and selection, and Annex II b Model estimated budget of the action. See also answer to question n.46.</p>
49	<p>NEW!</p> <p>I am not able to identify the projects mentioned in section 1.6 "Collaboration with SESAR Projects linked to the Actions" of the Annex I -Technical Specifications CEF-SESAR-2018-1. I have already tried using the CORDIS database but was not successful. Can you please provide a link to those projects?</p>	<p>As stated in Annex I - Technical Specifications, Section 1,6 : "<i>Nine (9) projects that have been rewarded under and Exploratory Research RPAS call organised in 2016 (ER2-RPAS call with reference H2020-SESAR-2016-1); they have started working and will address issues and challenges linked to the U-space;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>One (1) VLD project awarded in Q3 2017 following the call ER3/Open VLD open call (with reference H2020-SESAR-2016-2) also published in 2016, that should be kicked off in the beginning of 2018;</i> • <i>One (1) demonstration project on Active Geofencing Service (AGS) under the call with reference SESAR-2017-1 which is expected to be awarded in the beginning of 2018."</i> <p>Therefore, the call identifier must be used in order to activate the search in the CORDIS database, at the hyperlink provided in the same section: https://cordis.europa.eu/search/simple_en. Only signed grant agreements will be available.</p>
50	<p>NEW!</p> <p>We would like to request for an extension of the deadline for submitting applications by 3 weeks, i.e. June 5th 2018.</p>	<p>Without prejudice to other measures the SJU might consider taking, the deadline for the call remains on the 15th May.</p>
51	<p>NEW!</p> <p>We would like to have a clarification of the role of Member States in the U-space Call:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the Call will be financed from CEF, there are some obligations for Member States (regulation 1316/2013). Is there anything specific in regards to the U-space Call? 2. We have also noticed that under point 6.2 of the Description of the Call there is an information that the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under Section 1 of the Call, unless specified otherwise in the Call, the present call is governed by the rules of the SESAR Regulation, CEF Regulation and the Financial Regulation. Therefore, unless specified otherwise, the provisions of the CEF Regulation and the specific requirements of the call apply. 2. The agreement of the MS concerned requested in Section 6.2 of the Call corresponds to the requirement of Article 9(1) CEF Regulation. Section 4.3 of the Application form corresponds to the template which is to be used for obtaining this agreement. Please see

	<p>applicant shall provide the agreement of the EU Member State for the location where the studies and/or pilot activities are proposed to be performed. Shall the section 4.3 of the Annex II (Grant application form for U-space call) on page 10 be treated as the fulfilment of the obligation of a Member State, as stipulated in the regulation 1316/2013 or/and of the agreement of the EU Member State for the location? Are there any other documents that need to be provided by the Member State to support the application?</p>	<p>also answer to Q46. Apart from the Agreement of the Member State(s) concerned, please note the requirement of a letter of support from the National Supervisory Authority of the State where the activities are proposed to be performed, for the purpose of the evidence of operational capacity (Section 8.2 of the Call).</p>
<p>52</p>	<p>NEW! I would like to ask for clarification on the following: 1. Is there a validity requirement for the supporting documents (i.e. legal entity form, bank account form)? In other words the approval must not have been provided more than 3 months prior to the call deadline for example? 2. In Annex 2b (estimated budget) provided, on tabs „consolidated estimated budget” and „applicant no 1 etc” row 40 reads „Please calculate the sum of columns (g), (l), (m) and (n) of Table 1”. Could you please clarify what „columns l, m) and n) refer to?</p>	<p>1. The applicants shall submit recent supporting documents. As a general practice, the documents shall be issued/signed not more than six months prior to the submission of the proposal. An applicant shall make sure that all the information stated in the documents is valid. It should be noted that Annex II a “Declaration on honour on eligibility, exclusion and selection” shall be dully filled-in, signed and dated specifically for the purpose of the present Call. 2. Please disregard row 40 of Annex 2b as it wrongly refers to columns (l), (m) and (n); A corrigendum will be published shortly.</p>
<p>53</p>	<p>NEW! 1. With reference to Annex II.24.5.1: <i>The JU may, at any time during the implementation of the Agreement, suspend the pre-financing payments or payment of the balance for all beneficiaries, or suspend the pre-financing payments for any one or several beneficiaries:</i> May it happen that if a beneficiary (other than [entity]) has committed an error – payment to [entity] may be suspended? 2. With reference to Annex II.24.7: <i>Interest on late</i></p>	<p>1. Please note that all payments are transferred to the Coordinator. While in general, Article II.24.5.1 allows for the described approach, please note that the conditions are rather restricted (i.e. the reference is made to “substantial errors” (letter (a)) or “recurrent errors” (b) or “major delays” (d)). In addition, it should be noted that in accordance to Article 21 the SJU may hold the beneficiaries jointly and severally liable for any amount due to the SJU by any one of them, including for interest on late payment if any, in accordance with Article II.26.3(c). 2. Please note that the Directive 2011/7/EU regulates combating late payment in COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.</p>

	<p><i>payment: Articles II.24.4 and II.24.5, the beneficiaries are entitled to interest on late payment at the rate applied by the European Central Bank for its main refinancing operations in euros ("the reference rate"), plus three and a half points;</i>The EU Directive 2011/7/EU indicates an interest rate for late payments of at least the reference rate plus 8 base points. Why will that not be applied?</p> <p>3. With reference to Annex II.24.9: <i>Date of payment: Payments by the JU shall be deemed to be effected on the date when they are debited to the JU's account.</i> Can it be changed to: credited to the Beneficiary's account?</p> <p>4. The Call for proposals does not contain any provision that prohibits to make changes to the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement. Are applicants allowed to provide changes to the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement together with their applications?</p> <p>5. According to section 6.2.1. of the Call for proposals, the applicant has to provide the agreement of the EU Member State for the location where the studies and/or pilot activities are proposed to be performed. However, section 6.1 provides for that the requirements set forth in sections 6, 7 and 8 of this Call for proposals shall apply to each entity forming the consortium. In case the applicant is a consortium: Does each member of the consortium has to provide an agreement of/with the EU Member State concerned? Or is it sufficient if the agreement with the EU Member State is provided for by at least one member of the consortium?</p>	<p>Under Art. 83(2) of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012 of 29 October 2012 on the rules of application of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, applicable to the SJU:</p> <p>"The interest rate for amounts receivable not repaid on the deadline referred to in Article 80(3)(b) shall be the rate applied by the European Central Bank to its principal refinancing operations, as published in the C series of the Official Journal of the European Union, in force on the first calendar day of the month in which the deadline falls, increased by:</p> <p>(a) eight percentage points where the obligating event is a public supply and service contract referred to in Title V;</p> <p>(b) three and a half percentage points in all other cases."</p> <p>3. This is a standard condition in SJU's agreements. No modifications to the Model Grant Agreement are possible.</p> <p>Please see further Article 111.1 of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012 of 29 October 2012 on the rules of application of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012:</p> <p>"The date of payment is deemed to be the date on which the institution's account is debited."</p> <p>4. The Model Grant Agreement is published together with the Call in order to make sure that all applicants are informed in advance about the applicable rights and obligations. In order to ensure equal treatment, no changes to the Model Grant Agreement are possible.</p> <p>5. Please see answer to Q45.</p>
54	<p>NEW!</p> <p>Could you please explain what is the reason for the</p>	<p>As stated in Article 9 of the CEF Regulation, "Proposals shall be submitted [...] with the agreement of the Member States concerned". 'Member State concerned' should be</p>

	<p>member state agreement? It has to be signed by a competent EU Member State Ministry, who in our case, want to know exactly what they are signing for.</p>	<p>understood as the Member State in the territory of which the proposed Action is planned to be (or is being) implemented. In the case of this call it is the State(s) in which the Demonstrations are proposed to take place and the letter(s) shall be supplied by the Applicant.</p>
55	<p>NEW! Which kind of document is meant with "Letter of support from the National Supervisory Authority"? Which authority is allowed to sign this document?</p>	<p>See also Answer to Question n.26. In this context a National Supervisory Authority is the State body defined in the following link: https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/single_european_sky/national_supervisory_en This body ensures the supervision of the regulatory framework in a Member State. They are responsible, in particular, for certifying and overseeing air navigation service providers as well as for the preparation of national performance plans of the Member States concerned. Consequently, approval from this body will be required in order for live Demonstrations to be performed. The SJU, in its call, requires applicants to provide the SJU with evidence that shows the appropriate National Authority has been contacted and will not unreasonably withhold permission to fly and demonstrate in accordance with the call. This is the principle of a "letter of Support".</p>
55	<p>NEW! For efficiency purposes it is better that one of the partners coordinates certain (administrative specific WP related) activities for different consortium partners. Also, each of the different participating partners is willing to share the cost and agrees to be only 50% refunded by SESAR JU. Can you therefore confirm that participant partners within the same consortium can invoice each other for centralized activities and that such an invoice is eligible for reimbursement when handed in to the partner paying such invoice, given that all other eligibility criteria are met related to the underlying activity? Are there any specific formal aspects that need to be taken into account when performing such an "internal" recharge invoice?</p>	<p>According to Article II.23.2.1 of the GA the final financial statement drawn up in accordance with Annex VI and containing: a consolidated statement of the eligible costs incurred for the implementation of the action as well as a breakdown of the eligible costs incurred by each beneficiary, its affiliated entities and its implementing bodies; (ii) a summary financial statement ("summary financial statement"); this statement must include a consolidated financial statement and a breakdown of the amounts declared or requested by each beneficiary, its affiliated entities and its implementing bodies, aggregating the financial statements by beneficiary and indicating the receipts referred to in Article II.25.3.2 for each beneficiary, its affiliated entities and its implementing bodies; it must be drawn up in accordance with Annex VI. The participant partners cannot invoice each other because according to Article II.19.1 "Eligible costs" of the action are costs actually incurred by the beneficiary.</p>

57	<p>NEW!</p> <p>We would to participate in the next U SPACE CALL (CEF SESAR 2018-1). We are already registered in the H2020 participant portal. Do we need to re-introduce specific information in the frame of this SESAR CALL ?</p>	<p>See answers to question n.46 and n.48.</p>
58	<p>NEW!</p> <p>With reference to section 8.1 Financial capacity it is written "The above mentioned requirements apply to each entity forming the consortium", while in section 8.2 Operational capacity it is stated that "The need to demonstrate financial and operational capacity does not apply to applicants/entities forming the consortium which are a member state, a third country or a public sector body established in the EU." Can you please clarify which supporting documents public sector bodies need to submit attached to the application form?</p>	<p>The specific provision in Article 8.2 prevails. Consequently, a public sector body established in the EU is not obliged to demonstrate its financial and operational capacity. The public sector body shall submit supporting evidence concerning the eligibility and exclusion criteria.</p>