



CALL FOR PROPOSALS AND GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Call reference: GP/EFSA/PLANTS/2023/06

Call title: Experimental and observational evidence to reduce knowledge gaps for risk assessment of new and emerging plant pests

- Lot 1: Improving the knowledge on the European and global distribution of plant pathogenic species of the genus *Colletotrichum*, recently subject to taxonomical changes [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 300 000 Euro; maximum duration is 3 years from kickoff meeting]
- Lot 2: Investigating the epidemiology and control of citrus black spot, caused by the plant pathogenic fungus *Phyllosticta citricarpa*, in Mediterranean citrus growing areas in Tunisia [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 500 000 Euro; maximum duration is 4 years from kickoff meeting]
- Lot 3: Investigating the biology and capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa* of the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala robinsoni*, recently introduced into the EU [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 400 000 Euro; maximum duration is 3 years from kickoff meeting]

Restricted to **the list of competent organisations** established by the Authority's Management Board in application of article 2 the Commission Regulation (EC) No 2230/2004 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of European Parliament and Council Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 with regard to the network of organisations operating in the fields within the Authority's remit.

Brief description of the call objectives: The objective of this Call is to reduce key knowledge gaps for risk assessment of new and emerging plant pests, by collection, through focused research, of experimental and observational evidence. It includes three lots: distribution of *Colletotrichum* species; epidemiology and control of citrus black spot; biology and capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa* of the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala robinsoni*.



INDICATIVE PROCEDURE TIMETABLE

Milestone	Date ¹	Comments
Launch date	25/04/2023	Date of call publication on EFSA's website.
Deadline for applicants to raise clarification questions to EFSA	19/06/2023	If, after having read this Call for proposals and guide for applicants, you have any questions, you may address them to EFSAProcurement@efsa.europa.eu by indicating the Call reference.
Deadline for EFSA to reply to clarification questions	23/06/2023	Replies will be provided on EFSA's webpage where this Call is published and which the applicants are requested to consult regularly.
Deadline for submission of proposals <u>Any proposal posted after the final deadline will automatically be rejected.</u>	30/06/2023 07/07/2023	<p>Applicants can submit proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - either by post (registered mail) or by courier, in which case the evidence of the date of dispatch shall be constituted by the postmark or the date of the deposit slip, to the address indicated below. The applicant submitting a proposal by post or by courier is requested to send an informative advance e-mail to EFSAProcurement@efsa.europa.eu. - or delivered by hand not later than 12.30 hours (Italian time) on the deadline for submission of proposals to the address indicated below. In this case, a receipt must be requested from EFSA as proof of submission, signed and dated by the staff member in EFSA Post Office who accepted the delivery. The EFSA Post Office is open from 8.30 to 12.30 Monday to Friday. It is closed on Saturdays, Sundays and EFSA holidays. <p>Submission by post, courier or hand to this address: <u>European Food Safety Authority - EFSA</u> <u>For the attention of –Laura Gascon Serrano, Finance Unit (Procurement Team)</u> <u>Via Carlo Magno 1/A, I – 43126 Parma, Italy</u></p> <p>Proposals must be submitted using the double envelope system. The outer envelope should be sealed with adhesive tape, signed across the seal and carry the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "CALL FOR PROPOSALS GP/EFSA/PLANTS/2023/06 – NOT TO BE OPENED BY THE INTERNAL MAIL DEPARTMENT". - name of the applicant - the posting date should be legible on the outer envelope <p>The application submission must contain one original unbound paper version and one USB key of all documents, including the technical proposal.</p>
Notification of the evaluation results	July 2023	<p>Estimated</p> <p><i>Attention: outcome of the present call will be communicated to all applicants to the e-mail address indicated in their proposal. Accordingly, applicants who have submitted proposals under the present call are strongly invited to check regularly the inbox in question.</i></p>
Grant agreement(s) signature	August 2023	Estimated

¹ All times are in the time zone of the country of the EFSA.





1.	GRANT OPPORTUNITY AND CONDITIONS	6
1.1	LEGAL FRAMEWORK.....	6
1.2	BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CALL	7
1.3	TASKS, DELIVERABLES, TIMELINES, MEETINGS AND PAYMENTS	18
1.4	INFORMATION ON THE GRANT AGREEMENT	21
1.7	ELIGIBLE ORGANISATIONS	22
1.6	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	23
1.7	IMPLEMENTING CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTING.....	24
1.8	GRANT PRINCIPLES	25
1.9	ESTIMATED BUDGET AND ELIGIBLE COSTS.....	26
1.10	PUBLICITY	26
1.11	PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA IN RELATION TO GRANT PROCEDURES	26
1.12	PUBLIC ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.....	27
1.13	OPEN ACCESS	27
2.	SELECTING PROPOSALS	28
2.1	VERIFICATION OF SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS	28
2.2	ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	28
2.3	EXCLUSION CRITERIA.....	29
2.4	SELECTION CRITERIA	29
2.5	AWARD CRITERIA	32
2.6	PROCESS FOLLOWING THE ASSESSMENT AGAINST AWARD CRITERIA	33
3.	SUBMITTING PROPOSALS	33
3.1	SUBMISSION COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST	33
3.2	SUBMISSION MODALITIES	34
3.3	LANGUAGE OF THE PROPOSAL AND THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	35
3.4	EXPECTED DURATION OF PROCEDURE.....	35
4.	RULES ON ELIGIBILITY OF COSTS.....	36



Annexes:

Annex 1: Draft grant agreement

Annex 2.1: Estimated budget template [Lot 1](#)

[Annex 2.2: Estimated budget template Lot 2](#)

[Annex 2.3: Estimated budget template Lot 3](#)

Annex 3: Financial statement and monthly timesheet template

Annex 4: Confidentiality form



1. GRANT OPPORTUNITY AND CONDITIONS²

1.1 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Article 36 (1) of the Regulation (EC) 178/2002³ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, stipulates that the Authority shall promote the European networking of organisations operating in the fields within the Authority's mission. The aim of such networking is, in particular, to facilitate a scientific cooperation framework by the coordination of activities, the exchange of information, the development and implementation of joint projects⁴, the exchange of expertise and best practices in the fields within the Authority's mission. The list of competent organisations designated by the Member States, which may assist EFSA with its mission, is approved and regularly updated by EFSA's Management Board. The full list of Article 36 organisations can be found [here](#).

EFSA's founding regulation was amended by Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain.

The Commission Regulation (EC) 2230/2004 of 23 December 2004 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of the European Parliament and Council Regulation (EC) 178/2002 with regard to the network of organisations operating in the fields within the EFSA's mission specifies in Article 4 that tasks may be entrusted by the Authority to organisations on the list of competent organisations.

The present call specifically focuses on the below tasks defined in Article 4(3):

1. collecting and analysing specific data in response to a common priority, in particular the Community priorities contained in the Authority's work programmes, and in cases where the Authority's scientific assistance is urgently needed by the Commission, especially in the context of the general plan for crisis management referred to in Article 55 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002;
2. collecting and analysing data with a view to facilitating risk assessment by the Authority, including assessment tasks in the field of human nutrition in relation to Community legislation, especially the compiling and/or processing of scientific data on any substance, treatment, food or feed, preparation, organism or contaminant which may be linked with a health risk, and the collection and/or analysis of data on the exposure of Member States' populations to a health risk associated with food or feed;
3. producing scientific data or works contributing to the risk assessment tasks, including assessment tasks in the field of human nutrition in relation to Community legislation, for which the Authority is responsible; this type of task must correspond to precise problems identified in the course of the work of the Authority, and in particular that of its Committee and permanent Scientific Panels, and must not duplicate Community research projects or data or contributions which it is the industry's duty to provide, especially in the context of authorisation procedures;

² The applicant is reminded that this Call and guide for applicants contains a selection of the most important conditions for the grant implementation. For the full set of conditions, the applicant is invited to consult the draft grant agreement in Annex 1 of this Call.

³ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2002:031:0001:0024:EN:PDF>

⁴ Project is frequently referred to in this Call as "action", in line with EU Financial Regulation terminology.



Article 5(2) of the Commission Regulation (EC) 2230/2004⁵ of 23 December 2004 specifies that the financial support to the networking organisations shall take the form of subsidies (grants) awarded in accordance with the EFSA's financial regulation and implementing rules.

The present Call for proposals and guide for applicants (hereinafter referred to as "the Call") is procedurally governed by Title VIII of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 July 2018 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union.

This call is based on EFSA Founding regulation⁶ and EFSA's 2023 Draft Work Programme for grants and operational procurements as presented in Annex XII of the Programming Document 2023 – 2025, available on the EFSA's website⁷.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CALL

BACKGROUND

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) is the European Union (EU) agency for risk assessment in food safety, animal health and plant health. EFSA activities in plant health focus on regulated, new and emerging plant pests⁸ causing a risk to plants in the EU territory. Such activities are carried out in line with the EU Plant Health Law (Regulation (EU) 2016/2031⁹ aiming to prevent or reduce the risk of entry and spread of new plant pests), by conducting risk assessment¹⁰ and by supporting the EU plant health crisis preparedness. During its assessment, EFSA identifies and characterises limitations of scientific knowledge, evaluating the implications of these uncertainties for its scientific conclusions and also prioritising them to identify potential areas for future research.

The aim of this Call is to address, by collection and analysis of experimental and observational evidence, key knowledge gaps identified during EFSA plant health risk assessment and preparedness activities.

This Call for proposals is divided into three specific lots:

⁵ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:379:0064:0067:EN:PDF>

⁶ Regulation (EC) 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain.

⁷ <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2022-01/amp2325.pdf>

⁸ A plant pest is defined, in the FAO IPPC international standard ISPM n. 5, as "any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products"

⁹ See the EU plant health law at https://ec.europa.eu/food/plants/plant-health-and-biosecurity/eu-plant-health-legislation/new-eu-plant-health-rules_en

¹⁰ See the EFSA Journal online Virtual Issues: [https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1831-4732.Pest-categorisations](https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.1002/(ISSN)1831-4732.Pest-categorisations); [https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.2903/\(ISSN\)18314732.Quantitative-pest-risk-assessments](https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.2903/(ISSN)18314732.Quantitative-pest-risk-assessments); [https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.2903/\(ISSN\)1831-4732.Commodity-risk-assessment-for-plant-health-risks](https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.2903/(ISSN)1831-4732.Commodity-risk-assessment-for-plant-health-risks)



- Lot 1: Improving the knowledge on the European and global distribution of plant pathogenic species of the genus *Colletotrichum*, recently subject to taxonomical changes [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 300 000 Euro]
- Lot 2: Investigating the epidemiology and control of citrus black spot, caused by the plant pathogenic fungus *Phyllosticta citricarpa*, in Mediterranean citrus growing areas in Tunisia [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 500 000 Euro]
- Lot 3: Investigating the biology and capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa* of the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala robinsoni*, recently introduced into the EU [maximum amount of EFSA Grant is 400 000 Euro]

Applicants can apply to one or more lots.

The specific backgrounds for each Lot are described below.

Specific background to Lot 1: Improving the knowledge on the European and global distribution of plant pathogenic species of the genus *Colletotrichum*, recently subject to taxonomical changes

The EFSA Scientific Panel on plant health (hereinafter, the Panel) has recently conducted several pest categorisations of fungal species of the genus *Colletotrichum* (*Colletotrichum fructicola*, *Colletotrichum plurivorum*, *Colletotrichum aenigma*, *Colletotrichum alienum*, *Colletotrichum perseae*, *Colletotrichum siamense* and *Colletotrichum theobromicola*) (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2021a; EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2021b; EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2022), highlighting in its conclusions the key uncertainties on the European and global distributions of these plant pathogens due to the recent taxonomic changes. To reduce such uncertainties and to better define the current geographical distribution of *Colletotrichum* species, the Panel suggested to conduct systematic surveys and to re-evaluate *Colletotrichum* isolates in culture collections by using appropriate pest identification methods.

The genus *Colletotrichum* includes endophytes, saprobes as well as plant pathogens (Cannon et al., 2012; Udayanga et al., 2013). In the past, cultural and morphological characters were used to identify *Colletotrichum* species (Von Arx, 1957; Sutton, 1980, 1992), however it has been shown that these traits are not reliable for species level identification because of their variability under different environmental conditions (Cai et al., 2009; Damm et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2016). More recently, the use of multi-gene phylogenetic analysis has significantly changed the taxonomy of the genus *Colletotrichum* (Cannon et al., 2012; Weir et al., 2012) and several *Colletotrichum* species complexes have been so far identified within the genus *Colletotrichum*.

C. fructicola is a distinct fungal species belonging to the *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* complex, a large group of plant pathogens affecting many different crops (Weir et al., 2012). Based on multi-gene phylogenetics, 22 species and one subspecies have been identified within the *C. gloeosporioides* complex (Weir et al., 2012). *C. fructicola* was reported as the causal agent of coffee berry disease, and of anthracnose, bitter rot and leaf spotting diseases on many woody or herbaceous plants growing in different climates worldwide (Prihastuti et al., 2009; Damm et al., 2010; Cannon et al., 2012; Weir et al., 2012; Fu et al., 2019). The pathogen is morphologically and physiologically identical to other species of the *C. gloeosporioides* complex, but it can be identified based on multilocus gene sequencing analysis. *C. fructicola* was recently reported in the European Union in France (Nodet et al., 2019) and in Italy (Guarnaccia et al., 2016, 2021; Wenneker et al. 2021), however there are uncertainties on the actual global and European distribution and host range of this fungus, because in the past, when molecular tools were not available, identification was conducted only by morphology and pathogenicity tests, which cannot reliably identify *C. fructicola* (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2021a). To reduce these uncertainties, the Panel recommended to conduct systematic surveys and to re-evaluate *Colletotrichum* isolates in culture collections using multilocus gene sequencing analyses (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2021a)

The Panel also conducted a pest categorisation for other five *Colletotrichum* species, belonging to the *C. gloeosporioides* species complex: *C. aenigma*, *C. alienum*, *C. perseae*, *C. siamense* and *C.*



theobromicola. Also for these fungal species there are uncertainties on their actual distribution and host range, particularly with regard to old records when the identification was not performed applying a polyphasic approach¹¹. As for *C. fructicola*, to reduce such uncertainties, the Panel recommended to conduct systematic surveys and to re-evaluate *Colletotrichum* isolates in culture collections using appropriate identification methods (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2022).

Similarly, uncertainties on the global distribution and host range were also listed by the Panel when conducting a pest categorisation for *C. plurivorum*, a fungus of the *C. orchidearum* species complex, which has been reported from Africa, Asia and America to cause anthracnose and pre- and post-harvest fruit rots on more than 30 plant genera. Also for *C. plurivorum*, the Panel recommended to conduct systematic surveys and to re-evaluate *Colletotrichum* isolates in culture collections using appropriate identification methods (EFSA PLH panel et al., 2021b).

CITED REFERENCES

Cannon PF, Damm U, Johnston PR and Weir BS, 2012. *Colletotrichum* – current status and future directions. *Studies in Mycology*, 73, 181–213.

Damm U, Baroncelli R, Cai L, Kubo Y, O’Connell R, Weir B, Yoshino K and Cannon PF, 2010. *Colletotrichum*: species, ecology and interactions. *IMA Fungus*, 1, 161–165

EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), Bragard C, Dehnen-Schmutz K, Di Serio F, Gonthier P, Jacques M-A, Jaques Miret JA, Justesen AF, MacLeod A, Magnusson CS, Milonas P, Navas-Cortes JA, Parnell S, Potting R, Thulke H-H, Van der Werf W, Civera AV, Yuen J, Zappala L, Migheli Q, Vloutoglou I, Campese C, Maiorano A, Streissl F and Reignault PL, 2021a. Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of *Colletotrichum fructicola*. *EFSA Journal* 2021;19(8):6803, 41 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6803>

EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), Bragard C, Di Serio F, Gonthier P, Jaques Miret JA, Justesen AF, MacLeod A, Magnusson CS, Milonas P, Navas-Cortes JA, Parnell S, Potting R, Thulke H-H, Van der Werf W, Civera AV, Yuen J, Zappala L, Migheli Q, Vloutoglou I, Campese C, Maiorano A, Streissl F and Reignault PL, 2021. Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of *Colletotrichum plurivorum*. *EFSA Journal* 2021;19(11):6886, 35 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6886>

EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), Bragard C, Baptista P, Chatzivassiliou E, Di Serio F, Gonthier P, Jaques Miret JA, Justesen AF, MacLeod A, Magnusson CS, Milonas P, Navas-Cortes JA, Parnell S, Potting R, Stefani E, Thulke H-H, Van der Werf W, Vicent Civera A, Yuen J, Zappala L, Migheli Q, Vloutoglou I, Czwieneczek E, Maiorano A, Streissl F and Reignault PL, 2022. Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of *Colletotrichum aenigma*, *Colletotrichum alienum*, *Colletotrichum perseae*, *Colletotrichum siamense* and *Colletotrichum theobromicola*. *EFSA Journal* 2022;20(8):7529, 80 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7529>

Fu M, Crous PM, Bai Q, Zhang PF, Xiang J, Guo YS, Zhao FF, Yang MM, Hong N, Xu WX and Wang GP, 2019. *Colletotrichum* species associated with anthracnose of *Pyrus* spp. in China. *Persoonia: Molecular Phylogeny and Evolution of Fungi*, 42, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.3767/persoonia.2019.42.01>

Guarnaccia V, Vitale A, Cirvilleri G, Aiello D, Susca A, Epifani F, Perrone G and Polizzi G, 2016. Characterisation and pathogenicity of fungal species associated with branch cankers and stem-end rot of avocado in Italy. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 146, 963–976.

Guarnaccia V, Martino I, Gilardi G, Garibaldi A and Gullino ML, 2021. *Colletotrichum* spp. causing anthracnose on ornamental plants in Northern Italy. *Journal of Plant Pathology*, 103, 127–137 Liu et al., 2016

Nodet P, Chalopin M, Cret e X, Baroncelli R and Le Floch G, 2019. First report of *Colletotrichum fructicola* causing apple bitter rot in Europe. *Plant Disease*, 103, 1767. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-11-18-1915-PDN> Prihastuti et al., 2009

Sutton BC, 1980. The Coelomycetes. Fungi Imperfecti with pycnidia, acervuli and stromata. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew, UK. 696 pp.

Sutton BC, 1992. The genus *Glomerella* and its anamorph *Colletotrichum*. In: Bailey JA and Jeger MJ (eds.). 1–23. *Colletotrichum: Biology, Pathology and Control*. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, UK, 416 pp. Udayanga et al., 2013

Von Arx JA, 1957. Die Arten der Gattung *Colletotrichum* Cda. *Phytopathologische Zeitschrift*, 29, 414–468

Weir BS, Johnston PR and Damm U, 2012. The *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* species complex. *Studies in Mycology*, 73, 115–180.

¹¹ A polyphasic approach combines the application of molecular methods (such as multilocus gene sequencing analysis) with morphological and pathogenicity data



Wenneker M, Pham KTK, Kerkhof E and Hartevelde DOC, 2021. First report of preharvest fruit rot of 'Pink Lady' apples caused by *Colletotrichum fructicola* in Italy. Plant Disease. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-11-20-2404-PDN>

Specific background to Lot 2: Investigating the epidemiology and control of citrus black spot, caused by the plant pathogenic fungus *Phyllosticta citricarpa*, in Mediterranean citrus growing areas in Tunisia

The potential of *P. citricarpa* to establish in Europe has been studied previously (Paul et al., 2005; EFSA, 2008; Yonow et al., 2013; EFSA PLH Panel, 2014, 2016; Magarey et al., 2015). The EFSA PLH Panel (2014) combined previous modelling work on *P. citricarpa* ascospore maturation and release (Fourie et al., 2013) and a generic infection model (Magarey et al., 2005), to predict ascospore maturation, release and infection in EU citrus-growing areas. The EFSA PLH Panel (2014) primarily focused on the sexual reproduction cycle, as this was expected to be the principal way for this pathogen to establish and spread in a new area. However, in this assessment, considering the experimental studies on pycnidiospore splash dispersal (Perryman and West, 2014; Perryman et al., 2014), also the pycnidiospore infection was modelled.

Pycnidiospores have been shown to play a key role in citrus black spot (CBS) epidemics in Florida, where the population of *P. citricarpa* is clonal with only one mating type (MAT1-2) present (Wang et al., 2016; Hendricks et al., 2017). In Brazil pycnidiospores have been also reported having a major role in CBS epidemics (Sposito et al., 2007; Sposito et al., 2008), although in that country the presence of complementary mating types also allows the sexual reproduction through ascospores (Amorim et al., 2016). There is other published evidence worldwide showing the importance of pycnidiospores during the early stages of invasion by *P. citricarpa*. In Zimbabwe, at the beginning of the CBS epidemics, most infections were shown originating from pycnidiospores, while ascospores were only found in very small numbers (Whiteside, 1967). Later in 1978, when epidemics were well established, Kotze (1981) found that ascospores were abundant in the same area. In Argentina, Garran (1996) indicated that attempts to detect the sexual stage by weekly sampling of dead leaves in plots affected by CBS were unsuccessful. In Florida, CBS was first observed in 2010 (Schubert et al., 2012) and, as indicated above, CBS disease establishment and spread in this area were attributed to pycnidiospores (Wang et al., 2016; Hendricks et al., 2017).

Pycnidiospores of *P. citricarpa* are dispersed by water splash. Although they have been considered as a short-range dispersal mechanism of minor epidemiological relevance when compared with the airborne ascospores (Kotze, 1981; Kotze, 2000), more recent studies under laboratory conditions demonstrated that *P. citricarpa* pycnidiospores could reach longer distances than previously thought (Perryman and West, 2014; Perryman et al., 2014). In addition, infected leaf litter leaves could be dispersed by wind over relatively long distances (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2018). Citrus regions in Florida and Brazil are characterised by high rainfall during the growing season, creating conditions very favourable for splash dispersal and subsequent infections by pycnidiospores.

In 2017, Guarnaccia et al. reported *P. citricarpa* isolates belonging to only one mating type from leaf litter in few back-yard gardens in the Mediterranean, however these findings were not later confirmed by the national plant health authorities (EFSA PLH Panel et al., 2018).

EFSA reviewed the paper by Guarnaccia et al. (2017) highlighting some methodological uncertainties and found that results from simulation models indicated that climatic conditions at the locations where Guarnaccia et al. (2017) found *P. citricarpa* were conducive for the establishment of this fungus. The number of infection events by *P. citricarpa* pycnidiospores obtained for these locations in Europe was comparable to those from sites of current CBS occurrence outside Europe. However, there are uncertainties on the model parameters for the application to *P. citricarpa* of the generic infection model for foliar fungal pathogens by Magarey et al. (2005). Such uncertainties, due to the lack of epidemiological studies on *P. citricarpa* ascospore and pycnidiospore infection, are discussed in details in previous EFSA opinions (EFSA, 2008; EFSA PLH Panel, 2014).



In 2019 *P. citricarpa* was found, for the first time in a Mediterranean citrus growing area, causing citrus black spot disease in lemon and sweet orange orchards in Tunisia (EPPO 2019a and b; Boughalleb-M'Hamdi et al., 2020).

Following the recent CBS outbreak in Tunisia, Galvan et al. (2022) simulated potential infections by *P. citricarpa* ascospores and pycnidiospores in Mediterranean citrus growing areas using a generic infection model. This study indicated for Tunisia that the percentage of hours suitable for infection would be higher for pycnidiospores than for ascospores and that pycnidiospores infection would be mainly concentrated in autumn and spring.

CITED REFERENCES

- Amorim R, Daiani CS, Ferreira-Maba L, Aluizio R, Goulin EH, Takita MA, Machado MA and Glienke C, 2016. MATgene idiomorphs suggest a heterothallic sexual cycle in the citrus pathogen *Phyllosticta citricarpa*. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 147, 325–337.
- Boughalleb-M'Hamdi N, Fathallah A, Benfradj N, Mahmoud SB, Ali ABH, Medhioub L, Jaouadi I, Huber J, Jeandel C and Ios, R (2020), First report of citrus black spot disease caused by *Phyllosticta citricarpa* on *Citrus limon* and *C. sinensis* in Tunisia. *New Disease Reports*, 41: 8-8. <https://doi.org/10.5197/j.2044-0588.2020.041.008>
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2008. Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Plant Health (PLH) on a request from the European Commission on *Guignardia citricarpa* Kiely. *EFSA Journal* 2008;7(1):925, 108 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2009.925>
- EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Plant Health Panel), 2014. Scientific Opinion on the risk of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* (*Guignardia citricarpa*) for the EU territory with identification and evaluation of risk reduction options. *EFSA Journal* 2014;12(2):3557, 243 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3557>
- EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Plant Health Panel), 2016. Evaluation of new scientific information on *Phyllosticta citricarpa* in relation to the EFSA PLH Panel (2014) Scientific Opinion on the plant health risk to the EU. *EFSA Journal* 2016;14(6):4513, 53 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4513>
- EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), Jeger M, Bragard C, Caffier D, Candresse T, Chatzivassiliou E, Dehnen-Schmutz K, Gilioli G, Gregoire J-C, Jaques Miret JA, MacLeod A, Navajas Navarro M, Niere B, Parnell S, Potting R, Rafoss T, Rossi V, Urek G, Van Bruggen A, Van Der Werf W, West J, Winter S, Baker R, Fraaije B, Vicent A, Behring C, Mosbach Schulz O and Stancanelli G, 2018. Scientific Opinion on the evaluation of a paper by Guarnaccia et al. (2017) on the first report of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* in Europe. *EFSA Journal* 2018;16(1):5114, 48 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5114>
- EPPO, 2019a. EPPO report on notifications of non-compliance. EPPO Reporting Service n. 5/2019. N. article 2019/095.
- EPPO, 2019b. First report of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* in Tunisia. EPPO Reporting Service n. 7/2019. N. article 2019/141.
- Galvañ A, Boughalleb-M'Hamdi N, Benfradj N, Mannai S, Lázaro E, Vicent A. Climate suitability of the Mediterranean Basin for citrus black spot disease (*Phyllosticta citricarpa*) based on a generic infection model. *Sci Rep*. 2022 Nov 18;12(1):19876. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-22775-z. PMID: 36400797; PMCID: PMC9674692.
- Garran SM, 1996. Citrus black spot in the Northeast of Entre Rios: Etiology, epidemiology and control. *Proceedings of the International Society of Citriculture*, Sun City, South Africa, 1, 466–471.
- Guarnaccia V, Groenewald JZ, Li H, Glienke C, Carstens E, Hattingh V, Fourie PH and Crous PW, 2017. First report of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* and description of two new species, *P. paracapitalensis* and *P. paracitricarpa*, from citrus in Europe. *Studies in Mycology*, 87, 161–185
- Hendricks KE, Christman MC and Roberts PD, 2017. Spatial and temporal patterns of commercial citrus trees affected by *Phyllosticta citricarpa* in Florida. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 1641
- Kotze JM, 1981. Epidemiology and control of citrus black spot in South Africa. *Plant Disease*, 65, 945–950.
- Kotze JM, 2000. Black spot. In: Garnsey SM and Graham JH (eds). *Compendium of Citrus Diseases* (Timmer LW, 2nd edition. The American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN, USA. Pp. 23–25.
- Magarey RD, Sutton TB and Thayer CL, 2005. A simple generic infection model for foliar fungal plant pathogens. *Phytopathology*, 95, 92–100.
- Paul I, van Jaarsveld AS, Korsten L and Hattingh V, 2005. The potential global geographical distribution of Citrus Black Spot caused by *Guignardia citricarpa* Kiely: likelihood of disease establishment in the European Union. *Crop Protection*, 24, 297–308.
- Perryman SAM and West JS, 2014. Splash dispersal of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* pycnidiospores from infected citrus. EFSA supporting publication 2014-EN-560, 30 pp.



Perryman SAM, Clark SJ and West JS, 2014. Splash dispersal of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* conidia from infected citrus fruit. *Scientific Reports*, 4, 6568.

Schubert TS, Dewdney MM, Peres NA, Palm ME, Jeyaprakash A, Sutton B, Mondal SN, Wang N-Y, Rascoe J and Picton DD, 2012. First report of *Guignardia citricarpa* associated with citrus black spot on sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) in North America. *Plant Disease*, 96, 1225.

Sposito MB, Amorim L, Ribeiro PJ, Bassanezi RB and Krainski ET, 2007. Spatial pattern of trees affected by blackspot in citrus groves in Brazil. *Plant Disease*, 91, 36–40.

Sposito MB, Amorim L, Bassanezi RB, Bergamin Filho A and Hau B, 2008. Spatial pattern of black spot incidence within citrus trees related to disease severity and pathogen dispersal. *Plant Pathology*, 57, 103–108.

Wang NY, Zhang K, Huguet-Tapia JC, Rollins JA and Dewdney MM, 2016. Mating type and simple sequence repeat markers indicate a clonal population of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* in Florida. *Phytopathology*, 106, 1300–1310.

Whiteside JO, 1967. Sources of inoculum of the black spot fungus, *Guignardia citricarpa*, in infected Rhodesian citrus orchards. *The Rhodesia, Zambia and Malawi Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5, 171–177.

Yonow T, Hattingh V and de Villiers M, 2013. CLIMEX modelling of the potential global distribution of the citrus black spot disease caused by *Guignardia citricarpa* and the risk posed to Europe. *Crop Protection*, 44, 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2012.10.006>

Specific background to Lot 3: Investigating the biology and capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa* of the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala robinsoni*, recently introduced into the EU

X. fastidiosa is exclusively transmitted by xylem fluid-feeding insects of the order Hemiptera, sub-order Auchenorrhyncha, infraorder Cicadomorpha, superfamilies Cercopoidea (spittlebugs or froghoppers), Cicadoidea (cicadas) and Membracoidea (of this latter only the subfamily Cicadellinae - sharpshooters - is relevant) (EFSA PLH Panel, 2015¹² and 2019¹³). The transmission of *X. fastidiosa* by insects does not require a latent period, yet the bacteria are persistently transmitted (Almeida et al., 2005). Vectors (both nymphs and adults) acquire the bacteria by feeding in the xylem of an infected plant and can inoculate the pathogen to healthy plants immediately after acquisition. Bacteria are restricted to the alimentary canal (without systemically infect the insect body), where they adhere to and multiply in the pre-cibarium and cibarium (parts of the foregut). This implies that vectors lose infectivity with moulting, as the foregut is of ectodermal origin and is renewed with moulting. Therefore, newly emerged adults must feed on an infected plant to become infectious and spread *X. fastidiosa*. Once infected, adult vectors can transmit during their whole lifetime, as the bacterium multiplies and persists in the vector foregut (Almeida et al., 2005). Winged adults, because of their high mobility, are mostly responsible for *X. fastidiosa* spread (EFSA PLH Panel, 2015).

Although *X. fastidiosa* transmission is restricted to xylem fluid-feeding insects, the insect transmission of *X. fastidiosa* is known to be poorly specific and therefore all xylem fluid-feeding insects are to be considered vectors (Frazier, 1944; Purcell, 1989; Almeida et al., 2005; EFSA PLH Panel, 2015). However, the transmission efficiency varies substantially depending on the insect species, the host plant and the *X. fastidiosa* genotype (Redak et al., 2004; Lopes et al., 2010; EFSA PLH Panel, 2015). The list of the putative European vectors was provided by EFSA PLH Panel (2015) with the opinion “on the risks to plant health posed by *Xylella fastidiosa* in the EU territory” under table 4 and in Appendix C. Since then, EFSA has been funding detailed studies to collect data on the biology of xylem-sap

¹² See <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.3989>

¹³ See <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5665>



feeding insect vectors of *X. fastidiosa* (in Italy¹⁴, Balearic Islands (Spain)¹⁵ and Portugal¹⁶) and two large EU H2020 funded research projects PonTE¹⁷ and XF-Actors¹⁸ have unravelled the biology and ecology of the main vectors of *X. fastidiosa* in Europe and their transmission capacity.

In 2018 EFSA has conducted a pest categorisation for the non-EU Cicadomorpha vectors of *Xylella* spp., concluding, on 49 species and 1 genus, which was *Draeculacephala* sp., that such species met the minimum requirements assessed by EFSA for consideration as potential EU quarantine plant pest. The non-EU Cicadomorpha vectors of *Xylella* spp. are now listed as EU quarantine plant pests.

In March 2022, Rösch et al. reported the finding, for the first time in the Palaearctic region, of a species from the American leafhopper genus *Draeculacephala*: *Draeculacephala robinsoni* Hamilton 1967. *D. robinsoni* was found in France (Pyrenées-Orientales) and Spain (Catalonia) in 11 different sites with a maximum distance of 86 km between them and with large population sizes (particularly in wetlands), indicating that the species seems already established in the region and might spread to other areas as winged adults who are considered strong flyers (Rösch et al., 2022). *D. robinsoni* is native and widespread in North America, where it is reported on grasses and edges in the period from March to December, with a peak in the summer, thus likely to overwinter as egg (Rösch et al., 2022). The biology of *D. robinsoni* in North America has not been intensively studied, plus the taxonomical changes in the genus *Draeculacephala* make difficult to attribute old studies or reports, which were using a different nomenclature, to *D. robinsoni*. Moreover, when described for the first time (Hamilton, 1967), the species *D. robinsoni* was noted to be very similar to the species *Draeculacephala portola* Ball.

From the genus *Draeculacephala*, the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala minerva* was indicated in several papers as able to transmit *X. fastidiosa*. An experiment conducted by Turner and Pollard (1955), including two insect species, *Draeculacephala portula* Ball and *Draeculacephala balli* Van Duz, showed a limited transmission of Peach phony disease by *Draeculacephala* sp., however at the end of the experiment it was not possible to identify which of these two species was responsible for the transmission. *Draeculacephala portula portula* Ball was considered by Mason and Yonke (1971) as associated with the transmission of chlorotic streak of sugarcane, phony peach disease, Pierce's disease of grapes (citing Nelson, 1968), and corn stunt virus (citing DuRant, 1968).

In conclusion: the American sharpshooter species *D. robinsoni*, a European Union quarantine plant pest, seems established in wetlands and pastures in a large area between Catalonia (ES) and Pyrenées Orientales (FR); winged adults of *D. robinsoni* are strong flyers and thus may spread to other areas; *D. robinsoni* is reported in North America on grasses and sedges and seems overwintering as egg, however there are large uncertainties on the biology of this species due to the low number of ecological studies and to the taxonomic changes; *D. robinsoni* as xylem-fluid feeding insect has to be considered as a potential vector of *X. fastidiosa*; according to literature, *Draeculacephala* species and the species *D. portola* (which is very similar to *D. robinsoni*) were shown to be associated with plant diseases caused by *X. fastidiosa* and some viral plant diseases, however there are uncertainties as these studies are not recent and are not specific for *D. robinsoni*. To understand the host range and the capacity of *X. fastidiosa* transmission for a new potential vector, such as *D. robinsoni* recently introduced into

¹⁴ See the final report of this project published on EFSA Journal Supporting Publications at <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.2903/sp.efsa.2019.EN-1628>, and the related scientific papers at <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/11/2/130> and at <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-54279-8>.

¹⁵ See recent oral presentation given at the 3rd European Conference on *Xylella fastidiosa* at <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-06/Miguel-%C3%81ngel-Miranda.pdf>. The final report of this project is expected to be published during summer 2021 at <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/23978325>.

¹⁶ <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/art36grants/article36/gpefsaalp202107-experimental-and-observational-evidence-reduce>

¹⁷ <https://www.ponteproject.eu/>

¹⁸ <https://www.xfactorsproject.eu/>



Europe, it is very important when considering the very broad host range of *X. fastidiosa* in agriculture plants and native vegetation, which includes 412 plant species from 190 genera and 68 botanical families, based on last update of the EFSA *Xylella* spp. host plant database (EFSA et al., 2022).

The aim of this Lot is to collect data on the biology, ecology (particularly: the host range, the life cycle and its relationship with hosts) and the capacity to transmit *X. fastidiosa* of the insect *D. robinsoni*, an American sharpshooter insect species newly introduced into the EU. Following previous works conducted on xylem-sap feeding insect vectors and potential vectors of *X. fastidiosa* in Europe, the same approach and methodology established during the other three EFSA funded projects in Italy, Spain and Portugal should be applied, in order to obtain comparable results which can be useful for modelling risk and risk mitigation for *X. fastidiosa* in different agriculture systems in Europe, as well as for supporting integrated pest management (IPM) options to control the vectors.

CITED REFERENCES

Almeida RPP, Blua MJ, Lopes JRS, Purcell AH. 2005. Vector Transmission of *Xylella fastidiosa*: Applying Fundamental Knowledge to Generate Disease Management Strategies. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* 98(6): 775-786

Bodino N, Cavalieri V, Dongiovanni C, Plazio E, Saladini MA, Volani S, Simonetto A, Fumarola G, Di Carolo M, Porcelli F, Gilioli and Bosco D. 2019. Phenology, seasonal abundance and stage-structure of spittlebug (Hemiptera: Aphrophoridae) populations in olive groves in Italy. *Sci Rep* 9, 17725. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-54279-8>

Durant JA. 1968. Leafhopper Populations on Ten Corn Inbred Lines at Florence, South Carolina, *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, Volume 61, Issue 6, 15 November 1968, Pages 1433-1436, <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/61.6.1433>

Hamilton KGA. 1985. Review of *Draeculacephala* Ball (Homoptera, Auchenorrhyncha, Cicadellidae). *Entomologische Abhandlungen Staatliches Museum für Tierkunde Dresden*, 49, 83-103

IPSP-CNR: Bari, Torino and Portici; CRSFA Locorotondo (Bari); Università di Torino, DISAFA; Università di Bari, DiSSPA; Università di Brescia, DMMT; Di Serio F, Bodino N, Cavalieri V, Demichelis S, Di Carolo M, Dongiovanni C, Fumarola G, Gilioli G, Guerrieri E, Picciotti U, Plazio E, Porcelli F, Saladini M, Salerno M, Simonetto A, Tauro D, Volani S, Zicca S and Bosco D, 2019. Collection of data and information on biology and control of vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa*. EFSA supporting publication 2019:EN-1628. 102pp. doi:10.2903/sp.efsa.2019.EN-1628

EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), 2015. Scientific Opinion on the risks to plant health posed by *Xylella fastidiosa* in the EU territory, with the identification and evaluation of risk reduction options. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(1):3989, 262 pp., doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.3989

EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH), Bragard C, Dehnen-Schmutz K, Di Serio F, Gonthier P, Jacques M-A, Jaques Miret JA, Justesen AF, MacLeod A, Magnusson CS, Milonas P, Navas-Cortes JA, Potting R, Reignault PL, Thulke H-H, van der Werf W, Vicent Civera A, Yuen J, Zappala L, Boscia D, Chapman D, Gilioli G, Krugner R, Mastin A, Simonetto A, Spotti Lopes JR, White S, Abrahantes JC, Delbianco A, Maiorano A, Mosbach-Schulz O, Stancanelli G, Guzzo M and Parnell S, 2019. Update of the Scientific Opinion on the risks to plant health posed by *Xylella fastidiosa* in the EU territory. *EFSA Journal* 2019;17(5):5665, 200 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5665>

EFSA PLH Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Health), Bragard C, Dehnen-Schmutz K, Di Serio F, Gonthier P, Jacques M-A, Jaques Miret JA, Justesen AF, Magnusson CS, Milonas P, Navas-Cortes JA, Parnell S, Potting R, Reignault PL, Thulke H-H, Van der Werf W, Vicent Civera AV, Yuen J, Zappala L, Malumphy C, Lopes JRS, Czwienczek E and MacLeod A, 2019. Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of non-EU Cicadomorpha vectors of *Xylella* spp. *EFSA Journal* 2019;17(6):5736, 53 pp.

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Delbianco A, Gibin D, Pasinato L, Boscia D and Morelli M, 2022. Scientific Report on the update of the *Xylella* spp. host plant database-systematic literature search up to 31 December 2021. *EFSA Journal* 2022;20(6):7356, 70 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7356>

European Commission (EC). 2022. Latest developments of *Xylella fastidiosa* in the EU territory at https://ec.europa.eu/food/plants/plant-health-and-biosecurity/eu-plant-health-legislation/emergency-control-measures-4/latest_en

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). 2022. *Xylella* Virtual issue: [https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1831-4732.XylellaVI](https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/toc/10.1002/(ISSN)1831-4732.XylellaVI)

Frazier NW, 1944. Phylogenetic relationship of the nine known leaf-hopper vectors of Pierce's disease of grape. *Phytopathology*, 34, 1000-1001.



GP/EFSA/ALPHA/2021/07. 2021. Experimental and observational evidence to reduce entomological knowledge gaps for plant health risk assessment and surveillance

<https://www.efsa.europa.eu/pl/art36grants/article36/gpefsaalp202107-experimental-and-observational-evidence-reduce>

Lopes JRS, Daugherty MP and Almeida RPP, 2010. Strain origin drives virulence and persistence of *Xylella fastidiosa* in alfalfa. Plant Pathology, 59, 963–971.

López-Mercadal J, Delgado S, Mercadal P, Seguí G, Lalucat J, Busquets A, Gomila M, Lester K, Kenyon DM, Ruiz-Pérez M, Paredes-Esquivel C, Miranda MA, 2021. Collection of data and information in Balearic Islands on biology of vectors and potential vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa* (GP/EFSA/ALPHA/017/01). EFSA supporting publication 2021:EN-6925. 136pp. <https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.2903/sp.efsa.2021.EN-6925>

Mason CE, Yonke TR. 1971. Life histories of four *Draeculacephala* species and *Paraulacizes irrorata* (Homoptera: Cicadellidae). Annals of the Entomological Society of America 64: 1393–1399.

Miranda MA, Mercadal P, Delgado-Serra S, Paredes-Esquivel C, Lopez-Mercadal J. 2021. Understanding the epidemiological role of the vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa* in the Balearic Islands (Spain) by long-term macrocosm and microcosm studies. 3rd European Conference on *Xylella fastidiosa* and XF-Actors final meeting. Presentation. Available online: <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-06/Miguel-%C3%81ngel-Miranda.pdf>

Nielson MW. 1968. The Leafhopper Vectors of Phytopathogenic Viruses (Homoptera, Cicadellidae) Taxonomy, Biology, and Virus Transmission. Technical Bulletin, Agricultural Research Service United States Department of Agriculture, 1382, 1–393.

POnTE project: <https://www.ponteproject.eu/>

Purcell AH. 1989. Homopteran transmission of xylem-inhabiting bacteria, pp. 243-266. In K. F. Harris [ed.], Advances in disease vector research, vol. 6. Springer, New York.

Redak RA, Purcell AH, Lopes JRS, Blua MJ, Mizell RF, and Andersen PC. 2004. The biology of xylem fluid-feeding insect vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa* and their relation to disease epidemiology. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 49: 243-270.

Rösch V, Marques E, Miralles-Núñez A. 2022. *Draeculacephala robinsoni* Hamilton, 1967 (Hemiptera: Auchenorrhyncha: Cicadellidae), a newly introduced species and genus in Europe with comments on its identification. Zootaxa 5116 (3): 439 – 448 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.5116.3.8>

OBJECTIVES OF THE CALL

The objective of the call is to reduce uncertainties and knowledge gaps for risk assessment of new and emergent plant pests for the EU territory.

This would contribute to the achievement of the EFSA strategic objective(s):

- Deliver trustworthy scientific advice and communication of risks from farm to fork
- Ensure preparedness for future risk analysis needs.

MAIN OBJECTIVES

The **main objectives** for each Lot of this Call are listed in the Table below:

Title of the Lot	Main objective of the Lot
------------------	---------------------------



<p>Lot 1: Improving the knowledge on the European and global distribution of plant pathogenic species of the genus <i>Colletotrichum</i>, recently subject to taxonomical changes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the knowledge on the current geographical European and global distribution of <i>Colletotrichum</i> spp., such as <i>C. fructicola</i>, <i>C. plurivorum</i>, <i>C. aenigma</i>, <i>C. alienum</i>, <i>C. perseae</i>, <i>C. siamense</i> and <i>C. theobromicola</i> by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ re-evaluating <i>Colletotrichum</i> isolates in culture collections taking into consideration taxonomic changes and, using appropriate pest identification methods (e.g. multilocus gene sequencing analysis), to define ◦ collecting and analysing samples of anthracnose, bitter rot or leaf spotting, for the presence of the above mentioned <i>Colletotrichum</i> species, from host plants in the EU considered as key hosts for these fungal species
<p>Lot 2: Investigating the epidemiology and control of citrus black spot, caused by the plant pathogenic fungus <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i>, in Mediterranean citrus growing areas in Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate the epidemiology of the plant pathogenic fungus <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> in its only outbreak in the Mediterranean citrus growing areas, in Tunisia, with a focus on pycnidiospores infection. • To develop strategies for control of <i>P. citricarpa</i> in citrus orchards in its only outbreak in the Mediterranean citrus growing areas, in Tunisia
<p>Lot 3: Investigating the biology and capacity to transmit <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> of the American sharpshooter <i>Draeculacephala robinsoni</i>, recently introduced into the EU.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To Investigate the host range, ecology and life cycle of the American sharpshooter <i>Draeculacephala robinsoni</i> and its capacity to transmit <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>, to reduce uncertainties on the risk for the EU territory posed by this newly introduced insect species

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives for each Lot of this Call are listed below:

<p>Specific objectives for Lot 1:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To re-evaluate <i>Colletotrichum</i> isolates in culture collections in the EU using appropriate pest identification methods (e.g. multilocus gene sequencing analysis). Based on the results of the re-evaluation of <i>Colletotrichum</i> isolates in culture collections, the occurrence and distribution in the EU territory of different plant pathogenic <i>Colletotrichum</i> species (such as <i>C. fructicola</i>, <i>C. plurivorum</i>, <i>C. aenigma</i>, <i>C. alienum</i>, <i>C. perseae</i>, <i>C. siamense</i> and <i>C. theobromicola</i>) should be updated and discussed. 2. To re-evaluate <i>Colletotrichum</i> isolates in culture collections outside the EU using appropriate pest identification methods (e.g. multilocus gene sequencing analysis). Based on the results of the re-evaluation of <i>Colletotrichum</i> isolates in culture collections, the global occurrence and distribution of different plant pathogenic <i>Colletotrichum</i> species (such as <i>C. fructicola</i>, <i>C. plurivorum</i>, <i>C. aenigma</i>, <i>C. alienum</i>, <i>C. perseae</i>, <i>C. siamense</i> and <i>C. theobromicola</i>) should be updated and discussed. 3. To collect and analyse samples of anthracnose, bitter rot or leaf spotting, for the presence of the above mentioned <i>Colletotrichum</i> species, from host plants considered as key hosts in the EU for these fungal species (the project should focus on the major crops among the confirmed hosts for each <i>Colletotrichum</i> species), by applying appropriate identification methods. Based on the results of the samples analysed, the occurrence and distribution in the EU territory of different plant pathogenic <i>Colletotrichum</i> species (such as <i>C. fructicola</i>, <i>C. plurivorum</i>, <i>C. aenigma</i>, <i>C. alienum</i>, <i>C. perseae</i>, <i>C. siamense</i> and <i>C. theobromicola</i>) should be updated and discussed.



Specific objectives for Lot 2:

The specific objectives of this Lot 2 aim to reduce the knowledge gaps, by gathering experimental and observational evidence on the epidemiology and control of *Phyllosticata citricarpa* in Mediterranean citrus growing areas. This will support risk assessment and modelling (particularly regarding the estimation of parameters of the generic infection model) but will also support development of integrated pest and disease management (IPM) strategies.

The specific objectives of Lot 2 are as follows:

1. To study the epidemiology of *P. citricarpa* pycnidiospores under controlled laboratory conditions, to reduce the uncertainties on the influence of environmental variables on the infection process by such asexual spores. This specific objective will support risk assessment and modelling (particularly with regard to the parameterisation of the generic infection model for *P. citricarpa* pycnidiospores) but will also support development of integrated pest and disease management (IPM) strategies.
2. To study the epidemiology of *P. citricarpa* in the Tunisian outbreak areas, in order to solve or reduce the uncertainties on the influence of environmental variables on the infection process. This specific objective will support risk assessment and modelling (particularly with regard to parameters of the generic infection model) but will also support development of integrated pest and disease management (IPM) strategies.
3. To investigate strategies for sustainable control of *P. citricarpa* in Tunisian citrus orchards, with the aim to prepare for future control strategies in the Mediterranean citrus growing areas.

Specific objectives for Lot 3: Investigating the biology and capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa* of the sharpshooter *Draeculacephala robinsoni*

The specific objectives of this Lot 3 aim to reduce the knowledge gaps, by gathering experimental and observational evidence, on the biology of the sharpshooter *D. robinsoni* and its capacity to transmit *Xylella fastidiosa*. This will help to reduce the uncertainties on the risk for plant health in the EU territory caused by this newly introduced xylem-fluid feeding insect.

The specific objectives of Lot 3 are as follows:

1. To conduct a systematic literature review to collect and analyse published information and data on biology and plant pathogens transmission capacity of the xylem-fluid feeding insect *Draeculacephala robinsoni* and its related species

A systematic literature review should be conducted, without time or language limits, on *D. robinsoni* and other taxonomically related *Draeculacephala* species, with the aim to obtain a comprehensive knowledge, based on published scientific and grey literature as well as on geographical occurrence databases, on:

- pest distribution/occurrences in North America (and Central America when applicable), including information on host plants, time of the year and life stage, of *D. robinsoni* and other taxonomically related *Draeculacephala* species
- biology, ecology, life cycle and host plants of *D. robinsoni* and other taxonomically related *Draeculacephala* species in North America (and Central America when applicable)
- capacity of *D. robinsoni* and other taxonomically related *Draeculacephala* species in North America to transmit *X. fastidiosa* and/or other vector-borne plant pathogens.



2. Contribution to the knowledge of the biology of the xylem-fluid feeding insect *Draeculacephala robinsoni* by collection of experimental and observational evidence

In order to support the assessment of the risk of *X. fastidiosa* for the EU territory, there is a need to collect and analyse data on biology, ecology, life cycle and abundance of xylem-sap feeding insects that could act as potential vectors of *X. fastidiosa* in Europe. This specific objective regards such data collection on *D. robinsoni* from field observations in the areas of new introduction in France and Spain as well as in its native range in North America. Data should be collected in a harmonised way and aligned with the protocols applied in similar work already conducted in Italy and Spain by other EFSA funded projects^{13, 14}. In particular, this work should be done at both microcosm (small rearing cage) and macrocosm (field) level. Details, definitions and examples of the sampling protocols are given in Appendix A of this Call. The data collection should include at least two years of macrocosm and microcosm observations on biology, ecology, life cycle and abundance of *D. robinsoni*. Each sampled location should be georeferenced, also with collection of agronomic and meteorological data (by weather station/data logger).

3. Investigation on the capacity of *D. robinsoni* to transmit *X. fastidiosa*

In order to get a better understanding of the risk for the EU territory of this newly introduced sharpshooter, key issue is the investigation of the capacity of *D. robinsoni* to transmit *X. fastidiosa*. This specific objective includes the conduct of field studies and transmission assays under controlled conditions on transmission of the pathogen *X. fastidiosa* by *D. robinsoni*. All studies involving the handling of infectious vectors and/or infected plants must be done following the required plant health/quarantine authorisations and procedures, when applicable.

1.3 TASKS, DELIVERABLES, TIMELINES, MEETINGS AND PAYMENTS

The maximum duration of the projects for the various lots of this Call is:

- **3 years from kick-off meeting for Lot 1**
- **4 years from kick-off meeting for Lot 2.**
- **4 years from kick-off meeting for Lot 3.**

The applicant may propose shorter duration by technically justifying it in the proposal.

The **Meetings with EFSA and the Deliverables foreseen for both Lots** are indicated in the Table below. All deliverables/reports must be drafted in United Kingdom Standard English language and may be subject to publication at EFSA's discretion. Please note that all reporting, minutes, outcome of the discussions could be submitted at EFSA's discretion to EFSA's Panel, Network and WG members.

Meetings and Deliverables for all three Lots

Meeting	Date	Meeting type	Scope of the meeting
Kick-off meeting	3 months after the signature of the Grant Agreement, at latest	Tele-meeting	The kick-off meeting is regarded as the start of the project. At this meeting, details of the project will be discussed and the objectives, the final report structure, deliverables and timeframe will also be clarified. In particular, the beneficiary will present and discuss in details their project, including: the updated and detailed work plan and Gantt chart; the detailed description of the material and methods; the updated team composition and allocation of tasks.



			<p>Minutes of the meeting shall be taken and provided to EFSA by the beneficiary.</p> <p>The presence at kick-off meeting of a beneficiary's staff member responsible for administrative/finance issues of the project is advised as this will facilitate understanding by the beneficiary of the grant principles, related financial reporting requirements (declaration and documentation of incurred costs) and significantly ease the financial management of the grant agreement, both for EFSA and the beneficiary</p>
Interim meeting	1 month after the submission of the interim report, at latest	Tele-meeting	The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the interim report/deliverables as well as any problems or difficulties (technical or financial) encountered during the first half of the project, which may affect the work plan and project results. Minutes of the meeting shall be taken and provided to EFSA by the beneficiary
Final meeting	1 month after the submission of the draft final report, at latest	Physical meeting, held at EFSA premises (or tele-meeting in case of force majeure)	The purpose of this meeting is to present and discuss with EFSA the final draft report/deliverables as well as any major problems or difficulties (technical or financial) encountered during the project. Minutes of the meeting shall be taken and provided to EFSA by the beneficiary.
Periodical bilateral meetings	Four times per year	Tele-meetings	These periodical meetings are between the Coordinator and the EFSA scientific liaison officer, with the purpose of updating EFSA on progresses of the activities and discussing any problems or difficulties encountered during the period which may affect the work plan and project results. Short notes with actions needed, when applicable, shall be taken and provided to EFSA by the beneficiary.
Deliverable	Date of submission to EFSA	Type	Description of content
Deliverable 1	1 month after the kick-off meeting, at latest	Inception report	The inception report should include the updated and detailed work plan and Gantt chart following the discussion at the kick-off meeting, including the detailed description of the material and methods. The report should also include the updated team composition and allocation of tasks.
Deliverable 2	At 2/3 of the total project duration: - for Lot 1 by month 24 from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 2 by month 32	Interim report	The written interim report must describe in details material and methods and results of the experiments and studies conducted in the first part of the project. The interim report must also include the updated work plan and Gantt chart and detailed and updated description of materials and methods for the second half of the project.



	from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 3 by month 32 from the kick-off meeting, at latest		
Deliverable 3	Two months before project closure: - for Lot 1 by month 34 from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 2 by month 46 from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 3 by month 46 from the kick-off meeting, at latest	Draft final report	The draft final report must comprise the integration of the relevant parts of the inception report and interim report and describe in details material and methods and results of the experiment and studies conducted in the second part of the project. In particular, it must present an overall summary, material and methods, detailed results, conclusions and discussions for the whole project. All the raw data of the conducted experiments and studies must be annexed.
Deliverable 4	By project closure: - for Lot 1 by month 36 from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 2 by month 48 from the kick-off meeting, at latest - for Lot 3 by month 48 from the kick-off meeting, at latest	Final report	The final report, following the review and discussion of the draft final report in the final meeting with EFSA, must comprise the integration of the relevant parts of the inception report and interim report and present an overall summary, material and methods, detailed results, conclusions and discussions for the whole project (including recommendations on follow up studies needed). All the raw data of the host range test experiments must be annexed.

Subcontracting is allowed for non-core tasks only.

Core tasks which cannot be sub-contracted for these projects, for all Lots, are: project coordination and coordination of project work-packages, planning, reporting and communicating with EFSA.

Subcontracting is specifically permitted in the case of activities conducted on quarantine or exotic plant pests in the following cases:



- for Lot 2, to conduct experiments on pycnidiospore epidemiology and control of *P. citricarpa* in Tunisia. Reason for this is that *P. citricarpa* is a Union quarantine plant pest absent from the EU territory, but present in Tunisia. Tunisia is so far the only area in the Mediterranean citrus growing areas with an outbreak of *P. citricarpa* in citrus orchards
- For **Lot 3**, subcontracting is allowed to conduct experiments and collect data on the biology and capacity to transmit *X. fastidiosa* of the insect *Draeculacephala robinsoni* in North America. Reason for this is that both the bacterium *Xylella fastidiosa* and the insect *Draeculacephala robinsoni* are Union quarantine plant pests, native from America.

Please also refer to section 1.7 'Possibility of implementing contracts and subcontracting'.

No.	Payments	Linked to EFSA approval of deliverable No.
1	Pre-Financing payment as specified in articles I.4.1 and I.5.2 of the draft grant agreement (Annex 1 of the call for Proposals). Maximum 50%	N.A.
2	Interim payment , as specified in articles I.4.3 and I.5.3 of the draft grant agreement (Annex 1 of the call for Proposals). Maximum 30%	Deliverable 1 (inception report) and Deliverable 2 (interim report)
3	Payment of the balance as specified in article I.4.4 and I.5.4 of the draft grant agreement (Annex 1 of the call for Proposals). Remaining amount up to the eligible threshold.	Deliverable 3 (draft final report) and Deliverable 4 (final report)

Deliverables must be drafted in English and may be subject to publication at EFSA's discretion.

Please note that all reporting, minutes, outcome of the discussions could be submitted at EFSA's discretion to EFSA's Panel and Working Group members. Use of the grant deliverables may be subject to publication, subject to the terms and conditions set out in the draft grant agreement (Annex 1 of the call for proposals).

1.4 INFORMATION ON THE GRANT AGREEMENT

Applicants should note that the draft grant agreement is published with the call for proposals. If any applicant should have specific comments on the provisions of the draft grant agreement, these must be raised in a clarification, prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals so that a clear and transparent reply may be published for the benefit and information of all applicants.

1.4.1 Direct Agreement

This Call for proposals aims to conclude a Direct Agreement for the performance of the tasks described in these specifications for a fixed duration. The Agreement can be signed between the Authority and one or several partners.

The project to be supported under this Call is co-financed by EFSA at maximum **90% of the total eligible project costs**.



In addition, the maximum possible amount of EFSA grant (in Euro) and maximum duration (in years after the kick-off meeting) for the project is:

Lot	Maximum EFSA grant (Euro)	Maximum duration (in years from the kick-off meeting)
Lot 1 - distribution of <i>Colletotrichum</i> species	300 000	3 years
Lot 2 – epidemiology and control of Citrus Black Spot	500 000	4 years
Lot 3 – biology and capacity to transmit <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> of the sharpshooter <i>Draeculacephala robinsoni</i> .	400 000	4 years

In other words, the grant has double ceiling: the maximum amount and the reimbursement rate applied on the total eligible project cost. EFSA reserves the right not to award the grant agreement and to cancel the whole grant procedure at any time before the signature of the agreement without any compensation to be paid to the applicants.

The total amount of estimated eligible costs, as presented by the applicant in the estimated budget (Annex 2) (see also part 1.9), and which serves as a basis for calculation of the initial EFSA grant, will be verified by EFSA during the evaluation of proposals. EFSA reserves the right to implement the necessary adaptations to the estimated eligible costs in case the [Rules on eligibility of costs](#) were not correctly applied by the applicant.

If the amount granted is lower than the funding sought by the applicant, it is up to the applicant to find supplementary financing or to reduce the total cost of the project without diluting either the objectives or the content.

EFSA intends to fund one proposal for each Lot following this Call. However, EFSA reserves the right not to award all the funds available at any cost, e.g. if the quality of submitted proposals will not be satisfactory.

Please note that EFSA reserves the right not to award any grant and/or to cancel the whole grant procedure at any time before the signature of the grant agreement without any compensation to be paid to the applicant.

1.7 ELIGIBLE ORGANISATIONS

To be eligible, applicants must be on the list of competent organisations designated by the Member States in accordance with Article 36 of Regulation (EC) 178/2002 and Commission Regulation (EC) 2230/2004. This list is regularly updated by EFSA Management Board and is available for consultation using this link <https://efsa.force.com/competentorganisations/s/>.

In order to achieve the main objective of the call, proposals can be submitted by **one eligible organisation or by a consortium of eligible organisations**. In case of a consortium, one of the



partners must be identified in the proposal as the consortium leader. The applicant (consortium leader) is responsible for identifying consortium partners.

1.6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

For proper understanding of this call it is important to have clarity on the terminology regarding involved organisations and their roles.

Proposals submitted by a sole applicant:

- **The Applicant** submits the proposal to EFSA. There can be only one applicant in the proposal.

As soon as the grant agreement is signed, the applicant becomes the beneficiary. The beneficiary is liable for the technical implementation of the project as described in the proposal which becomes Annex 1 of the grant agreement.

The beneficiary:

- Communicates with EFSA;
- Receives and answers all claims EFSA might have in relation to the implementation of the project;
- Requests and reviews any documents or information required by EFSA and verifies their completeness and correctness before passing them to EFSA;
- Informs EFSA of any event that is likely to substantially affect the implementation of the project;
- Submits the deliverables and reports to EFSA;
- Requests and receives payments from EFSA.

Proposals submitted by consortium:

- **The Applicant** submits the proposal to EFSA on behalf of the consortium. The applicant is the leading entity of the consortium.
- **The Partner** is the other entity in the consortium. There can be a minimum of one partner or more partners.

Once the grant is awarded, the grant agreement is signed between EFSA and the applicant (leading entity of the consortium).

Partners do not sign the grant agreement directly but instead sign a mandate (template provided by EFSA) authorising the applicant to sign the grant agreement and any future amendments on their behalf.

As soon as the grant agreement is signed, the applicant becomes the Coordinator and partner/s become co-beneficiary/ies. The coordinator and co-beneficiary/ies are referred to as the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries are jointly and severally liable for the technical implementation of the project as described in the proposal which becomes Annex 1 of the grant agreement. If a beneficiary fails to implement its part of the project, the other beneficiaries become responsible for implementing that part.

The coordinator has the following important roles:

- Takes part in implementing the project;
- Monitors the action is implemented properly;



- Act as intermediary for communication between the consortium and EFSA;
- Receives and answers all claims EFSA might have in relation to implementation of the project;
- Requests and reviews any documents or information required by EFSA and verifies their completeness and correctness before passing them to EFSA;
- Informs EFSA and the partner/s of any event that is likely to substantially affect implementation of the project;
- Submits the deliverables and reports to EFSA;
- Requests and receives payments from EFSA and distributes the funds to partner/s without unjustified delays.

The coordinator may not delegate the above-mentioned tasks to the co-beneficiary/ies or subcontract them to any third party.

The other beneficiary/ies:

- Take part in implementing the project;
- Forward to the coordinator the data needed to draw up reports, financial statements and other documents required under the grant agreement;
- Inform the coordinator of any event or circumstances likely to substantially affect or delay the implementation of the project.

1.7 IMPLEMENTING CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTING

Implementation contracts:

Where the implementation of the project requires the award of procurement contracts (implementation contracts), e.g. purchase of services and/or goods or equipment necessary for the implementation of the action, the beneficiary must award the contract to the entity offering the best value for money or the lowest price (as appropriate), avoiding conflicts of interests. The beneficiary is expected to clearly document the tendering procedure and retain the documentation for the event of an audit.

Entities acting in their capacity as contracting authorities within the meaning of Directive 2014/24/EU¹⁹ must comply with the applicable national public procurement rules.

Sub-contracting:

Sub-contractors are not consortium partners and are not party to the grant agreement. They do not have any contractual relationship with EFSA. Subcontractors are entities contracted by the beneficiary to carry out some specific tasks or activities. Subcontracting is allowed under these conditions:

- **Core tasks must not be subcontracted.** Only ancillary and assistance tasks can be subcontracted. Core tasks which cannot be sub-contracted for these projects, for both Lots, are: project coordination and coordination of project work-packages, planning, reporting and communicating with EFSA.
- **Subcontracting is specifically permitted for this Grant for activities conducted on plant pests which are quarantine pests for the European Union in the following cases:**
 - for **Lot 2**, to conduct experiments on pycnidiospore epidemiology and control of *P. citricarpa* in Tunisia (*P. citricarpa* is a Union quarantine plant pest absent from the EU territory, but present in Tunisia. Tunisia is so far the only area in the

¹⁹ Directive 2014/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC (OJ L 94, 28.3.2014, p. 65-242)



Mediterranean citrus growing areas with an outbreak of *P. citricarpa* in citrus orchards, where the experiments can be conducted);

- For **Lot 3**, subcontracting is allowed to conduct experiments and collect data on the biology and capacity to transmit *X. fastidiosa* of the insect *Draeculacephala robinsoni* in North America. Reason for this is that both the bacterium *X. fastidiosa* and the insect *D. robinsoni* are Union quarantine plant pests, native from America.
- Subcontracts must be awarded to the entity offering best value for money or the lowest price (as appropriate), avoiding conflicts of interests;
- Subcontracting must only cover the implementation of a limited part of the action;
- Recourse to subcontracting must be justified having regard to the nature of the project and what is necessary for its implementation;
- Tasks to be subcontracted and the corresponding estimated costs must be identified in the estimated budget and approved by EFSA before the signature of the grant agreement;
- Recourse to subcontracting during project implementation, if not envisaged from the outset in the proposal, is subject to prior authorisation in writing by EFSA, and must be formalised via an amendment to the grant agreement. Approval may be granted as long as it does not entail a change to the grant agreement which would call into question the decision awarding the grant or be contrary to the equal treatment of applicants;
- The conditions applicable to the beneficiaries under Articles II.6 (*Confidentiality*), II.7 (*Processing of Personal Data*), II.8 (*Visibility of Union Funding*) of the grant agreement are also applicable to the subcontractor.

1.8 GRANT PRINCIPLES

The financial help provided by EFSA under this Call is a grant governed by the EU Financial Regulation referred to in part 1.1. Accordingly, the grant awarded following this Call must comply with the following principles:

The form of grant awarded under this Call is grant based on a combination of the forms of grant in accordance with Article 125(1)(f) EU FR. Specifically, reimbursement of a specified proportion of the total eligible project costs actually incurred (Article 125 (1)(b), Unit costs for certain cost headings (Article 125(1)(c) and flat rate financing (Article 125(1)(e).

- **Co-financing:** In accordance with Article 190 of the Financial Regulation, grants shall involve co-financing. The resources necessary to carry out the project /action shall not be provided entirely by the grant. The project costs not covered by the EFSA grant must be financed from the applicant and partner/s resources. The applicant and its partner/s must therefore contribute financially to the project. Additionally, there may be also a financial contribution from another entity, but such an entity must be a public body. Contributions from the private sector are not permitted.
- **No-profit:** In accordance with Article 192 of the Financial Regulation, grants shall not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit within the framework of the project for the applicant or partner. Profit is defined as a surplus of the receipts over the eligible costs incurred by the beneficiaries, at the time of request for payment of the balance. The receipts shall be limited to income generated by the project, as well as financial contributions specifically assigned by donors to the financing of the eligible costs. Where a profit is made, EFSA shall be entitled to recover a part of it in line with procedure foreseen in the Grant agreement. The verification of the non-profit rule does not apply to low value grants (</= 60.000 €).



- **Non-retroactivity:** A grant may be awarded for a project which has already begun only where the applicant can demonstrate in the grant application the need to start the action before the grant agreement is signed. In accordance with Article 193 of the Financial Regulation, costs eligible for financing may not have been incurred prior to the date of submission of the grant application. No grant may be awarded retrospectively for a project already completed.
- **Non-cumulative:** In accordance with Article 191(3) of the Financial Regulation, in no circumstances shall the same costs be financed twice from the EU budget. To ensure this, the applicant shall indicate the sources and amounts of Union funding received or applied for the same project or part of the project or for its functioning during the same financial year as well as any other funding received or applied for the same project.

1.9 ESTIMATED BUDGET AND ELIGIBLE COSTS

The proposal must be accompanied by the estimated budget (Annex 2) which must be established in line with the [Rules on eligibility of costs](#). The estimated budget must show all the costs and income which the applicant considers necessary to carry out the project.

Estimated budget will have to be:

- sufficiently detailed to permit identification, monitoring and checking of the costs;
- balanced, i.e. total income and total costs must equal;
- consistent with the work plan;
- expressed in Euro.

1.10 PUBLICITY

All beneficiaries are expected to follow the rules on visibility of EFSA funding set out in Article II.8 of the grant agreement.

According to Article 38 of the EU Financial Regulation EFSA is bound to publish information on recipients of its grants at its website. Such publication shall take place no later than 30 June of the year following the financial year in which the grants were awarded and shall cover these data of the beneficiaries:

- name of the beneficiary
- address of the beneficiary
- subject of the grant
- amount awarded

With regards to publications of EFSA outputs that are integrating the preparatory work delivered in the context of this grant, the beneficiary could be mentioned in authorship lists indicating the affiliation to its organisation.

1.11 PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA IN RELATION TO GRANT PROCEDURES

Processing of personal data by EFSA

Information on the processing of personal data by EFSA in the context of this grant procedure is available in the [Privacy Statement](#) on the EFSA website as well as in Article II.7 of the draft grant



agreement. Any personal data included in the Agreement must be processed by EFSA in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 2018/1725.²⁰

Applicants should note that personal data as applicant or selected beneficiary may be registered in the Early Detection and Exclusion System (EDES) if you are in one of the situations mentioned in Article 136 of the Financial Regulation. For more information see the Privacy Statement on: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/explained/management/protecting/protect_en.cfm#BDCE).

Processing of personal data by the beneficiary

In case the implementation of activities under the grant agreement resulting from this call entails the processing of personal data, the beneficiary shall comply with the relevant rules in Article II.7.2 of the Grant Agreement (Annex 1) as a data processor of EFSA.

1.12 PUBLIC ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS

In the general implementation of its activities and for the processing of grant procedures in particular, EFSA observes Regulation (EC) N° 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.

1.13 OPEN ACCESS

EFSA is committed to the publication of grant outputs in the [Knowledge Junction](#) in order to improve transparency, reproducibility and evidence reuse. The Knowledge Junction runs on the EU-funded Zenodo research-sharing platform where uploaded items receive a unique Digital Object Identifier to make them citable. Any part of the output resulting from the action under this grant may be published (at EFSA's discretion) on the Knowledge Junction with attribution to the beneficiary.

²⁰ Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC



2. SELECTING PROPOSALS

The **Evaluation Committee** established by EFSA specifically for this call will evaluate the submitted proposals in five steps:

1. Verification of submission requirements (2.1)
2. Eligibility criteria (2.2)
3. Exclusion criteria (2.3)
4. Selection criteria (2.4)
5. Award criteria (2.5)

If the proposal fails at any step it is automatically excluded from further evaluation. EFSA may contact the applicant during the evaluation process if there is a need to clarify certain aspects or for the correction of clerical mistakes.

2.1 VERIFICATION OF SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The following will be verified:

- proposal was submitted within the deadline for submission of proposals;
- administrative data for grant application form is duly signed by the authorised representative of the applicant;
- proposal is complete and includes all the supporting documents.

2.2 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Criterion No. 2.2	Requirements and requested evidence
1	Eligibility criteria
	The following requirements will be verified:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the day of deadline for submission of proposals, the applicant and in case of consortium also its partner/s are on the list of competent organisations designated by the Member States in accordance with Art 36 of Regulation (EC) 178/2002 and Commission Regulation (EC) 2230/2004; • Applicant and in case of consortium also its partner/s participate in the project financially; • Applicant and in case of consortium also its partner/s are involved in the execution of the project; • Subcontracting, if any, is justified in the proposal and indicated in the estimated budget.
	Requested evidence:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative data for grant application (including Legal Entity and Financial Identification Forms): available here • LEGAL ENTITY FORM: available here



	<p>to be completed and signed by the applicant and in case of consortium also by its partner/s. For a public body the legal entity form should be provided together with a copy of the resolution or decision establishing the public body, or other official document establishing that public body. For a private body an extract from the official journal, copy of articles of association, extract of trade or association register, certificate of liability to VAT (if, as in certain countries, the trade register number and VAT number are identical only one of these documents is required).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FINANCIAL IDENTIFICATION FORM: available here to be completed only by the applicant and in case of consortium only by the coordinator. <p>Please note that there is no need to submit the Legal entity and Financial information forms if they have already been submitted under another EFSA procurement or grant procedure and provided that these forms are still valid. In this case simply indicate in the administrative data for grant application form the reference of the call under which the form/s were previously submitted to EFSA.</p> <p><u>Only applicable if the applicant is a consortium:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARTNERSHIP STATEMENT: The applicant and partner/s must provide EFSA with a statement indicating their involvement in the action. The applicant and partner/s must sign the partnership statement. No template is provided by EFSA.
--	--

2.3 EXCLUSION CRITERIA

Criterion No. 2.3	Requirements and requested evidence
2	Exclusion criteria
	The following requirements will be verified:
	The applicant and partner/s must sign a declaration on their honour certifying they are not in one of the exclusion situations referred to in the Articles 136-140 of EU Financial Regulation.
	Requested evidence:
	THE DECLARATION ON HONOUR – Section A , available here : to be completed/signed individually by the applicant and in case of consortium by each partner.

2.4 SELECTION CRITERIA

A) Financial capacity

Criterion No. 2.4A	Requirements and requested evidence
1	Financial capacity
	The purpose of the selection criteria is to verify the financial capacity of the applicant and in case of consortium also of its partner/s.



	<p>The applicant and in case of consortium also its partner/s must have stable and sufficient financial resources to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintain their activity throughout the period during which the project is being carried out, and • participate in its funding.
	Requested evidence:
	<p>Documents to be provided by the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DECLARATION ON HONOUR – Section B, available here to be completed by the applicant or in case of consortium by the coordinator. • SIMPLIFIED FINANCIAL STATEMENT available here only required for private bodies if the grant requested from EFSA is >60.000 €. The template published with the Call should be completed for at least the last two closed financial years. • LETTER OF COMMITMENT: applicable only when another public body financially contributes to the project (body other than EFSA, applicant or in case of consortium, its partners); to be signed by the contributing public body; it serves to confirm its commitment to financially contribute to the project; no template is provided by EFSA;

B) Operational capacity

Criterion No. 2.4.B	Requirements and requested evidence
1	Operational capacity:
	Requirements:
	<p>The applicant or in case of a consortium, the consortium as a whole, must have the professional resources, competencies and qualifications necessary to complete the proposed project:</p> <p><u>Requirement 1</u></p> <p>This requirement is specific for each Lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Lot 1, the applicant must provide evidence of its expertise (or of the consortium as a whole) in the field of mycology of plant pathogenic fungal species, with at least 5 scientific publications (published in the last 5 years) on peer reviewed scientific Journals. • For Lot 2, the applicant must provide evidence of its expertise (or of the consortium as a whole) in the field of mycology of plant pathogenic fungal species, with at least 5 scientific publications (published in the last 5 years) on peer reviewed scientific Journals. • For Lot 3, the applicant must provide evidence of its expertise (or of the consortium as a whole) in the field of entomology of phytophagous insect species, with at least 5 scientific publications (published in the last 5 years) on a peer reviewed scientific Journal. <p><u>Requirement 2</u></p>



	<p>This requirement is specific for each Lot. The applicant should demonstrate its ability to provide a team compliant with the following expertise requirements indicated here below for each Lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement 2 – specific for Lot 1: One team member with at least two scientific publications published on a peer reviewed journal within the last 5 years on <i>Colletotrichum</i> species • Requirement 2 – specific for Lot 2 At least one team member with at least two scientific publications published on a peer reviewed journal within the last 5 years on <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i>. • Requirement 2 – specific for Lot 3 At least one team member with at least two scientific publication published within the last 5 years on a peer reviewed journal on <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> and its transmission by insect vectors. • Requirement 2 – generic for all lots LIST OF PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS NAMES – general for each lot, the applicant shall also summarise, the names of the individual project team members with their role including indication who will be the coordinator of the project team. <p><u>Requirement 3:</u></p> <p>This requirement is common for all lots: Lot 1, Lot 2 and Lot 3. The coordinator of the proposed team for each Lot must have a very good level of written and spoken English. For non-native speakers, this should be demonstrated by an Official certificate of English proving a B2 level OR at least 3 years of work/study in an English-speaking environment or least 3 years of experience working in international projects where English is the working language.</p>
	<p>Requested evidence:</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>EVIDENCE REQUESTED FOR REQUIREMENT 1:</u> LIST of 5 (within last 5 years) scientific publications in the field indicated for the Lot, co-authored by member(s) of the project team. • <u>EVIDENCE REQUESTED FOR REQUIREMENT 2:</u> LIST of 2 (within last 5 years) scientific publications in the field indicated for the Lot, co-authored by member(s) of the project team. • LIST OF PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS NAMES – in addition to the CV’s, the applicant shall also summarise, the names of the individual project team members with specification of their role in the project. • <u>Evidence requested for requirement 3:</u> CURRICULUM VITAE of the proposed coordinator of the Project team for each lot demonstrating the English language requirement. • INDIVIDUAL DECLARATION OF INTERESTS Template available here. EFSA will request Individuals DoIs only from the awarded beneficiary, prior to and as a condition of grant agreement signature. EFSA may



	<p>request Individuals DoIs for members of the project team having influence and/or control over scientific outputs, prior to and as a condition of grant agreement signature. The requirement to submit Individual DoIs will be specified in the award letter and will have to be provided and assessed by the EFSA Authorising Officer before and as a condition of grant agreement signature. Individual DoIs do not need to be provided with your proposal at this stage.</p> <p>In case of a consortium and/or in case of subcontracting, such declarations will need to be completed separately and submitted for each partner and for each identified subcontractor and for each individual member of the project team coming from consortium partners or subcontractors. Please refer to EFSA's policy on independence and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management for more detailed information.</p>
--	--

2.5 AWARD CRITERIA

The applicant should present for each Lot a detailed technical proposal describing how the project will specifically address the main and the specific objectives for each Lot.

The following award criteria are applicable in this Call for all Lots: Lot 1, Lot 2 and Lot 3-

Criterion No. 2.5	The award criteria serve to assess the quality of the proposals in relation to the objectives of the Call. The following award criteria are applicable in this call:
1	The extent to which the proposal achieves the specific objectives for the relevant Lot of this call and is likely to deliver output that will be useful: MAX 45 POINTS in total, according to the three specific objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For Specific Objective 1 MAX 15 points - For Specific Objective 2 MAX 15 points - For Specific Objective 3 MAX 15 points
2	The extent to which the project is described in detail, as well as the proposed methodology is well described and of high quality. MAX 25 POINTS
3	Clarity of the project planning , including: phases, clear timelines for the project tasks completion, detailed milestones per task (e.g. via a project Gantt chart), expected outcomes and deliverables; task distribution among consortium partners (if applicable) and individual team members, both internally (i.e. within the consortium/team) and externally (communication with EFSA): MAX 10 POINTS ;
4	Feasibility of the project execution and risks management , including: feasibility of the proposed methodology; description of identified risks and proposed mitigating actions, if any, proposed contingency plan in case of deviations from the project programme: MAX 10 POINTS
5	Cost effectiveness and technical and financial consistency of the proposal: consistency between the proposed project and its estimated budget, e.g. how it reflects the task distribution/role of partners: MAX 10 POINTS.

The estimated budget submitted with the proposal is analysed by EFSA, to assess whether:

- it is realistic;



- it is consistent with the proposed project;
- the estimated budget is sufficiently detailed;
- the cost items are reasonably justified;
- to eliminate cost items which cannot be accepted according to the [Rules on eligibility of costs](#).

An overestimation or underestimation of costs, or missing justification of the costs, missing details, or detected inconsistency with the technical description of the project will have a negative impact on the evaluation score under the award criterion 9/10.

If EFSA regards the estimated budget as realistic, consistent with the technical description of project, sufficiently detailed, well justified and established in accordance with the [Rules on eligibility of costs](#) and no modification is needed, it will become the approved estimated budget and the EFSA grant may correspond to the applicant's request. In some cases, the analysis of the estimated budget could result in EFSA suggesting reductions, e.g. need to correct the costs in line with the Rules on eligibility of costs. After the proposed modifications are agreed by the applicant and EFSA, the estimated budget, as modified, will become the approved estimated budget for the project.

The final EFSA grant will be determined based on actually incurred costs, in line with Article II.25 of the grant agreement.

In order to be considered for a reserve list, the proposal must score a minimum of 70 points out of maximum possible 100 points and a minimum of 25 points out of maximum possible 45 points for criterion 1.

Proposals which have satisfied these quality thresholds will be ranked in a reserve list.

2.6 PROCESS FOLLOWING THE ASSESSMENT AGAINST AWARD CRITERIA

The applicant(s) will be notified, once the evaluation has been finalized, whether they are placed on the reserve list or not.

EFSA reserves the right to invite the 1st ranked applicant on the reserve list, to adapt its proposal based on the evaluators' comments in accordance with article 200(5) EU FR.

Following the successful conclusion of the adaptation phase, the award decision will be taken by EFSA. Subsequently, the grant agreement will be prepared.

If the 1st ranked applicant fails to adapt its proposal, EFSA reserves the right to reject the proposal. The budget made available in this way may be used for a project of the next ranked applicant on the reserve list.

3. SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

3.1 SUBMISSION COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST

The proposal must be submitted along with all the requested annexes and the administrative data for grant application form signed by a duly authorised legal representative of the applicant.

The applicant should be precise and provide enough detail to ensure the technical proposal is well described (free format).



By submitting a proposal, the applicant and in case of consortium also partner/s accept/s the procedures and conditions described in this Call and in the documents referred to in it.

In addition to a full paper version of the application, the applicant must submit the application also on a USB. The electronic version must be identical to the paper version. In case of any discrepancies between the electronic and paper version, the latter will prevail. All documents presented by the applicant become the property of EFSA and are deemed confidential.

The below checklist is designed to help the applicant to collect the documents in a structured way before submission of the proposal/application to EFSA.

APPLICATION SUBMISSION COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA: for details of which documents are needed see part 2.2 of the call:</p> <p>Administrative data forms signed (including Legal Entity and Financial Identification Forms) available here.</p> <p>Partnership Statement (only for consortium)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>EXCLUSION CRITERIA: for details of which documents are needed see part 2.3 of the call:</p> <p>Declaration on honour section A, available here.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>SELECTION CRITERIA: for details of which documents are needed see part 2.4 of the call:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Declaration on honour section B, available here. - Simplified Financial Statement, available here only for private bodies if the grant requested from EFSA is >60.000 €. - Letter of commitment applicable only when another public body financially contributes to the project - Requirement 1 for each lot: LIST of 5 (within last 5 years) scientific publications in the field indicated for the Lot, co-authored by member(s) of the project team - Requirement 2, specific for each lot: LIST of 2 (within last 5 years) scientific publications in the field indicated for the Lot, co-authored by member(s) of the project team / list of project team members with indication of their specific role in the project. - Requirement 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CURRICULUM VITAE of the proposed coordinator of the Project team for each lot demonstrating the English language requirement. - INDIVIDUAL DECLARATION OF INTERESTS. Template available here.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>AWARD CRITERIA: Technical proposal covering award criteria, see part 2.5 of the call</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Estimated budget in excel and signed pdf</p>

3.2 SUBMISSION MODALITIES

Proposals are to be submitted as indicated in the second page of this document in the Indicative procedure timetable.



3.3 LANGUAGE OF THE PROPOSAL AND THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Proposals may be submitted in any official language of the European Union. However, as EFSA's working language is English, the submission of proposals in English would speed up the evaluation process.

Please note that some supporting documents are required. These supporting documents are an integral part of the proposal. For more information on the relevant supporting documents to be submitted, please refer to part 2 of this Call. If these supporting documents are in a language other than English, in order to facilitate and speed up the evaluation, it would be appreciated if a reliable translation of the relevant parts of the documents into English is provided with the proposal.

3.4 EXPECTED DURATION OF PROCEDURE

In accordance with Article 194(2) of the Financial Regulation, the maximum time-limits for the procedure are as follows:

- All applicants will be informed of the decision regarding their application within 6 months of the deadline for submission of proposals;
- Signature of the grant agreement will take place within 3 months from the date the successful applicant/s has/have been informed of the decision on their application.



4. RULES ON ELIGIBILITY OF COSTS

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The eligible costs of the project receiving an EFSA grant must be shown in detail in an estimated budget. EFSA will take the final decision on the nature and amount of the costs to be considered as eligible.

Estimated budget must be:

- sufficiently detailed to permit identification, monitoring and checking of the costs;
- balanced, i.e. total income and total project costs must be equal;
- consistent with the work plan;
- expressed in Euro.

Costs eligible for an EFSA grant are those that are:

- incurred during the duration of the project, with the exception of costs relating to audit certificates;
- indicated in the estimated budget of the project;
- necessary for the implementation of the project which is the subject of the grant;
- 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 according to the usual cost accounting practices of the beneficiary;
- complying with the requirements of applicable tax and social legislation;
- reasonable, justified, and comply with the principle of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy and efficiency.

Estimated budget – cost side:

- **Eligible direct costs:**
 1. Costs of personnel;
 2. Travel costs and subsistence allowances;
 3. Depreciation costs of equipment or other assets;
 4. Consumables and supplies;
 5. Workshops, seminar, conferences;
 6. Subcontracting;
 7. Eligible VAT;
 8. Miscellaneous costs are costs arising directly from the requirements imposed by the grant agreement.

The above categories represent an exhaustive list of possible eligible direct costs. However, if, for example, the project does not foresee costs for workshops / seminars / conferences, then this category of costs can be left empty in the estimated budget.

- **Eligible indirect costs** incurred in carrying out the project are eligible for a flat-rate funding capped at not more than 10% of the total eligible direct costs. If a beneficiary (partner in the consortium) already receives an operational grant from the EU budget its indirect costs are not eligible under the present call.

Estimated budget – income side:



- **Mandatory incomes:**
 1. Grant requested from EFSA;
 2. Applicant's financial contribution;
 3. Partners financial contribution;
- **Optional incomes:**
 4. Financial contributions from other public bodies;
 5. Income generated by the project.

To be eligible, costs need to be incurred during the duration of the project, i.e. from the grant agreement entry into force and project deadline.

The eligible costs presented in the estimated budget must be as realistic as possible, except for eligible indirect costs which are a flat rate.

Once the project is implemented all the eligible actually incurred direct costs must be justified by supporting documents, e.g. invoices, timesheets, evidence of travel or presence at a meeting etc. EFSA reserves the right to ask any supporting document in order to verify that the costs declared as eligible were actually incurred and paid.

2. ELIGIBLE COSTS

2.1 ELIGIBLE DIRECT COSTS

"Direct costs" of the project are those specific costs which are directly linked to the implementation of the project and can therefore be attributed directly to it. They may not include any indirect costs²¹. To be eligible, direct costs shall comply with the conditions of eligibility set out above in point 1.

2.1.1 COSTS OF PERSONNEL – Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.1

The costs of personnel working under an employment contract with the beneficiary or an equivalent appointing act and assigned to the project are considered eligible costs (comprising actual salaries plus social security contributions and other statutory costs included in the remuneration).

In line with the EU Financial Regulation, the salary costs of public officials will be considered as a direct cost of the beneficiary to the extent that they relate to the cost of activities which the relevant public authority as beneficiary would not carry out if the project concerned was not undertaken.

The costs of natural persons working under a contract with the beneficiary other than an employment contract may be assimilated to costs of personnel, provided that the following conditions are fulfilled:

- the natural person works under the instructions of the beneficiary;
- the result of the work belongs to the beneficiary

If the above conditions are not met, the amounts paid to the natural person shall be presented under the category "subcontracting".

IMPORTANT:

²¹ Indirect costs are explained in section 2.2 below.



Staff assigned to the project must be classified in one of the [four](#) categories Manager, Researcher/Teacher/Trainer, Technical, Administrative. EFSA will check the correctness of the assigned category of each staff member from the CV's which will be provided by the beneficiary.

UNIT COSTS for personnel are shown in the table below. These costs are calculated based on EUROSTAT data, EFSA historical data, information received from other EC services and considering the annual labour costs per country. An annual revision of unit costs is done based on the application of the national inflation rates as published by [Eurostat](#). **Last revision entered into force on 16 August 2022.**

The **UNIT COSTS** per day for staff **must** be used when establishing the estimated budget and when declaring the incurred costs. **THE NUMBER OF DAYS** spent on the project (one day is composed of 8 working hours according to working day duration at EFSA) is to be indicated when establishing the estimated budget and when declaring the incurred costs.

The rate of the country in which the partner organisation is registered should be applied, independently of where the tasks will be executed (i.e. a staff member of an organisation of Country A working fully or partly in Country B will be budgeted on the basis of the rates of Country A).

The beneficiary must be able to justify the personnel costs at the end of the project by providing supporting documents (e.g. timesheets), if requested by EFSA.

The beneficiary shall ensure that CVs for all profiles (including technical and administrative staff) inserted in the budget are submitted together with the proposal for **direct** agreements. This will allow EFSA to check the correctness of the assigned role of each staff member. For those profiles for which the applicant reserves the right to recruit staff after the communication of the outcome of the call, CVs need to be provided to EFSA for checking the correctness of the assigned role as soon as the recruitment is complete.



UNIT COST PER DAY IN EUROS (August 2022)

Country	Manager	Researcher Teacher Trainer	Technical	Administrative
Austria	500	337	272	216
Belgium	471	382	269	240
Bulgaria	73	66	50	34
Croatia	225	203	163	103
Cyprus	322	240	149	101
Czech Republic	198	127	92	67
Denmark	589	416	291	261
Estonia	118	90	69	49
Finland	441	271	209	173
France	468	378	277	217
Germany	499	339	252	222
Greece	207	145	103	93
Hungary	127	102	77	52
Ireland	410	340	248	184
Italy	477	313	212	183
Latvia	100	75	58	43
Lithuania	134	79	54	39
Luxembourg	544	383	309	241
Malta	129	107	83	62
Netherlands	462	374	236	187
Poland	150	98	75	56
Portugal	274	192	130	82
Romania	143	109	85	54
Slovakia	135	109	96	78
Slovenia	257	195	156	98
Spain	344	227	174	125
Sweden	398	335	276	212
Iceland (EEA Country)	393	358	309	199
Liechtenstein (EEA Country)	492	331	267	213
Norway (EEA Country)	516	430	364	280
Switzerland (EFTA Country)	657	471	411	325



2.1.2 TRAVEL COSTS AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES – Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.2

All travel costs for missions, workshops/seminars/conferences must be included under Sheet A.2:

MISSIONS: travel costs and related subsistence allowances of staff and other persons taking part in the project are eligible. Kick-off, interim, final meetings and field trips (if any) are part of this category.

WORKSHOP/SEMINAR/CONFERENCE: travel costs for external participants and speakers (not staff employed by coordinator or partners) are eligible. As subsistence allowances are not foreseen for the participation of external participants in workshops/seminars/conferences, meals and accommodation for workshops must be inserted under the category “Miscellaneous” – Sheet A.6.

The daily subsistence allowances and travel costs of EFSA representatives shall not enter in the estimated budget because these costs are paid by EFSA directly to the staff concerned.

Travel costs

These unit costs must be applied when establishing the estimated budget and when declaring the incurred costs:

UNIT COSTS

Type of transport	Distance in road Km	Travel Unit cost
Car	Any distance	0.33 €/Km
Train	Any distance	0.40 €/Km
Flight	Any distance	500 €

If two or more staff members travel together sharing a car, the cost should be calculated only one time for the entire group of people. Insert the number of km for only one of the staff travelling by car and insert “shared” for all other staff traveling together.

Inter-continental flights are not included. They should be estimated on a case-by-case basis and declared on real incurred cost of flight ticket. The most economical fares must be sought (i.e., non-flexible economic class).

Daily subsistence allowances (DSA)

The DSA applies only for a mission to a place more than 50 km from the normal place of employment.

For travels related to workshops, the DSA is not applicable because costs of hotel accommodation and meals (lunch and dinner) are to be declared under item Miscellaneous costs (see article 2.1.5).

The amounts presented in the below table are calculated to cover the following expenses during a day of mission: accommodation, meals, local transport to reach airport/train station at the place of residence/employment and within the place of mission (car, parking, taxi and/or public transport), and sundry expenses, such as telecommunications costs (fax, internet).

The DSA is to be calculated according to the length of the mission: from the time of departure of the means of transport used until the arrival at the place of employment or home.

- </= 24 hours: full DSA;



- > 36 hours </= 48 hours: 2 x DSA, etc.

Missions to countries not mentioned in the below table shall be submitted to EFSA for an ex-ante agreement.

Country	€
Austria	234
Belgium	250
Bulgaria	192
Croatia	185
Cyprus	228
Czech Republic	194
Denmark	297
Estonia	185
Finland	255
France	282
Germany	225
Greece	194
Hungary	184
Iceland (EEA country)	245
Ireland	267
Italy	246
Latvia	189
Liechtenstein (EEA country)	175
Lithuania	186
Luxembourg	246
Malta	226
Netherlands	269
Norway (EEA country)	220
Poland	183
Portugal	184
Romania	198
Slovakia	174
Slovenia	201
Spain	216
Sweden	304
Switzerland (EFTA country)	220



2.1.3 DEPRECIATION COSTS OF EQUIPMENT OR OTHER ASSETS – Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.3

These costs are eligible if:

- the acquisition is strictly necessary for the performance of the project;
- those costs are recorded in the accounting statements of the beneficiary;
- the asset has been purchased in accordance with Article II.10 of the Grant agreement and it is written off in accordance with the international accounting standards and the usual accounting practices of the beneficiary.
- **Important:** The depreciation costs of equipment/software bought before the submission of the proposal can be taken into account in the estimated budget and when declaring the incurred costs but only for the portion covered by the period of the implementation of the proposed action. The percentage and the period covered by the depreciation costs should comply with the usual accounting practices of the beneficiary.

EFSA reserves the right to verify the correct application of the usual accounting practices of the beneficiary. In case the depreciation periods are not clearly indicated in those practices the following rules will be applied by EFSA:

- computer equipment (hardware) is written off over a period of 3 years,
- office furniture and equipment (photocopiers, fax, etc.) over 5 years, and
- specific computer software (not common software which is supposed to be covered by indirect costs) is covered in full.

The costs of rental or lease of equipment or other assets are also eligible, provided that these costs do not exceed the depreciation costs of similar equipment or assets and are exclusive of any finance fee.

Only the portion of the equipment's depreciation corresponding to the duration of the project and the rate of the actual use for the purposes of the project can be considered by EFSA as eligible. Consult the call for proposals for the maximum allowed duration of the project.

2.1.4 CONSUMABLES AND SUPPLIES – Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.4

The costs of consumables and supplies are eligible if:

- they are purchased in accordance with Article II.10 of the Grant agreement;
- they are directly assigned to the project.

Unlike the equipment, these are “consumables²²”, i.e. items that are not entered as fixed assets in the accounts (or inventory) of the beneficiary and are not written off. The term “directly assigned to the project” is important in order to avoid reimbursing the same cost twice by way of indirect costs. The nature of the project and the fact that the costs are specific to the project are key factors justifying direct cover of these costs.

All other items that are not “consumables” are to be inserted under “miscellaneous” (e.g. publication fees).

2.1.5 SUBCONTRACTING – Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.5

Costs entailed by subcontractors within the meaning of Article II.11 of the Grant agreement are eligible, provided that the conditions laid down in that Article and in the Call for proposals are met.

²² For example: laboratory material, reagents, gloves, medicines, etc.



The costs of natural persons working under a contract with the beneficiary other than an employment contract and which cannot be assimilated to costs of personnel, as indicated in part 2.1.1, are to be declared in this section.

Core tasks²³ may not be subcontracted. Only ancillary and assistance tasks may be subcontracted.

2.1.6 MISCELLANEOUS COSTS– Estimated Budget Excel, Sheet A.6

GENERAL MISCELLANEOUS COSTS: These might be the costs arising directly from requirements imposed by the Grant agreement, e.g. dissemination of information, specific evaluation of the project, audits, translations, printing/copying, including the costs of any requested financial guarantees, provided that the corresponding services are purchased in accordance with Article II.10.

MISCELLANEOUS COSTS RELATED TO WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS, CONFERENCES: This category of eligible costs is intended to cover costs linked to the organisation of a workshop, seminar or conference, in particular:

1. hire of premises;
2. hire of equipment;
3. interpretation (interpreters and hiring of booths);
4. translation costs in connection with workshop/seminar/conference;
5. catering (lunch and dinner) and accommodation costs for external participants and speakers
6. external speaker fee (intended for an expert coming from outside of beneficiary/consortium), max 500 € per speaker per day;
7. other costs (e.g. printing costs for documentation to be distributed to participants, various supplies, reception staff).

In case a contract is to be awarded within the context of a workshop, e.g. translation or preparation of documents, these services or supplies must be purchased in accordance with Article II.10 of the Grant agreement.

2.1.7 ELIGIBLE VAT

Duties, taxes and charges paid by the beneficiary, notably value added tax (VAT), are eligible, provided that they are included in eligible direct costs.

VAT is accepted as an eligible cost if it is not recoverable, and so declared on honour by the beneficiary in the estimated budget.

The eligible VAT cost should be declared in the same heading of the estimated budget in which the related cost is declared.

2.2 ELIGIBLE INDIRECT COSTS – Estimated Budget Excel, Summary sheet

"Indirect costs" of the project are those costs which are not directly linked to the implementation of the project and can therefore not be attributed directly to it. They may not include any costs identifiable or declared as eligible direct costs.

To be eligible, indirect costs shall represent a fair apportionment of the overall overheads of the beneficiary and shall comply with the conditions of eligibility set out in point 1.

²³ For example coordination of the grant



Unless otherwise specified, eligible indirect costs shall be declared on the basis of a flat rate of 10% of the total eligible direct costs. Eligible indirect costs may not include any eligible direct costs. The formula in the Summary of the estimated budget excel automatically calculates the eligible indirect costs at 10% of the inserted eligible direct costs.

The indirect costs are frequently of an administrative, technical and logistical nature, are cross-cutting for the operation of the beneficiary's various activities and cannot therefore be booked in full to the project for which the grant is awarded because this grant is only one part of those activities. Indirect costs comprise costs connected with infrastructures and the general operation of the organisation such as renting or depreciation of buildings and plant, water/gas/electricity, maintenance, cleaning, insurance, supplies, small office equipment such as toner, paper, stationary, communication and connection costs (phone, internet, fax, etc.), postage, and costs connected with horizontal services such as administrative and financial management, human resources, training, legal advice, documentation, IT, etc.

3. INELIGIBLE COSTS

In addition to any other costs which do not fulfill the conditions set out for eligible costs, the following costs shall not be considered eligible:

- return on capital;
- debt and debt service charges;
- provisions for losses or debts;
- interest owed;
- doubtful debts;
- exchange losses or costs of conversion;
- costs of transfers from the Authority charged by the bank of the partner;
- costs declared by the beneficiary in the framework of another action receiving a grant financed from the Union budget (including grants awarded by a Member State and financed from the Union budget and grants awarded by other bodies than the Authority for the purpose of implementing the Union budget); in particular, indirect costs shall not be eligible when the beneficiary already receives an operating grant financed from the Union budget during the period in question;
- contributions in kind from third parties;
- excessive or reckless expenditure;
- deductible VAT.

The ineligible costs, if any, must be declared in the Estimated Budget excel, Summary Sheet.

4. FLEXIBILITY WITH APPROVED ESTIMATED BUDGET

After the estimated budget of the project has been approved by EFSA (corrections are possible during the evaluation of the proposal) it becomes the approved estimated budget, and it will be attached to the Grant agreement. The approved estimated budget is based on estimates, and therefore it is normal that during the project implementation there might be a need to adjust it to reality or any unforeseen events.

The approved estimated budget may be adjusted by making transfers provided that such adjustments do not affect the basic purpose and the completion of the project is not jeopardised. No amendment is necessary for these transfers.

If the beneficiary wishes to replace a staff member by another employee, e.g. because of dismissal, maternity leave, long term sick leave of original staff member, a prior approval of EFSA should be



sought and the new CV and individual declaration of interest (if DoIs are applicable) shall be provided. No amendment is necessary for these changes.